

Revolutionary Transformation After Hurricane Katrina

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. spoke in Washington, D.C., Sept. 16, 2005, at an international webcast sponsored by LaRouche PAC, and moderated by LaRouche spokeswoman Debra Hania Freeman. Some of the graphics mentioned are not reproduced with this transcript, but can be found on the website <http://www.larouchepac.com>.

Freeman: On behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I'd like to welcome all of you to today's event. I think without question, you'll agree with me, that the nature of our gathering today will prove to be historic in nature. Because, in fact, with the rising waters of Hurricane Katrina, the final threads of credibility and legitimacy of the Bush-Cheney Administration were washed away. And in fact, it is actually in the midst of that storm surge, that Mr. LaRouche once again emerged as the key figure in the United States, who was prepared in the face of the complete paralysis and uncaring of an incompetent, insane Administration, to step to the fore, and to give direction, not only to the party whose Presidential nomination he sought, but also to give direction to our elected leaders.

Thankfully, members of the Congress responded, and in fact, acted when the Administration failed to act. Last night, all of us were witness to the Idiot-in-Chief's attempt to try to run damage-control for what he did not do, when the crisis emerged, both prior to and after its immediate manifestation. But the fact of the matter, is that his legitimacy has already been *so damaged* and so threatened, that a national address and a sympathetic glance, along with an 800 number, is not sufficient to regain the legitimacy of his office.

For the first time, people in Washington realize, that there is no way around an incompetent, insane White House. The question now, though, is what direction the nation will take, and what direction the world will take. And I think, again, we can all agree, the direction of the world will very much be determined by the direction of the United States.

There are many things that I can say. There are things that I will refer to, during the course of today's event. But, ladies and gentlemen, without any further introduction, please join me in welcoming Mr. Lyndon LaRouche.

LaRouche: Thank you. Thank you, Debra. Thank you, very much.

To start with, my function here, which is international, as you know, is to set the pace for where this nation goes: because, where this nation goes now, the world goes. There's no other part of this planet in trouble, which is capable of making certain initiatives, certain decisions, which must be made for the world. Many parts of the world would welcome what I propose the United States must do in providing leadership, but they won't start it themselves. We in the United States must start it. Because we have a Constitution, and a tradition that goes with that, which gives us a capability, that no other nation on this planet has ever achieved. We look like sour eggs right now, or something. But that's not our character. Because the character of a people is not defined by what it is at a moment. The character of a people is embodied in its living history.

Now, for example, in my family, I am personally acquainted, actively, with someone who was born more than 200 years ago. I never met this gentleman, a great-great-grandfather. But he was a dominant personality, back in the 1920s, at the dinner table of family gatherings. He was a legend; he was a leader in the civil rights struggle, coming out of the Carolinas during the early part of the last [19th] Century. He was chased out of Carolina, and had to go to Ohio, where he became a leader of the civil rights struggle there, the struggle against slavery there, and ran the Underground station north of Columbus, Ohio, of escaped slaves being shipped up to Canada to get some kind of freedom.

So this, in a sense, typifies my experience, my family experience in the United States, from the first people here—



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., Sept. 16: "My function here, which is international, as you know, is to set the pace for where this nation goes: because where this nation goes now, the world goes."

apart from an Algonquin Indian who was in there earlier, and is part of the ancestry; you may not note it now, but it's there—came into North America in the latter part of the 17th Century, from France into Quebec, and into Pennsylvania from England. And we have some Scottish immigrants from the 1860s—one came over as a sword-wielding dragoon, who joined the First Rhode Island Cavalry for the Civil War.

So, we have embedded in us, in our family connections, in other connections, the transmission of ideas, of our nation to us, which reaches back deep into the founding of this nation, before it became a republic, in places such as the Plymouth Brethren settlement in Plymouth, Mass., or the Massachusetts Bay Colony. We represent those from Europe, who came here with a very clear idea, about establishing a bastion for freedom, here, that was not available in Europe, with the intention of bringing the establishment of freedom here, as a force, back into Europe to reform it.

Out of that, we created the best Constitution that the world has ever seen: our Federal Constitution, our Declaration of Independence. These are standards of constitutional law which no other part of the world has ever approached! And this is an integral part of our tradition.

We are not a perfect nation. There are no perfect nations, and never will be. There are nations in the process of development. And the development is represented by those, who, in a *tradition*, a national tradition—also the tradition of European civilization in its best aspects—are in the process of trying to build forms of society which will make the human race a

better place in which to live, for our descendants, than we have today.

The common idea, which came out of Greece, actually, as far as we know, as it is expressed by Solon of Athens, on which our Constitution was modelled in a sense—the ideas of our Constitution were modelled upon the reference to Solon of Athens, the first kind of free state in all European civilization. It didn't work out too well. It failed. But then, came along the work of Plato, who represented Socrates. And in Plato's *Republic* was founded the *idea* on which this nation was founded, the idea of a republic, of a people dedicated to what we call the General Welfare: that the purpose of a nation is to provide for the General Welfare, of all of its people, and especially, even more than the living, those who come after them.

It was that sense of a republic, that sense of the immortality, the immortal purpose of a nation, which is its character. And we in the United States have been given a constitutional tradition.

Despite all the evils we've had to fight against within our republic, the best in the world, with all its present, most noticeable, imperfections.

So therefore, what I have to do, is, being an older person—older, not so much in years, because there are people who are much older, at least a few of them, and they're valuable—but, old in the sense that my thoughts go back not less than 3,000 years. And therefore, the ideas I carry within, the ideas which represent the policies on which I speak, are at least several thousand years old, and date from the ideas of European civilization, since ancient Greece: the Greece of the Pythagoreans, of Solon, and Plato. Therefore, it's from that standpoint, of recognizing that I must speak to that, to the inner Constitution within our Constitution, the intention on which this nation was founded, that we must now bring a remedy for the ills of the entire planet.

A Nation in Purgatory

We now face the worst financial crisis in all modern history. This is not a depression. The equivalent of the 1929 Depression happened in October 1987—and we've been going downhill since then. The condition of the lower 80% of our family-income brackets, has been deteriorating in the United States, and as I shall deal with this with some indications today, it's been getting worse, and worse, and worse. There are whole sections of the United States, such as the states of the Central States—Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois—which were once powerful states—western Pennsylvania—

once powerful, in terms of industrial and agricultural progress: *Been destroyed!* It's a wasteland! The entire great farm belt, the grain belt, which was a power of this nation, has been largely destroyed! It's been destroyed by the policies of government, over a period of about 40 years.

We had many mistakes we made in the post-war period. We didn't continue the Roosevelt direction fully. It became worse and worse. And after the assassination of Kennedy, and about the time we plunged into the war in Indo-China, we began to go worse. Under Nixon, we became much worse, and we've been going downhill, at an accelerating rate, ever since.

We're in a condition today, in the United States, as increasingly now in Europe, too, in which the infrastructure, and the industries on which this nation depended for its riches, have been destroyed. Now, infrastructure, for example, water systems have a life-expectancy of 30-odd to 50 years. Power systems have an immediate approximate life-expectancy of a quarter-century or more. Highway systems; railway systems, which have disappeared; and so forth—factory systems, industrial systems. More important: the skills of labor! We do not have a labor force that has the skills, even approximately the skills, of production that it had three decades ago. We have become a post-industrial nation; some call it a "services economy." It's an economy waiting to be served—at lunch!

