

STATE OF THE UNION

Lyndon LaRouche Presents a Vision for America's Future

Lyndon LaRouche gave this address in a webcast aired live on LPAC-TV on Jan. 18. The two-hour program began with a keynote speech by LaRouche and was followed by a dialogue with members of the international audience, including high-level Russian personalities. In his introduction, moderator Matthew Ogden noted that LaRouche had decided that, in the absence of any qualified Presidential figure in the United States, today, "the responsibility has fallen to him, to give this nation's annual State of the Union address."

The program can be viewed at <http://www.larouchepac.com/sotu2012>.

This, I promise you, will be an exciting evening; but not because I'm exciting, but because the nature of the subject-matter is exciting.

Now, I'll take four sections of this, just for your identification. The first, I'm going to deal with identifying and discussing the present great world crisis of 2012, because that's what it is. It's a crisis which is tantamount in effect to two world wars, and probably much worse, potentially, than the two world wars of fame. And this will include the question of the financial crisis which is crucial in this, and we also have in progress, a high degree of potentiality for an early worldwide, thermonuclear war, which might leave very little of civilization alive. That potential now exists. It does not mean it can not be stopped, but it can

only be stopped by those who are qualified and able to stop it.

Because right now, amid all these other things, we're looking down the throat of a clear, early potentiality, for thermonuclear global war, in which the targeting will be primarily against the nations of Asia, or Eurasia, Russia, China, India, and so forth. And of course, these nations can shoot back with thermonuclear weapons, just as the United States is the greatest thermonuclear power on this planet, for this sort of thing. So there won't be much left of the planet if this war is actually allowed to occur. And therefore, this is a very serious business.

I shall also deal with, first of all, the Constitutional implications of what has to be done, in terms of Constitutional measures and reforms which are required as essential elements, if we are to succeed in preventing this war from occurring.

Then, I shall deal with the question of economic reforms, as such, physical-economic reforms, in particular.

And then, I shall take you, at the end of this presentation, to the subject of our new galactic destiny. If we can escape thermonuclear war in the meantime, mankind, and we on Earth in particular, have a galactic destiny before us, something greater, more beautiful, more satisfying, than anything you've ever dreamed of before.



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche, in his State of the Union address, outlined the dangers facing mankind today, from economic collapse, to thermonuclear war, and galactic challenges. He also put forward the remedies; and said, "We can not put mankind at risk: The way we avoid that, is by adopting common missions for mankind."

The Final Stage of a Breakdown Crisis

Now, what we're in right now, we're in the final stage of a general breakdown crisis of all of the nations in the trans-Atlantic community. We have, at the same time, a crucial kind of crisis developing in China, India, Russia, and so forth. But these nations of the Asian region, the major powers of the Asian region, are in a much better condition economically, than Europe or the Americas, to say nothing of poor Africa, which has continued to die under the influence of British slavery of the Africans in general. So that's the first thing to consider in this. Then we have to consider, actually, the details of what I mean by this thermonuclear war threat.

Now, we have been [in a breakdown crisis] since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the later assassination of his brother, when his brother Robert was about to be designated by the Democratic Party as the Democratic Party's Presidential candidate. And he was eliminated by an assassination which brought us a series of disasters, including the Nixon Administration, which would not have occurred with-

out the assassination of Robert Kennedy.

This breakdown crisis which we're in now, has been going on for a long time, as I said. We made a downturn when Franklin Roosevelt died, and a British agent, virtually a British puppet, Harry Truman, succeeded to the Presidency. From that point on, the United States lost the drive that it had for a recovery program, a postwar recovery program, which had been in place under Franklin Roosevelt. There was a systemic and intentional destruction of the potential for growth by conversion of the war potential, that is, the economic potential for war-fighting, which we mobilized in the course of World War II. And at the end of that point, we had this vast apparatus. And what Truman did and the British did—and Truman did it under British orders, Churchill's first—what he did was actually shut down the greatest productive potential which had ever existed on this planet, which was the potential controlled, in a sense, by the United States, which was organizing other nations of the world around this

kind of program, which had been the greatest burst of progress for humanity we had ever heard of. But that was pretty much shut down.