So therefore, we are a ruined nation. But we still have, in the immortal aspect of ourselves, in the memory of what we were, in the evidence of what we were, we have the keys to success, the keys to rebuilding.

Now, very few politicians in Washington have that view. Very few so-called leaders today, have that view. We're like a nation in Purgatory, waiting to be delivered into Hell! We live. But we live in the end-phase of history, where history has come to an end, and we're living in Purgatory, in the end of history, waiting to be dropped into Hell. And that's considered popular opinion, conventional opinion, today.

But now, all these people who have been sleeping in Purgatory, the Purgatory of Baby-Boomerism in particular, are now faced with destruction. They've assumed that they could live on, in the end of history, and silently pass into death without pain. And having a sort of a comfort zone to live in, in the meantime, to live in, until they were delivered to a more ugly destination.

That's ended: There is no comfort zone! There's no safe place to which to flee. There's no hiding place. You can't shrug it off. It's *you*. It's *your* situation. It's the situation of the nation as a whole. There's no place to run; there's no place to hide: You have to get up and fight, whether you like it or not. Not because you like to fight, but because you have no alternative.

That pretty much is the actual situation of the world today. It's become worse and worse over the past two, three decades. But now, we've come to the end of the game. We are minutes, in the sense of history, minutes away from the destruction of world civilization. We're minutes away from a process that



FEMA/Jocelyn Augustino

FEMA looking for residents in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. "What you saw, in the effects of Katrina are two things . . . a part of the economy which is in much worse condition than it was 30, 40, years ago . . . a lot of poor people, who didn't even have the money to get out of town, who were hit by poverty that was imposed on them as a condition. But we saw, also, the poverty of government, the insanity of government, the virtually criminal negligence on the part of the President and Vice President, and their institutions."

could lead to a collapse of the world population from over 6 billion today, to about the population size of the 14th Century before. The very means of existence are being destroyed.

What you saw, in the effects of Katrina, are two things: You saw the effects of a part of the economy, which is in much worse condition than it was 30, 40 years ago. We see the effects of a lot of poor people, who didn't even have the money to get out of town, who were hit by poverty, the poverty which was imposed upon them as a condition. But we saw, also, we saw the poverty of government, the insanity of government. The virtually criminal negligence on the part of the President and Vice President, and their institutions. They were on a vacation—they should have stayed there, and left

the office to somebody else to take over.

So, we're in two kinds of crisis: We're in an economic crisis, a moral crisis, a social crisis, which have been building up over decades: decades of error, decades of negligence, decades of carelessness, decades of corruption! But we also find ourselves in a desperate situation, in which the leading institutions of the Executive branch of government are a catastrophic failure—and worse than a failure; you almost wish they weren't there. But we need those institutions, but under better management, to get us out of this mess.

And that's the situation around the world. Germany is operating below breakeven. Germany, under the present policies, hasn't a chance. My wife, who's running for Chancellor in Germany, is the best chance Germany has! Because at least she represents the ideas. And there are some people around Chancellor Schröder who recognize the importance of these kinds of ideas, and some people in parts of Europe recognize it. But Europe could not save itself on its own. It could not take on the challenge of the changes in policy which have to be made on a global scale.

The Danger of 'Permanent War'

Now, in such times of crisis as this, when the world is decaying because of bad policy and its economic effects, you come into a very dangerous time, in which Hell may break out in the form of certain kinds of wars.

Now, the principal subject, among the several I want to deal with summarily and in succession today, is, first of all, the greatest immediate danger of all: the danger of permanent war.

Now, I'd like to have you start with this by looking at the cover of the next issue of *EIR*. ["Dick Cheney: Permanent Revolution, Permanent War"]. And I'll explain what this is. And I'll explain why it's important to do that, today.

Now, one of the things I have to do today, and in the days following, is to make clear to people in the Senate and other parts of our government, in influential institutions, exactly what the problem is: The problem typified by Cheney, a Cheney, who in a sense, in his own way, is far worse and more dangerous than Adolf Hitler. And if you don't stop him now, you may have nothing worth stopping.

What the danger is, is this: In a time of crisis, when things can no longer go on the way they have been going on, you come to a point, where somebody decides to push through dictatorship. And that is exactly what the Cheney-Bush Administration (in that order), and what the British government of Tony Blair, are doing. There's an Anglo-American alliance to bring Hell on this planet.

Now, many people object to the specific things that they recognize that Cheney and Blair are doing, in their alliance—which is made through his wife, Lynne Cheney, who actually runs the family. He used to be a performing stud service in the family, and when that was over, they gave him another assignment, as Vice President. But, look—we've got the *EIR*

cover (keep it on there for a minute, because I want to get this theme thoroughly impacted). Now, we know that Cheney and Company—and Cheney's the leader of this in the government, because Bush doesn't know which end is up and which end is down—but Cheney, since he was Secretary of Defense, under Bush #1, or they call him "41," had a plan for a war. At that time, the first Bush Administration, which was advised by various people who were saner and more intelligent than George H.W. Bush, said, "Don't continue a war in Iraq. Don't try to occupy it. Get out of it! Make the agreement, and leave." Which was done.

Cheney's policy, at that time, was to continue with the war and the occupation, with the kind of thing which did happen, recently under his direction as Vice President. Some people think that was a bad idea—they *don't understand* what the idea was.

Now remember, that when Cheney was going to war, with that stooge, a President, doing the spade-work for him, he was warned by the military, that without an exit strategy, without a plan for an exit strategy, this would become a mess—with no satisfactory conclusion. Now, that warning has been borne out. Iraq is a mess. There is no solution. There will never be a stable state, under this condition, today. People would say, "But doesn't that prove that Cheney failed?" No, it does not prove that Cheney failed. Cheney did not fail. He succeeded. Because, what was his purpose? See, naive people think, that when the United States goes to war, it's going to war to win war. War means, you defeat an opponent, you readjust the country, and leave, having declared victory. Well, Bush declared victory, but he didn't have a victory, and Cheney never intended a victory! Rumsfeld never *intended* a victory in Iraq! They *intended* this to continue the way it is! They intend, now, to do the same thing with Iran. They intend to do this in North Korea. They intend to do this in other parts of the world.

Now, we've reached the point, that we no longer have a military capability for conducting wars. What we have is a military capability, for destruction. Largely from the air, by missile or aircraft. With nuclear weapons—mini-nuclear weapons, but it won't stop there.

Their plan for permanent war: Again, the cover. (Keep it on for a while.)