We went on, through that. We were saved when Truman was dumped. This man was essentially a Wall Street asset. He came from the Midwest, Missouri, but he essentially was a Wall Street asset; he was very much a Wall Street man, taking orders on everything, first from Winston Churchill, and then from the British government in general.

Then we got Eisenhower—and the country was pretty sick of Truman after the few years he was President. He also got us into a long war, which was cut off. The long war—and all long wars—are bad! The intention is to drag down civilization by protracted wars. When a war must be fought—and I will say that wars of that type can no longer be considered, because the threat to humanity of conducting any of these long wars under modern conditions, would tend to destroy civilization. It might not eliminate the human race, but it would pretty much make a mess of it.



President Kennedy was murdered by the British imperial faction because he refused to be dragged into a long war in Indo-China. Further infuriating the empire was his commitment to great projects such as NAWAPA and the space program. He is shown here at the inauguration of the Frylingpan-Arkansas Reclamation Project in Pueblo, Colo., August 1962.

So, Eisenhower saved us. He did not succeed in reversing all of the effects which the Truman Administration, and Churchill and so forth, had combined to develop. But he did a very good job. For example, he slapped the British in the face, got the Prime Minister of Britain [Anthony Eden] to retire, and prevented a major war involving the Soviet Union in Egypt and so forth, at that time. He also cooperated with Charles de Gaulle, who was then the President of France, who was a great leader, whose program would have made France a great success, but unfortunately, the British, who controlled the opposition to de Gaulle, managed to frustrate him.

This came to a point where, now, Kennedy was President; his brother, Robert was an active part of that Presidency. They dealt with Khrushchov—and the British-created crisis, successfully. We escaped a major war, which would have been a nuclear war, at that stage! *But*, then Kennedy came in as part of this process, and for as long as he remained President, as long as he remained alive, not only did he continue the upturn in the United States, which Eisenhower had helped to foster, together with our dear friend in France, Charles de Gaulle, but he also introduced programs of recovery and expansion, including the space program. And his programs actually sent the United States soaring in the direction of a great recovery! It would not undo the entire damage that had been done by Truman, in shutting down the postwar potential we had then, but it was

a great job.

It was during this period, for example, that President Kennedy organized the Glass-Steagall-type of operation, but in the form of a program for developing our water system, and that was one of the great achievements. The other one was the space program: The space program was *entirely* the creation of John F. Kennedy. And also the development of NAWAPA was his creation. So, again.

JFK: ‘No’ to Long Wars

Now, at this point, the British as usual, and shall we say, the “Liberal people” in

our establishment, decided they wanted to have a *long war* in Indo-China. And President Kennedy said, “No. We’re not going to be involved in a long war in Indo-China.” Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was the chief advisor to Kennedy on preventing this long war; and General Eisenhower, the former President, had also supported that view.

How then, were the British and their lovers in the United States, going to defeat the most successful President of the United States since President Roosevelt himself? How were they going to defeat him, and get him to involve himself and the United States in a *long war* in Asia? They assassinated Kennedy! And then, later, when his brother Robert, who had been his collaborator while President, was going to take up the position of President, and was within days of receiving the nomination of the Democratic Party for the Presidential candidacy, he, too, was assassinated.

As a result of that, the United States was largely destroyed, by the *long war*. Which the British had intended, to run us down, and to take the Franklin Roosevelt out of us, if possible. The killing of Bobby Kennedy gave us Nixon, another disaster! And there were a number of disasters with Nixon. Well, we got through that mess.

Then we got another President [Ronald Reagan], and this President did something good: He supported my proposal for the Strategic Defense Initiative, what

has become, and still is, the founding program for any future of the United States. And it was my invention. I'd gotten people who were formerly in government, formerly leaders of our intelligence service, who voluntarily came over to me, and said, "Okay, you're right. We're going to support you." I had leaders in the military in France, leaders in the military in Germany, in Italy, and other countries, who supported me, and as we came to the eve of what was a great movement by this President, they shut it down, again, and some of the Democrats, again, did that. So they shut this down.

Now, what they did, whether they understood it fully or not, those who shut it down, including members of the Senate of the United States, together with British-controlled clowns such as Mikhail Gorbachov, a British agent! He's still floating around in the world, in Russia, but mostly in England, where he gets his advice from, and where he gets his soul from: from the British, again.

So, what happened was, we got to a point, where because of the defeat of the SDI, which was my baby, by these political forces, they pulled down and induced the Soviet Union to destroy itself.

But they also did something to destroy civilization more generally; and that was demonstrated by the fact that we're now on the verge of not only a series of wars, usually British-organized *long wars!*, like the long wars in Afghanistan by both the Soviet Union and the United States; *long wars* all over the place. A *long war* in Iraq that was totally unnecessary and fraudulent. So we got into long wars.

In the meantime, in the background, the great nations of the planet were building up thermonuclear capabilities, thermonuclear-warfare capabilities. These accumulated. The Soviet Union collapsed out of its folly, under Gorbachov, in particular, probably the greatest enemy Russia ever had, or at least qualified for something like that. This led to more long wars! More long war in Afghanistan. More long war in the Middle East! More long war in other places. We were being destroyed.

The Bailout: Economic Suicide

Now, we've come to the point that what has been done, also—again, the British! From the British Queen



Kenroy Ambris/Commonwealth Secretariat

The British royals and "the whole kit and caboodle of the British establishment" are determined to wipe out the greater part of humanity. Shown: Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip lordling it over their subjects in Trinidad and Tobago, November 2009.

herself. The British Queen thinks there are too many of you. She and her family, and the whole kit and caboodle of the leadership of the British establishment, has said, "We must, knowing now that we have 7 billion people living on this planet, human beings, we're going to reduce that, to 1, or less." And so, we have a policy of reducing the economy and the population of the planet, especially the trans-Atlantic region, reducing it to destruction.

And in the process, a final stage was put in: the bailout process! The bailout process was the economic suicide of the United States, and it was orchestrated from London, and by Wall Street clowns, who were actually London agents, not Americans, really. They may have American citizenship, but they're not American in spirit or morality. And they started the big bailout.

What happens now? They have successfully destroyed the economy of the United States, in a long wave of things which began, essentially, in the later period, but essentially, with the assassination of John F. Kennedy. That set into motion a long war in Indo-China, a destruction of our technological capability, a moral and intellectual destruction of our young people who were then coming out of junior high school and high school ages, who degenerated morally. And then produced children of morally degenerated parents. And the nation became more and more corrupted, self-corrupted.

And we got to the point, that the whole nation—all of Europe, the United States, the trans-Atlantic region generally—has gone into a *deep* economic collapse, such that we now have a situation where we could *not*, without a change from the current policies, we could not guarantee an adequate food supply *beginning this Spring* for the population of the United States, and for the populations of other nations. We've come to that point.

We're now at the point, with this bailout, which bankrupted the United States, in every way imaginable: *No one could ever pay that debt*. It could never be paid! And we're having this worthless debt piled on us, geometrically. It's killing us. And it can be stopped, as I shall get to that later.

But in the meantime, the British Empire, the British Queen, the ones who want to reduce the numbers of you, from 7 billion to 1, or less, has proceeded to organize a war, with the complicity of a British agent, who is currently the President of the United States. He's nothing but a British puppet. He has no mind of his own. He's actually *clinically insane*, but they keep him on as President, despite that.

So what happens? Now we have, in the meantime, Russia has come back to some degree—under the leadership of [Prime Minister Vladimir] Putin in particular, and [President Dmitri] Medvedev, and others—has come back, in programs which would actually successfully, not only rebuild Russia, the whole area of Russia, including the Siberian area, but would open up areas of development throughout the world, because Russia has certain technologies which are specific to them.

In the meantime, China now represents 1.4 billion people. India represents 1.1 billion. They may have been weakened by the international economic problem, but they have still maintained a certain factor of growth and progress. Japan is a vigorous, smaller nation, but a vigorous nation, as we see with the tsunami operation: No nation but Japan could have done as successful a rescue operation as Japan did, and the recovery operation! No one could have! So we have Japan, who wants to coop-



Libya's President Qaddafi was brutally murdered while in captivity—no trial, no due process—on orders from London and Washington. Why? So the empire and its puppet Obama could turn their guns on Syria and Iran, and thence to Russia and China. Shown: Qaddafi's living quarters in Tripoli burned, Aug. 24, 2011.

erate. We have an improvement in the situation in Korea, where North and South Korea are now going to more of a collaboration: This is an excellent development.