Historical Precedents

Now, where did this idea come from? The idea is very old. Let's take the idea as it existed in European civilization: The first case of this kind of warfare, in European civilization, was the Peloponnesian War, which destroyed the power of Greece. Greece was destroyed internally, by the Peloponnesian War. The end-game of the Peloponnesian War, was to eliminate Greece as a major factor—it was a dominant factor in the Mediterranean, at that time—in order to make way for a new empire. The empire was intended to be formed by an alliance of Macedon, with the Persian Emperor, the Achaemenid Empire, and to create an empire of the entire Mediterra-

near region, which would be divided into two parts, with a shared empire by the King of Macedon, and the Emperor of Persia. To divide, to take the Halys line and the line in the Middle East, divide the world at that point: to the East, all the way to Pacific Coast, would be one half of the empire; and to the West, from this line, such as the Halys River in Anatolia, would be the other part of the empire.

Now, that didn't work, because the Academy at Athens backed up Alexander, who hated his father (justly so), and who broke the deal, and destroyed the Persian Empire. So, for that moment, the empire was off. But then, Alexander was poisoned, he was killed by poisoning, and therefore, a certain amount of chaos went on in this period, the Ptolemy period.

But then, it came back: About 200 B.C., you had the emergence of Rome as an imperial force. It was not yet an empire. It was still called a republic, but the intention was empire. And the transition occurred to empire, through civil wars and various kinds of wars in the Mediterranean, to settle which of three powers would be the head of the empire: Would it be Egypt? Would it be the Middle East? Or, would it be Rome itself? At first, there was supposed to be a compromise between Cleopatra and Julius Caesar, but that didn't work out, because Julius got himself killed. Then the heirs of Julius Caesar began to quarrel among themselves. And there were various deals: Marc Anthony tried to marry Cleopatra again—she was apparently the trading merchandise of the day. And they got defeated, because the legal heir of Julius Caesar, who changed his name, made a deal with the forces in the Middle East, and they defeated the forces of Marc Anthony/Cleopatra, and he became, of course, the Emperor Augustus.

They had an imperial system. The imperial system decayed internally, and the Emperor Diocletian divided the Empire into two parts, an Eastern and Western division of the Empire, just as had been planned at the time of Philip of Macedon, and the Persian Empire. A two-empire system. So, you had the Empire of the West and the Empire of the East, divided in the middle of what is now Yugoslavia. That didn't work out too well.

Then you had the emergence of the medieval period, about 1000 A.D., in which the Venetian financier-oligarchy emerged as the successor to Byzantium, and made an alliance with the Norman Chivalry. And the two of them ran the world in that area, in a form which was called Crusades, which started with the Albigensian Crusade, the Norman Conquest, and a series of official Crusades, all the way until the verge of the collapse of that empire, in the 14th Century in a new Dark Age—the financial system collapsed.

But then, we had the emergence, in the Golden Renaissance, of a new kind of society: a true nation-state society, which was formed out of the Council of Florence, with the establishment of the first modern nation-state, based on the principle of the General Welfare—Louis XI's France. Now, you had a fellow at Louis XI of France's court, by the name of Richmond. He was an Englishman. And he went to En-



clipart.com

The Anglo-Dutch Liberals established an empire, creating the British East India Company as its imperial battering ram. The British East India Company ensured years of permanent colonial war on the subcontinent. Here, a royal British procession in India in the 19th Century.

gland, and he overthrew the bastard, Richard III, and established England as the second modern nation-state, that is, committed to the principle of the General Welfare.

At that point, a struggle broke out between the vestiges of the old imperial interests, and a new kind of state, the modern nation-state. They tried to break it up with religious war, from 1492, with the Expulsion of the Jews—by Spain, by the Grand Inquisitor—until 1648, when religious peace was established in Europe with the treaty of 1648, the Peace of Westphalia.

In this period, however, a new imperial force came up—no longer the Habsburgs, but the Anglo-Dutch Liberals, initially the Anglo-Dutch Liberal India Companies. And they set forth to establish an empire. And through a war, which they organized on the continent of Europe, called the Seven Years' War, they became an imperial power, the British East India Company, in February 1763 at the Treaty of Paris. And this became the beginning of the British Empire, which initially was an empire of the British East India Company.

The American Challenge

Now, at that point, the oppression occurred against the American colonies. And as well, against the people of Europe.

So, an international alliance developed, among leading intellectual and moral forces inside Europe, and the forces inside North America, led by Benjamin Franklin, which resulted in the formation of this republic, with the support of most of Europe, of most of the people of Europe. But then, the French Revolution, which the British orchestrated, the unleashing of Napoleon to destroy much of Europe with his wars, created the situation which led into all kinds of Hell, for us and others, until Abraham Lincoln led in victory, against a British puppet called the Confederacy, the British slave-



Courtesy of Imperial War Museum, London

The trench warfare of World War I, was part of the British Empire's permanent warfare, to keep its financial and political grip on the world. The imperial forces, led by Britain, wanted to halt the spread of the American System into Germany, Japan, and Russia in the late 19th Century. Today's heirs of these imperial forces, are trying to push the United States into another "permanent war."

holder faction.

Then, the United States emerged as a great influential power on the planet. The ideas of the United States, the U.S. economy, spread into Germany, in 1877-78, with the Bismarck reforms which were modelled upon the U.S.; in Japan, in the same period, with the Japan reforms, which started Japan as an industrial society, as a modern society; with a development in Russia under Alexander III in particular, the development of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and the industrialization of Russia. And similar things in other parts of the world.

So, at this point, the British Empire, which had seemed to dominate the world in the period of the early 19th Century, was suddenly placed in jeopardy, not because there was an imperial power threatening them, but because the nations of Eurasia, as well as the Americas, were in revolt against empire. They were for development, agro-industrial development; for the freeing of people from conditions of serfdom and slavery and other kinds of impoverishment.

Again, the imperial forces, led by Britain, organized a war, called World War I—with the help of the assassination of a President in 1901. And so forth. It led to the second war, planned by the same people. But then, we had a President, Franklin Roosevelt, who knew what the game was, and who represented the American tradition, of his ancestors. Who led, not only in rebuilding this nation out of the Depression, where, under Hoover, the economy collapsed by one-half. But Franklin Roosevelt made us the greatest economic power the world had ever seen, from under depression conditions. And because of our existence, Hitler, who would have been success-

ful, was defeated. Without the power of the United States, and the commitment of the United States, we would have been living, saying "*Heil Hitler!*" today.

Roosevelt saved us.

Overturing the FDR Legacy

But then, again, the *same crowd*, which had backed Hitler—including Americans, including the grandfather of the present President of the United States, Prescott Bush, who is the guy who organized the funds to save the Nazi Party from bankruptcy, in time to make Hitler dictator of Germany! This crowd, once Roosevelt was dead, began to go back to the same, old business. They couldn't do it immediately. They could do it by pieces. Most of you here, *don't know what we lived through* under Truman. Truman was the most evil President that I can think of: He did more, by intention, to destroy the United States. *He* was the one who threatened to put us into *preemptive nuclear war!* It was Truman, who stopped the peace treaty, which had been negotiated with Japan, so that we could drop the only two nuclear weapons we had as prototypes, on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The intention was to create a nuclear arsenal and conduct a preemptive war against the Soviet Union—which was called off, only when the Soviet Union developed some nuclear weapons, and developed priority in a thermonuclear weapon.

At that point, they called the show off. They told Harry go, "go git!" "Git back home, there, Harry! Your time is over!" And we brought in Eisenhower, who kept us from going to war, during the time he was President. Otherwise, we would have been in nuclear war.