But, the British Empire, which is behind all this, which owns their clown called Obama, this psychotic clown, and they don't like that. So, they decided to start *a great, new war!* This time, a *thermonuclear war*, in which the United States would be a key force, under this President, Obama. Other nations—Britain is a somewhat downtrodden thermonuclear power; France is a thermonuclear power; other nations have some thermonuclear capabilities. China has a very important thermonuclear capability. Russia has a very important thermonuclear capability.

The Libya War

Now, what are these guys trying to do? Well, it happened when you had a law that was rammed through the Congress by a leading Senator's collaboration with the President. And that law set into motion and authorized an illegal action called the Libya War. The U.S. involvement in a war in Libya was a violation of the Constitution. It was a criminal act, by the President of the United States, an impeachable act.

What they did, then: You had Britain, France, and the United States, and some other collateral powers, who

were going ahead with this Libya War. And they succeeded in getting to the point, through President Obama, of bringing the country down.

Then you had the President of Libya, who was defeated, had agreed to admit that he'd been defeated by this force of powers—but then, the British were not satisfied, nor was the President of the United States satisfied. Because the problem, as they put it, in France and elsewhere, the problem was, that if he lived, and they held him as a captive, they would have to try him; if they put him through a trial, this would delay going to the next chosen target. So they had him killed, murdered!

Here's a man, who's captive. No evidence has been presented; the trial has not been established. But to avoid a trial of the accused, *they murdered him, Obama-style!* Which Obama's been doing to Americans and others, recently, on his way.

So now we come to the point: What's this all about? Why should this crazy idiot, our President—why should he want to make a war against a rather small nation, a weak nation, Libya? Why should he want to do that? Why should he want, as he did, together with the French government, together with the British government: They connived to assassinate a captive, who had been the head of state of a nation. Why would they do that? Well, they said so. They said, "We can not allow ourselves to be tied up with a long delay, bringing to conclusion, this Libya case. Why? Because, they said, we intend to start wars immediately against two West Asian nations: Syria and Iran.

Now, the purpose of doing this was not to conduct a war against Syria and Iran—that was not the purpose. That was the sideshow. What you had, if you looked at the map, and looked at the Eastern Mediterranean and the bay around Iran, you saw the greatest concentration of thermonuclear-warfare capabilities on this planet, represented by the forces of the United States, Britain, and other powers. Why would they have to have the thermonuclear capabilities of major powers and others combined, against two small nations—a relatively very small nation, Syria, and a medium-size small nation, shall we say, Iran: Why?

Because their target wasn't Syria, their target wasn't Iran. Their target was—as we know now, from the diplomatic scandals that have broken out in Washington



White House/Pete Souza

Sen. John Kerry collaborated with the President to authorize the unconstitutional Libya War. "It was a criminal act, by the President of the United States, an impeachable act."

and Europe—the target was Russia and China. What does that mean? Why should Britain and the United States, and other nations, wish to launch thermonuclear war, against two great thermonuclear powers, Russia and China? And you have a nuclear power, Pakistan; and India's also a thermonuclear power.

So what you have, is that the entirety of that part of Asia is now under death threat *from this President!* Who is not fit to be in a cattle herd. And the suckers are letting this happen! This man, under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, is *clinically insane!* The terms are specific: *This man is clinically insane.*

And our leaders in the Congress—and some of them are people I like, and think they're otherwise nice people, or proper in their duties—but they're not acting that way! Just like Kerry, Senator Kerry, has acted in a *terrible* way. Nothing like we used to think of him: I once supported this man in his candidacy for President. I wouldn't do so today. He's changed: He's not the same man he was then! And if you know his record, that's striking.