But then, Eisenhower was out of office. Kennedy did not know what the score was. His father had been on the wrong side, anyway. And therefore, they killed him—and we went through a change.

This is what we're up against, this crowd.

Now, what's the point? The financial interests, the same financial interests of the United States and Britain, and other countries, which brought Hitler and what he represented to power in Europe, during the 1920s and 1930s—these same financier interests, which, through people like George Shultz, use stooges like Cheney, are determined to get us into a special kind of war, which we should understand from the history of European experience with imperialism, beginning from the time of the Peloponnesian War. The purpose of Cheney's operation, is not to fight a war to win it against an adversary, and bring peace, by winning war. The purpose of empire, as the Roman Empire, as the British Empire, as other empires, is *to use war, as a means of government*. To kill off, by war, forces which are independent. And to get wars going on religious bases, and other bases, among peoples, and by playing people against each other, national groups against each other, national areas against each other, to rule the world, the way Rome, under the Roman legions, ruled its empire. The way that medieval Europe, under Venetian-Norman chivalry con-

trol, used *war*, like Crusades and other wars, as a means of controlling Europe, in an imperial way. That's the method used by the British Empire: *war as a method of government*.

Parvus, Trotsky, and 'Permanent Revolution'

Now, the problem we have—and I'll get back to this in this cover picture again (the cover story, shall we say?): Now, you've got three characters there. You've got in the middle, Cheney. I think you recognize the bum. With all his glory, his beauty, hmm? And you've got over on the side, on our left, Leon Trotsky. On the right, a fellow, Alexander Helphand, otherwise known as Parvus. These are the people who conveyed into Europe, in their time, a doctrine called *permanent revolution*. Which is a doctrine, which by name, is associated by the cognoscenti with Trotskyism. Trotskyists have the theory of permanent revolution.

But, this is tied to a doctrine of permanent war. Who gave Trotsky the idea of permanent revolution? Parvus. Alexander Helphand. What was Helphand? Helphand was a British agent, of Russian extraction, tied to a famous character, Colonel Zubatov, in Russia—the chief of the Okhrana, the secret police. And with Jabotinsky, Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky. These were the people who set up fascism in Europe; for example, Italy, was set up as part of this crowd. And Parvus died in the 1920s, organizing what became the Nazi movement—then under the movement, under Coudenhove-Kalergi, which he was working on at the time he died of natural or unnatural causes.

During the period, he was a gun-runner, a grain trader, and so forth—everything. He was trained in Britain, recruited in Britain, and deployed as a Russian operative in British operations around the world: organizing wars, organizing weapons trade, organizing and so forth.

In 1905, he had Trotsky in tow, and took him into Petersburg, where the Okhrana chief, Zubatov, was organizing a revolution against the Tsar—from inside the Tsar's government. And he gave Trotsky a paper, which he, Parvus, had written, on permanent revolution. He left Trotsky with the paper. Trotsky got into trouble. He had left the scene, and Trotsky thereafter defended this doctrine of permanent revolution.

So, what it is, is a kind of a left-right operation, of organizing instability, riots, insurrections, so forth, various means of creating Hell. It's otherwise called "regime change"! In other words, what we did in Iraq. We go through regime change, and the place is turned into a hellhole—from which it will never recover, under the present trends. It's not intended to recover—ever. They intend to spread it to Syria, to Iran, and so forth. Permanent regime change: permanent revolution. And part of that is *permanent war*.

That's what we in the United States face, within and without.

The problem, the challenge before us, today, in the middle of what is a great depression, great suffering, great problems

among us, and in the world at large: The chief challenge is, that the government, the Executive branch of our government, is in the control of a few people, typified merely by Cheney, who are for permanent regime change, permanent revolution. And the irony of the thing, is of course, they've recruited a lot of Trotskyists, who are called neo-cons, neo-conservatives—or, chicken-hawks, because they ducked service in Vietnam, and went on to wars in other places, where other people are fighting the wars—and permanent war.


Not war to *win*, in the sense of nation-state wars. But war as a method of government, to destroy the planet, so that a handful of people, relatively speaking, control the entire planet, as an empire. These people are financier interests, of the type that are looting our government—like Halliburton and Bechtel, for example, today. This crowd. And that's what we're up against.

So our people in the Senate and elsewhere *do not yet understand this!* And their failure to understand this, to understand what we're really up against, means they do not take the appropriate response. They may take an honest response, they may do useful things—but they're going on to bigger and better things than they have faced right now, or recognized so far: They're facing something much more deadly, than they imagine. And my job is to make those facts clear to them. And we will be doing that, which is why I refer to the cover of *EIR* to document exactly what this is. And to put forth, internationally, documentation of the *nature of the danger we face*: What is the danger of *war*? What does it mean? What is the policy? Where does it come from? How is it organized? And, how do we defeat it?

If we don't understand that, we will lose. And therefore, understanding what is behind the idea of permanent revolution, and permanent warfare, is crucial to saving this nation, and saving civilization. And unfortunately, only relatively few people understand that, today.

All right, now, when you're dealing with something ugly, my view is, that you start, as did my great friend François Rabelais of France, who faced terrible conditions; and the case of *Don Quixote*, of our dear friend Miguel Cervantes: When you face a terrible situation, and Spain was a terrible place at the time; there was nothing good in Spain. There's nothing good in *Don Quixote*: Everybody is nuts, greedy and nuts. There aren't any good Spaniards in *Don Quixote*; they're all nuts. But, Miguel Cervantes used humor, great humor, as a way of trying to mobilize people in Spain to an awareness of what their problem was. To desire to rise above being either Sancho Panza—you know, belly, that's what it is—or, this crazy old knight, with a bucket on his head. To become real. To enter modern civilization.

François Rabelais faced a similar situation. He was a great thinker. He joined many religious orders. He was a power in his time. He was a great physician, among other things (which is where he got some of his vocabulary from), but he dealt—with his Pantagruel and his Gargantua—dealt with the situa-



After Charles Addams

“When people can laugh about terrible problems, then, instead of being gripped by fear and terror, they can clear their heads and think seriously about what we’re going to do about this problem.”

tion with humor. Because, when people can laugh, and laugh about terrible problems, to see the irony of the situation, then, instead of being gripped by fear and terror, they can clear their heads and think seriously, about what’re we going to do about this problem? And put it in perspective. Not be in awe of the problem—but be the intellectual *master* of the problem. And being the intellectual master of the situation, is key to being the physical master of yourself.

So, let’s look at some of these things. They’re something from the [Charles] Addams cartoon series [see graphic]. This, of course, is one way of looking at what happened in Louisiana.

Next one [another Addams cartoon] Now, there’s three characters you’ll recognize, with George Shultz up there, in a portrait on the wall, while they’re preparing a torture rack. The shoe-shopper, [Condoleezza] Rice, and the President, and his boss, Cheney.

And then the third one, Franklin Roosevelt [driving a car], and these two [Bush and Cheney about to roll a rock down the hill on top of his car].