So therefore, what's the point? The British now say, what's the purpose of this? They told you: The purpose is, as the Queen of England and others have insisted, their intention is to reduce the population of the planet, from 7 billion people to 1 *or less!* Their argument is the Green policy! And therefore, if you want to have a Green policy, and what that connotes, you can not tolerate Russia's existence; you can not tolerate 1.4 billion people in China; you can not tolerate 1.1 billion people in India, and other nations. Therefore, this is a British

operation, run under the Green policy of Her Majesty the Queen and her cohorts to change the character of the planet, in this way. In other words, *these guys make Hitler look like a piker!*

A Loss of Morals and Guts


And we in the United States have a President, who is the leading edge of that policy under British orders, the British monarchy's orders. That's why this is the big crisis. And that's why anyone in politics, who's running for President, or similar rank of office, and doesn't deal with this, *ain't fit to be elected anything*. There are some of these candidates, a couple of these Republican candidates who are sane; I would admit that. Some of them are not sane: I will also emphasize that. And we have a similar kind of situation among others.

We are a nation which has temporarily lost its guts, lost its morals and its guts. Because the evidence of this, is what it is.

Now, in fact, the only reason that I know of, that we're not already *in* that war, is because people in the Joint Chiefs and other institutions have said, "Don't go ahead." So it's only a *minority*, but an important minority in our government, which is an organized resistance against this thing, which is *far worse evil, far more evil*, than anything Adolf Hitler ever accomplished in his intention.

And that's where the problem lies. And therefore, we have to deal with it, accordingly. Anyone who's running for office, who does not say this President, Obama, must be immediately removed under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, *is not fit to lead our government!* They haven't got the *guts* and the honesty, to do it. They can't be trusted, because they *refused* to respond to their responsibility, to the office for which they were elected, or which they have the prospect of being elected to. They are not fit to serve!

And therefore, look at the clown show we have going on, outside in this nation. Look at the Republican campaign, so far; it's a clown show! One of those guys in there, is a decent fellow; he's an intelligent, decent, probably under most circumstances, would do a good job; he was a former governor of a state. And I think he's intelligent enough to be that. But look at the rest of them: Who is standing up? Who is *fit* to run for Federal office? Who is fit to *choose* a candidate for Federal



CNN/SRLC

"Where's the sense in this whole election campaign that started last year?," LaRouche asked. "Where's the sanity? Where's the morality and intelligence of the citizens who would participate in this atrocity called an 'election campaign,' the Republican election campaign?" Left to right: Rick Santorum, Mitt Romney, Newt Gingrich, Rep. Ron Paul.

office, who does not recognize these implications? Where is someone who will stand up, who has the *guts* to be errand boy, let alone President? And that's where we are today.

And that's the first thing you have to consider: We are dealing with a regime of *evil*. The organizer of that evil, centrally, is the British monarchy. The most conspicuous tool of that evil is the current President of the United States and his accomplices. And that's what's wrong with our government. And anybody who wants to bring up any other issue, any different issue, contrary to what I've just said here, is not fit to vote, let alone be elected! Because the fate of humanity depends upon defeating what this British operation under the Queen, and what this President of the United States represent: They are unfit to be in public office in any major nation. And those who support them, are not fit to hold important office in any nation.

And yet, why do our people act like clowns? And vote for these Republicans, who've just been running?

Where's the sense in this whole election campaign that started last year? Where's the sanity? Where's the morality? Where's the morality and intelligence of the citizens who would participate in this atrocity called an "election campaign," the Republican election campaign? And what we have on the Democratic side: We have Obama, the more-than-Hitler of the United States. People will support *him*? What's wrong with their

minds and morals? They say they want to lead this nation, they want to determine the policies of this nation, when where they lead, is leading the world to a holocaust beyond belief?

No, this election campaign in the United States, so far, among the leading parties, *is a farce*. And the sooner you recognize that, and say so, and act so, the sooner we might get out of this mess.

Now, there are some other aspects here, to be dealt with. Assuming that we're going to avoid thermonuclear war, avoid this holocaust, what's next?