Hurricane Katrina

All right, now. Let’s start, then, by looking at the Mississippi situation, and what that involves, and the adjoining states, of course first; and then, come to the general problem of the economy as a whole. Take first, of all just a picture

of this Katrina, what that looked like on a map [weather map showing Katrina shortly before landfall]. This is what you’re looking at. You recognize the area; you recognize the temperature concentration there [darker colors show the cooler, and therefore higher, cloud tops].


Now, let’s go on to the next one, on the levee system itself. This is what the structure was. You have the Mississippi River, which is a much higher level than New Orleans itself; then Lake Pontchartrain, and you have a system, a damming system, levee system, which keeps the water out of the New Orleans area.

Next, (**Figure 1**): This indicates some of the canals, levees, which were in trouble, and were part of the problem.

But, get on to the next issue. Now, this is the area that was immediately affected by this storm. Now, let’s get on to the next picture (**Figure 2**). We’re looking at the Mississippi; look at the dates. We’ll go through this twice, “Change in the percentile of manufacturing workers in the workforce.” The red [counties] are the more dense, the blue ones, the light blue ones, the less dense. You see, there are changes going on, there are interchanges—not constantly. But you see, overall, a general collapse of the workforce in that entire area. So you’re going through this entire period, since the end of the

FIGURE 1

New Orleans Flood Protection Structures—Not Upgraded



This schematic Army Corps of Engineers’ 2003 map shows levee/floodwall sites in the core New Orleans area, which were part of the Corps’ overall plans to upgrade storm protection structures to withstand maximum Category 5 hurricanes, not lesser Category 3. Repeated requests for funding for strengthening and heightening the levees were denied by the George W. Bush Administration. Under Katrina, the levees breached in five places.

1970s, into increasing impoverishment, intrinsic impoverishment of this area. And you see, the crucial thing you'll find, is, 1990 is a very crucial point in this whole process.

Again, we go on to the next [graphic]. Okay, now, this is service workers, where you're going from an industrial society, an agro-industrial society, to a service-worker economy, and you see what's happening here, the opposite effect: that you're getting an increase in service workers, which are low-paid, unskilled, no guarantees, "no nothing" to speak of—hamburger flippers—as opposed to productive jobs, which represent more stability, more wealth produced.

Then go on to the next graphics (**Figures 3 and 4**). All right. This combines the two, "service workers as a percentage of the total workforce" [county by county], and you see what's happening. It's spreading, weakening, character is destroyed, from 2000, especially, on. And this is what hit this area.


Now, look at the farmers [graphic]. Look at the farmers as a total. There's no animation here. But, this is 2002. Now look at the next one, old farmers, "65 years and older." Again: We're depending upon old farmers, who are therefore going out of business; there are not young farmers to replace them. Our food supply is in jeopardy.

Now, look at the poverty issue in this area, which was hit by this (**Figure 5**).

Now, look at the adjacent area, which is significant, the Tenn-Tom [Tennessee-Tombigbee]. Now, what this involves is this: You've got two ways down. Remember, the greatest part of our food and export supply comes from an area which is between the two mountain ranges, the Rocky Mountains and the Allegheny Mountains, and you have river systems which flow down there. These river systems are not only water systems, they're also transportation systems. The greatest amount of our exports comes down from these areas, western Pennsylvania on down on one side, and so forth on the other. They come down. They come down toward the Mississippi, the mouth of the Mississippi, into the Gulf area. And there, they are exported around

FIGURE 2

Manufacturing Decline Nationwide, 1975 and 2000, by County—Boundaries of Greater Mississippi Basin Shown*
(Percent of Total Workforce Engaged in Manufacturing)




Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Map produced by MapInfo.
*Boundary shows 19 states in Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri Rivers basin.

The decline of U.S. manufacturing from 1975 to 2000 is evident throughout all geographic concentrations, from the Northwest aluminum center, to steel and auto in the Midwest, and high-tech fabrication in the Northeast. In the 19-state watershed basin of the Mississippi/Missouri/Ohio Rivers (outlined), which reaches world trade routes through the Gulf ports, the mass loss of manufacturing jobs is a marker of how the entire landscape of farming, regional industry, and infrastructure (rail, locks and dams, urban and rural centers) has been degraded and downscaled in the U.S. productive heartland between the Alleghenies and the High Plains.

FIGURE 3

Manufacturing Employment Decline, by County, 1975 and 2000

(Percent of Total Workforce Engaged in Manufacturing: Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama)




Source: EIR 2005, Map by MapInfo.

The marked decline in percent of the workforce in manufacturing, reflects the mass shutdown of industries of all types formerly in the three-state region—principally textiles, agriculture processing (cane sugar, canneries, cotton milling, meat-packing), pulp and paper, and many others. The “Sunbelt process” of siting new factories here in order to pay relatively low, non-unionized wages, in no way altered the dramatic pattern of regional de-industrialization (e.g., Sunbelt auto plants locating in Alabama—Mercedes Benz, 1997; Honda, 2001; Hyundai, 2005; in Mississippi—Nissan, 2003; in Louisiana—GM, 1978).

FIGURE 4

Service Employment Increase, by County, 1975 and 2000

(Percent of Total Workforce Engaged in Services Jobs: Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama)




Source: EIR 2005, Map by MapInfo.

Service jobs of all kinds, with low wage rates, came to dominate what employment existed in these three states by 2000. In the so-called “hospitality” sector, casino work led the way, as these states were among the first nationally to legalize riverboat gambling. These states’ average individual weekly wages and salaries have been about 85% of the national average (including industrial and services combined). Of 12 million citizens in the three states, 3.6 million are black; nationwide, the median income of black households is below 70% of the national median.

FIGURE 5

Hurricane Katrina Hit Three of Nation's Poorest States

(Official Poverty Rate, Non-Institutional Population, Percent: Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama)



Source: EIR 2005, Map by MapInfo.

In terms of how far their populations are below the U.S. median income, the storm-hit states of Mississippi (2.9 million people) ranks worst in the nation (30% below U.S. median income); Louisiana (4.5 million) ranks second-worst (22%); and Alabama (4.6 million), fifth-worst (18%). According to the U.S. "official" (much under-represented) poverty rate, 20 counties in the three states have 30-45% of their people in poverty. Dozens of other counties are very poor. Only ten counties have poverty rates less than 15%. Thus, the vulnerability to harm from disaster was very high among those already lacking good health, transportation, living conditions and decent jobs.

the world. And then, of course, you have some transport goes up the river in reverse, but more comes down.

So this area, the whole area, has been in a process of economic collapse, from western Pennsylvania—the whole area, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, the grain states in general, and so forth. They're in a process of collapse, and *have been* in a process of collapse, over a period of more than 30 years. It's actually industrial collapse. Whole communities have vanished, or virtually vanished. It's like East Germany, in a sense, in that area.