Constitutional Issues

Well, let's take the question of the U.S. Constitution. There are two actions which must be taken now, by any authorities who deserve to be called "authorities." The United States, like all of Western and Central Europe, is now *bankrupt*. It is, under its present statutes, its present Constitution, it is *hopelessly* bankrupt! There's no way, under these kinds of political leaders, with these policies, that the United States or Western or Central Europe, is going to survive. Not possible.

Well, where's the seriousness on this one? You want to pick somebody for President, you want to pick a party for President, with these kinds of clowns loose? Where's your guts? Where's your mentality? Where's your brains? Where's your morality?

The evidence is clear: We are bankrupt. Look, all that bailout money, between Europe and the United States, that has been put out so far, *will never be paid!* It's worthless! And worse than that, the worthlessness of that money is the fact that a slight *twitch*, right now, as we see this in Europe—in Greece, for example; threatened in Italy, for example; threatened in Spain, threatened in Portugal; threatened in other parts of Europe—we're on the verge of a general collapse! In other words, it's like 1923 Germany, but on a multinational level.

Well, what are we doing about that? Where's our economic policies? More bailout? The whole thing is totally bankrupt now. There's no value in it. All it takes is a twitch! And the whole system goes down. And the Queen gets closer to her ambition of reducing the world's population from 7 to 1 billion people. Because that type of catastrophe can have exactly that type of effect.

Well, where are the politicians that are saying something about that? Or doing something about that? You want to call them serious? Can you call yourself *sane* if you consider voting for one of these clowns? Can't we find some Americans who are not clowns? Who have

the guts to tell the truth about the situation? The United States now, in its present condition, is *hopelessly bankrupt and on the verge of going the same way that Greece is going right now!* What are you going to do about it? Where's your morals? Where's your brains?

The Remedy

Now, there's a remedy for this. And it's not a remedy that London and Wall Street like—I have to concede that. They won't like it at all.

What are we going to do? Well, the two things we have to do, which are Constitutional in their character: First of all, they're Constitutional against the background of our Constitution. Also, people don't understand economics. The leading economists generally in the United States are distinguished by the fact of their total ignorance of economics. They have these myths: Anyone who could believe that the bailout is a help to the world economy, when it's nothing but complete bankruptcy of every part of the world that's in on it? Of course, the British have a view on this thing, the British monarchy: They're going to kill a lot of people—that's good as far as they're concerned. They say so, repeatedly.

But the other side is, they don't intend to play by the rules. They intend to see the world collapse around them, and they intend to have a survival group, which is going to come up with a completely new system to replace—they hope!—the bankrupt system, that they made bankrupt.

So therefore, there are two things that we have to do, but the two things are under one idea, one principle. The principle is: As far as we know from direct evidence, in European civilization and beyond, nations have been governed by a system which is called a "monetarist system." Now, the peculiarity of this monetarist system, which virtually no economist in the United States understands, and very few in Europe: We used to understand this, when we had the Massachusetts colony, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, we understood what the difference is between a monetarist system and a credit system.

The United States government, the Constitution, was based on the concept of a *credit system*. But Andy Jackson, who was not exactly a patriot of the United States, worked under a whore, a British whore, who followed him as President [Martin Van Buren]. And they shut down the essential institution of banking of the United States.

Our system, which we got in the period coming out

of the victory in the Revolutionary War, in the process of creating our Constitution, went to the precedent of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, to create a *credit system*—in other words, not a money system, but a credit system—where the Massachusetts Bay Colony created credit. Not currency, not a monetary system. And the credit was simply, credit by the government, or the collectivity of the government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, to allow certain scrip to be uttered, to allow for the production of goods and the means of production.

Under this policy, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was way ahead of the British Kingdom, in terms of technology, and in terms of economic growth. It only lost that growth, after it was suppressed by the head of what was called the New Venetian Party, which led into the establishment of the British Empire.

Now, what happened with Andrew Jackson, that whore Jackson—and I say it advisedly—he was a Democratic whore. They say he’s a Democrat, but he’s a whore, so therefore, he must be a Democratic whore! What he did was to induce, with his boss, who was later President, the Great Crash of 1837. This destroyed the credit system of the United States, by that operation by Andrew Jackson, under the orders of his boss, who gave us the 1837 Crash.