All of this involves these rivers, which are main arteries of transport. Now, go back to this Tenn-Tom thing [graphic]. Now, what's the significance here? We created, some years ago, we used a river system which cut into the Tennessee Valley area, system; you see places like Florence, Decatur, Clarksfield, this is the Tennessee Valley area. We created a link to the Tennessee-Tombigbee River, which would be a parallel to the Mississippi, as an additional way of transport down to the Gulf. And we lost economy in this area, so that



Courtesy of Lowndes County Port Authority

The Lowndes County Port on the Tennessee-Tombigbee. "We created, some years ago . . . a link to the Tennessee-Tombigbee River, which would be a parallel to the Mississippi, as an additional way of transport down to the Gulf. And we lost economy in this area, so that at the time this route was completed, we had lost the purpose for the route, in the sense, we'd lost the agriculture, we'd lost the industry and so forth, which would have been served by this."

at the time this route was built, was completed, we had lost the purpose for the route, in the sense that we'd lost the agriculture, we'd lost the industry and so forth, which would have been served by this.


You get up there around Cairo [Illinois], you come into a jam-up, where the system there, the management of the river system, is breaking down now. This is a log-jam. Even if you had the product to ship, you would have troubles, because this system is old and needs repair.

All right now, then look at the New Orleans port from this standpoint [graphic]. What this just simply shows, is that this port was key to our relations to the world. You take this area of the United States, the interior, between the Rocky Mountains and from western Pennsylvania, the Alleghenies, down: the flow along these river systems for our exports. This was the internal central *power* of the United States. And that is what's being destroyed.

Now, look at the railroad system [graphic]. This is clear—you can get more of this, we've got copies that you can access. But this just indicates, this is the network we're dealing with in rails. This, also, is collapsing! Look at New England! In terms of freight, there's nothing. It used to be the prime driver of the nation in terms of technology. Nothing!

Look at the Railroad Mileage in Operation (**Figure 6**). Look at this area, down around the Mississippi. The collapse! The collapse of not only water transport, the collapse of rail transport, which are the two primary transports. We have trucks running all over the highways—which is not efficient. It's very expensive, and it's not efficient. Rail and water transport are the most efficient, cheapest way per ton-mile. And certain kinds of freight go better by water, because their aging

FIGURE 6



factor per ton is not as crucial. High premium value product, you tend to ship it by higher speed modes. But lower value per ton product, you prefer water or rail.

Now, let's look at the financial system, and let's start with general derivatives view [graphic of "Derivatives vs. GDP vs. Debt"]. This, again, is an animation, with a time-scale in the upper left-hand corner. You see what's happening to the ratio of debt to gross product. Now, derivatives come in, especially after '87—this is Greenspan. And the derivatives are taking over. Ready to eat up everybody else. Hmm?

Now, look at the U.S. commercial bank situation (**Figure 7**). That's your reserves, hmm? Bank capital, the loans and leases, that's the business of the bank; total assets; now, look here—derivatives. That's the nature of our financial crisis: *This*.

That's self-explanatory at this point.

And now, more or less to conclude, we'll get to the next. Let's look at the Federal derivatives [graphic "From Bank to Casino"]. Yes—Greenspan, or "Greenspin" [as derivatives bubble grows]. Remorseless.

And one final touch, which some of you will appreciate [see photo]. The motto is, "Fish stinks from the head." You may recognize the characters.


The Financial Cancer Is Growing

Now, to return to the strategic question that all this involves. People say, "Is this a depression?" You know, there are some people who are really idiots. You tell them there's a depression going on, and they say, "Yeah, but how's the market doing today?" "Yeah, the markets doing fine, look at those derivatives." What you're seeing as market expansion, is entirely financial derivatives. Now, financial derivatives are the equivalent to an economy, of cancer to a human being. "I'm better than ever. The doctor says the cancer is growing!" That's what it is.

But what this also means, is that the ratio of financial

FIGURE 7

U.S. Commercial Banks, June 30, 2005



obligations outstanding, is so great, there is no possibility of an ordinary solution in bankruptcy court. Take, for example, right now: Let's take the case of the airlines. What we have, for example, in the oil price scandal: probably \$40 out of the going toward \$80, now, of oil, is pure swindle. It's speculation, and it's run on behalf of the financial interests in the South, which concentrated the oil traffic in the Gulf area, to be near to George Bush, and the Carlyle Group. So, the United States economic operations, in respect to petroleum, have been concentrated to the advantage of the Bush family and related interests. That's where the speculation is.

There was no shortage of petroleum! There was a superabundance of petroleum! The ports were *clogged* with petroleum. There is no oil shortage! And producing more oil from the reserves, is not going to solve the oil price crisis: It's purely speculative! It's speculators out manipulating the market, to rip people off at the pump, by more than \$40 a barrel.

What is this being done for? For two reasons: First of all, because George Bush's friends love to steal. For example, it didn't occur to them what they could do, in the case of New Orleans, for example, until they discovered how to steal! And the way to steal, is to send Halliburton in there. Which is what they're doing. The same Halliburton, the same Bechtel crowd which pulled the swindle in Iraq! They fire the military engineers, fire the capabilities that we used to have, to deal with these situations; you bring in a private company, which boondoggles. Charges all prices, off record, unregulated. The Congress is not allowed to have hearings, which actually get into who's doing what for whom, in terms of these areas.

They do the same thing with the oil price scandal: Someone says, "Let's regulate it. This is out of control, this is not

justified by supply and demand or any such consideration.” Schröder, the Chancellor of Germany, said in Gleneagles, “Let’s regulate it.” Who turned it down? The British and the United States. Why? To steal! What were they doing? Well, they were not just stealing: You recall the derivatives crisis which hit in the Spring. You will find that a lot of hedge funds went belly-up, as a result of that struggle. The whole system is ready to blow. So, bailing out their system, the hedge-fund system, is crucial for the people who run the system. How are they going to bail the system out? They’re going to have to steal. *Well, \$40 a barrel rip-off, off the top of the price, on oil, is a very good rip-off,* for people who desperately need profit to keep from going bankrupt.

Look at the effect of this; look at airline industry: We’ve got two new, major airlines are going bankrupt. The entire pension system of the United States is now in jeopardy, because these two airlines are about to dump their pension responsibilities—which they had not been maintaining—to dump them on the Federal government! Now, this dilutes the ability of the Federal government to maintain the pension guarantee system. But, why do we have the problem? *Because:* Some people decided to rip-off the airline industry. The danger is, if Northwest and Delta and a few others go, what have we got? *We no longer have a way of transporting people from coast to coast, inside the United States!*

You want a national security problem? We’re on the edge of that, right now.

So, the other side of this, is, we’re in a crisis. There’s no possible way of getting out of this by normal management methods. There’s only one way this can work: The Federal government has to put the whole shebang into bankruptcy. It has to put the Federal Reserve System into bankruptcy, which is a way of putting the banking system into receivership. Then the Federal government must act, to prevent the banks from closing their doors. To make sure they continue their normal business, because that affects the life of communities—it affects industry, everything. We must have a flow of credit. We must have financial security of a type which is needed to maintain communities and industries.

Defend the General Welfare!

We must also act in terms of defending the General Welfare. We need airlines! We’re going to have to put the thing into government receivership, and reorganize the system, recognizing it has been torn down by speculation. By looting! We’ve got to put the thing back. We’ve got to rebuild the rail transport system. We’ve got to have a rational relationship between high-speed rail transport, and air transport. We’ve got to do a lot of things in this direction.

We’ve got to go into a large investment, Roosevelt-style, but larger, into re-creating industries that are lost! But the problem in trying to re-create industries that are lost, is that we don’t have the skilled labor force *we have lost!*—through

government and related policies—over the period since the 1970s, especially 1977. Under Carter, which is really under Brzezinski, we went into deregulation. We used to have a policy in the United States, even in the post-Roosevelt period, initially—a “fair trade” policy.

A fair trade policy meant, that you would arrange all the mechanisms of government, tariff regulations, all kinds of regulations, in order to ensure that if somebody is doing something, in the private sector, which is useful to the United States, useful to the people of the United States, we want them to stay in business. We don’t want to go around the world, trying to find some cheap labor to replace them! We want to keep the farms, the industries, and so forth, *here*. We want our basic economic infrastructure solid.

So, therefore, what we do, is, we set up a system of tariffs, and similar kinds of devices, to ensure that an honest industry, which is producing an honest product, is going to have the fair costs of its production *paid*. By setting the prices at that level. And it’s going to be able to get credit, to be able to meet those obligations of production and so forth. To improve itself, to be more productive and so forth.

So, we had a protectionist policy, which is called a “fair trade” policy! We wanted to have, not big corporations gobbling people up, not stockholders who are fleeing from one corporate stock to the other every day! But, people who are committed in the long term to building an industry *in a community!* Within a state! People who are building for the future. We wanted private entrepreneurs, closely held companies, people who were production oriented: The machine-tool end of the thing, especially. This was our strength. This was the strength that Roosevelt used to make us the greatest economic power the world had ever seen, as we entered into World War II.

We have to do it again. *We can* do it, again!

But, we have to recognize that that’s the problem! We have to recognize that the switch to a service economy was a piece of clinical insanity! We have to recognize that free trade is a piece of clinical insanity! We have to recognize that globalization is imperialism. We have to say, “These things come to an end!”

We have a primary obligation, which I don’t think the nominee for Chief Justice understands. I don’t think he *wishes* to understand it. (I want to know who his cosmetician is! If you’ve seen him on television, you’d say, “Who’s pasting him up every day?”)

The Constitution of the United States *is*, in his terms, *political!* It *is* in his terms, *ideological!* Patriotism in the United States *is* ideological! It *is* political! The politics of the United States, the existence of a republic, is *a commitment to the General Welfare*. General Welfare means, “living people and their descendants.” The defense of them. The promotion of the improvement of our territory. The promotion of our industries, of our agriculture: I want to be able to get apples!

I don't want to get Australian strawberries! I want American strawberries! Nothing wrong with Australian strawberries—we should get some of them. But we should also grow our own!

Now, these ideas that I just listed, are ideas which were the standard belief of people coming out of World War II, after the Roosevelt experience and the preceding Hoover experience. We *had* Coolidge and Hoover! We didn't need it again! We thought Coolidge and Hoover were bad—we hadn't seen Bush! Hmm?

So, the point is, we have to realize, that we're at a point where the existence of the system of the nation-state, the sovereign nation-state, internationally, is in jeopardy. Our own state is in jeopardy. But because we were summoned to war, to defeat Hitler—many of us didn't understand what it was all about, but we defended the country, and we fought. We didn't fight well. We weren't well trained, we weren't military people. We had a few people in the military, called "USA—Useless Sons Accommodated." People who couldn't get jobs, would go into the military. Nobody wanted to use them for anything, they kept them around to have the numbers in there.

The best military went into the WPA [Works Progress Administration], under [Harry] Hopkins. Not as WPA workers, but as people who set up the program of economic development, of turning useless workers into useful workers; and who set up the industrial program, which made us the greatest economic power on this planet. About 100 military people, typified by [General] Lucius Clay, went in under Harry Hopkins on that program, and built this nation. We've got to do it again! The same kind of thing again. It's going to be hard work, but we can do it! And if we are future-oriented, if we are not people who are depending upon what we can get today, and if we know our life is limited, and we're not going to be here forever—we're going to go on: We're concerned about what we leave behind. And, therefore, we're concerned about what we leave to our children and grandchildren, and those generations.

We have a Baby-Boomer generation, which is now getting into 60 and beyond, and they're about to go—one way or the other, I think. I've not much hope for them, their survival capability, their intellectual survival capability—not much commitment to life. There's more commitment to enjoying Purgatory as sort of a comfort zone.

But we have, coming up now, a generation which has entered adulthood, which is now considered 18 to 22, 25, as entering adulthood—and the future belongs to them. Not right away. It'll take a little time before they're ready to take over the industries and similar kinds of positions. But it won't have to take *too* much time. And therefore, our future depends upon them. And getting the old folks, those who are about 60 years of age, who are considered—I'm considered—the antiques of society, today, to do their job, and to be mustered to find



Courtesy of Eisenhower Library

Gen. Lucius D. Clay with President Eisenhower in 1955. "The best military went into the WPA [Works Progress Administration], under [Harry] Hopkins . . . as people who set up the program of economic development, of turning useless workers into useful workers; and setting up the industrial program, which made us the greatest economic power on this planet. About 100 military people, typified by Lucius Clay, went in under Hopkins on that program, and built this nation. We've got to do it again!"

their souls again, and do their job to rebuild this nation, which they have done so much to destroy by their ideology, by their service economy ideology. And to give the future, which many of us will not see—to give the future, a future. To give our people, the young people who are now entering their twenties, a future, and to give their children a future. And, we should take pleasure in doing that.

'Think of the Future'

Many people came from various parts of Europe into the United States. They came from poor parts of Europe, because they found an opportunity here, not a rich opportunity, but an opportunity to seek an opportunity. They came into our country, as poor immigrants, mostly; became farmers and workers and so forth, and they worked hard. They worked hard to give something to their children, a better life than they had had, an education. In about two or three generations, they became sort of a solid part of the regular population of the United States as a whole. They built a future. They had the confidence and courage to come here, to build a future. They found here the opportunity—not an easy one—but an opportunity, nonetheless, to build a future. And they worked to build a future! They worked, and they suffered, and they sacrificed, for the sake of their children: especially to get their children education, and things of that type, to get things that they needed for the next generation. And as they grew older, they took delight in their grandchildren, and said, "It's been

worth it all.” That is the American Dream. That is what we represent.

We now come to a time, a difficult time, a hard time. We don’t have many of the things we need to rebuild this country. We’re going to have to work hard to rebuild it. But, if we have our morality with us, we’re going to think of the future.

I’m not going to have much of a future—oh, 10 years, or maybe 20 years, if Amelia [93-year-old civil rights leader Amelia Boynton Robinson] lets me. *But:* I’m thinking ahead: I’ve got 3,000 years, approximately, of history in me already, and I’ll think ahead about a hundred. And I’m counting on what’s going to happen in the next hundred years. And that turning the corner, from going down, where we are now, to going up! And I have to try to get, with my limited powers and influence in the world, to get some other people—who are a little bit younger than I am—to take up the challenge, and to recognize what the danger is. And to recognize, that they’re our soldiers.

Thank you.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Freeman: Thank you, Lyn. . . . The first question comes from a national political operative, who has a fairly large stake in what is going on right now, in the Gulf area, and the Delta in general. And he wanted to ask you, very specifically, a question, since he’s also responsible for advising many Democratic members of the Congress.

He says: “Lyn, there are a lot of people, now, who are arguing that Katrina may very well have closed the case, on the failure of the whole post-industrial globalization culture. The fact is, though, that right now, we are not the same nation that we were when John F. Kennedy mobilized us to put a man on the Moon. On the one hand, there isn’t a single member of the Senate who’s stupid enough not to attach his name to Mary Landrieu’s Operation Pelican legislation.”

(This is, for people who don’t know, this is one *big* piece of legislation, that was authored by Mary Landrieu, who’s the Democratic Senator from the state of Louisiana, and by Senator David Vitter, who’s the freshman Republican from that state. This is a bill that actually seeks to put the reconstruction effort in one big package, so as to not hold it up. And it actually provides funding of about \$183 billion. By the time that bill actually reaches the Senate floor, it will be co-sponsored by, I think, every single member of the Senate—with the exception of the acting president of the Senate, Mr. Cheney, who has not been invited to attach his name to it.

But, what the question is, is—he says:)

“There isn’t a single member of the Senate who’s stupid enough not to attach his name to this legislation. But the problem that we face is that right now, money and good intentions simply are not going to be enough. We made a commitment here, but the question is, how do we honor it? Again, we

aren’t the same nation we were, when Kennedy mobilized us: So, how do we proceed? Do we legislate it? Do we just appoint people to do it? It still is not clear to me, how to take on a task of this magnitude.”

LaRouche: Well, the problem is, we don’t have a President. We have something occupying the place where a President should be, when he’s not on vacation.

Therefore, you have an institution which we’re depending upon, now, for much of the leadership. We have certain committees in the House, which have capabilities, and which are very important politically, in the picture, in many other ways. But the hard core of the decisions that have to be made, is in the Legislative branch of government, which is the opposite number, the primary opposite number, to the President: And that is, the U.S. Senate.

Now, so far, we have a situation, in which the Democratic leadership of the Senate, is by and large pretty much together, on the right side of the angels.

We have, on the Republican side, a growing number of Republicans, who wonder what’s happened to the Republican Party. They come in all shades and colors, so to speak. But they are patriots, generally, in a certain deep-down sense, particularly when challenged on things which get their gumption up, on defending the nation.

So, we have in effect a potential bipartisan coalition, of overwhelming potential, in the Senate. And you’ve got a former boxer as the leader of the Democrats [Harry Reid of Nevada], which does help him to understand how to deal with certain issues—that is—he’s got the instinct. He doesn’t go out punching people up, but he does have the instinct of how to think, if you’re in the ring.

The problem for the Republicans—by and large, there are several problems here to consider: The problem with the Republicans is, this means a break with the party, in a sense. Or, not a break—it means they’ve got to decide to break the party free from the grip of Bush-Cheney. Now, that’s a tough fight for them, with an election year coming up. They’re being asked to do to Bush and Cheney, what they did to Nixon. And that’s the jam-up for them. It doesn’t mean they’re not capable of doing that. It means that they’re not coming up to speed fast enough so that we worry, “Will they be willing to act fast enough to prevent a war in Iran? A war against Iran?”

Because if they don’t, we now go into a new dimension, that I referred to, of permanent war. Permanent revolution/permanent war. That’s the danger.

So therefore, the issue here, is to get—in the long term, if we’re left alone, with a bipartisan coalition forming in the Senate, certain aspects of government could move in the right direction. The problem we have now, is, will that come fast enough? Right now, it is not coming fast enough.

There are a couple of issues, where it is coming up fast enough. The Mary Landrieu motion has got a lot of wet legs to it. But they’re going to do everything possible to sabotage it, because, from the standpoint of Dick Cheney, reporting to



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

“We have to give the future a future.” Here, LaRouche Youth Movement members at the Sept. 16 webcast.

his boss, George Shultz, Halliburton needs the money. And you’re not going to get any benefit, for the people of Louisiana, to speak of, if Halliburton gets in there. You want to look at what they did in Iraq, to get a pretty good idea, what they’re going to do. So, that’s one of the problems.

But, to come back to the other problem: The Senate is not an efficient institution to replace the Presidency. It’s the relative institution in the Legislative branch to *control* the Presidency, on everything except money, which is the responsibility, essentially, of the House of Representatives. But they are not up to it. Because, they are not *institutionally* up to it.

Thinking Like a President

Now, what I’m trying to do, in understanding this thing, in understanding the Senators—as I think I do understand them—is, to provide myself, not to pretend to be President, but to provide them, and to provide people abroad as well, a sense that there is someone who thinks like a President, acting in the United States. And right now, it’s a vacuum. Nobody else but me, is thinking like a President, at least, not like a President required for this time of crisis. Therefore, my function is to fill that void.

Now, the enemies I have, who are largely in the financial sector—whose reputations were made in their support for Hitler, back in the early 1930s—don’t like me. Wall Street finance hates my guts. And many politicians, including leading Democrats, are afraid of Wall Street. Therefore, when my name comes up, you want to see people’s eyeballs go into spin! Even people who agree with what I’m saying—saying

about meeting with me, “W-h-a-t are you suggesting?!” “You’re suggesting we commit mass suicide, on a Wall Street account?”

So, therefore, despite the fact that this situation exists, I’m acting as a President should. I had hoped that the former President [Clinton] would play that role, but recently he’s been reluctant to do so. He’s trying to play a somewhat different role.

So, what I’ve done today, for example, in raising this question of permanent war; what I did in raising the question of the neo-cons; what I did in raising the question of these crazy “Children of Satan”: I’m doing this, because these ideas have to get *out*, and they have to get out as if from a President of the United States who is providing a focal point of leadership.

I’m saying things, which many people in the Senate and elsewhere agree with. But they’re not prepared to do it! They’ll say, “It’s not time”; “It doesn’t

work that way”—but I’m saying, “The clock is running out!” Someone has to say, “The clock is running out!” You can’t set the agenda and the time scale based on your comfort zone! You’ve got to operate on the basis of—you’ve got to think like a commander in war! Because we’re *in* war! We’re in the war I described. We’re in *permanent* warfare! Permanent revolution! Permanent regime change!

The United States is faced with destruction! We’re faced with the choice of being an empire, under the people who own Cheney, like George Shultz’s bosses, or being a republic! We have to make that decision *soon*. Are we going to? If we tolerate, if we try to accommodate, to Cheney, if we try to “deal” with George Bush, if we try to concede to those sentiments! If we try to concede to Wall Street—we’re lost! We no longer have a nation. We’re like the people who said, “Hitler is going to go away”—until Göring set fire to the Reichstag, and then he became a permanent dictator.

That’s the situation we’re in. And you have to think like a commander in warfare, to lead this nation now: Not to fight war, *but to prevent it!*

And nobody’s prepared to do it! You know what my political circumstances are. But I have to do it! Because there’s nobody else, who so far has stepped forward to do that!

And that, my questioner knows. And he knows what the answer is. He knows what my answer is. And if he wants to save this country, and I know he does, *he knows what he’s got to do.*

[For more questions and answers, see www.larouchepub.com.]