We’ve had recoveries from that kind of effect, since that time. One, in fighting the Civil War: In the case of the Civil War, we went to greenbacks. Now, the greenback system was a *credit system*, and it was a credit system that is specified *in our Constitution!* It’s one of the strongest features of *intent* in the U.S. Federal Constitution: that the United States currency is based on a credit system, not a monetary system. And everything we’ve been ruined in, in economy in the United States, has generally been a result of a return to this kind of monetarist system, some kind of monetarist system, as opposed to our Constitutional system, which is a credit system.

Now, I’ll explain what this means: We’re now bankrupt. The whole country is bankrupt. The situation of our people is generally hopeless, for most people, right now! How do we cure that? Well, we have two things we can do which will get us out of this mess: One is called Glass-Steagall. Now, Glass-Steagall, which is a law crafted under Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President—this *saved* the United States, and made us the greatest power, again, in world history at that time, and defeated Hitler. Without Glass-Steagall, Hitler would be ruling the world, today! Or something like him.

So therefore, this system, which we keep going back

to every time we want to have an American-style recovery, is going back to the concept of a credit system, which is built into the design of our Federal Constitution. Now, a lot of jerks don’t understand this; that’s why they’re called jerks. Because anyone who’s trying to run the United States, who doesn’t know the principle which makes the United States function effectively, is not qualified to be advising anybody on how to run the United States.

A Broken-Down Economy

All right, so now, we have a broken-down economy. The economy was broken down beforehand, before 2008, but, the breakdown was aggravated by the bailout. The bailout, as in Europe, the interchange between the U.S. banking system, the Wall Street-type of system, *taking over* the U.S. banks, not only those banks which are Wall Street-type of banks, but also the commercial banks. So our *entire* banking system, and the looting of our mortgage system, was engineered by this mechanism, of the monetarist system. And now, the actual debt of the United States, the debt of Europe, *far exceeds anything that could ever be paid!*

Well, I say, number one: Use Glass-Steagall. Roosevelt created it. It’s in the tradition of the United States, in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in the Pine Tree Shilling system. And what we did with the idea of the paper currency, by Benjamin Franklin—it was his proposal—then, under Franklin’s influence, it became the policy of our Secretary of the Treasury [Alexander Hamilton]; and that became a Constitutional principle. And every success we’ve had in the United States, since that time, has been based on those periods when we went back to that principle of the credit system. Abraham Lincoln—the credit system—that saved the United States from destruction.

Roosevelt saved the United States from destruction by the credit system, which is his idea of the Glass-Steagall law. He did not go all the way, but he went far enough to enable us to recover, to become again a powerful nation of the world, and to win World War II. And that was only destroyed under the influence of Harry S Truman.

But that’s not adequate, because we have a broken-down economy. There’s no chance of any full recovery. The hopes of most people out there—they have no real basis for hope! Not under this system. Even Glass-Steagall, while it is necessary to get rid of the real garbage, which is what it does: Glass-Steagall puts the garbage



LPAC-TV

The economy was broken down before 2008, but, the breakdown was aggravated by the bailout, which allowed the Wall Street monetarist system to take over and wreck the entire U.S. banking system. Here, LaRouchePAC organizers campaign with Congressional candidate Keshia Rogers, in the Martin Luther King Day parade in Houston, Jan. 16.

in the garbage pail, and leaves what is not garbage to be used. But the problem is, the system has been so rotted out by the looting, by this monetarist looting, that even Glass-Steagall will not be sufficient to cause an actual recovery of the U.S. economy, physically. But, however, these systems, which are based on that kind of monetary system, even of any improved type, will not allow the nation to come back to life.

So therefore, we have to go to what's called a pure credit system. And do the same thing all over again.

Now, the only way we can do that, is by the entire United States system, banking system, and so forth, on a credit system. Why? Because, in the kind of money you would get in the banking system from Glass-Steagall, you will not get enough money, as credit in the system, to organize an effective recovery of the United States from the slide into Hell, where it's going right now!

However, under a credit system, we can utter credit, legally and properly, based on the amount of good we intend to do. In other words, we just say, "We, the Federal government, as we did in bailing out from the debt of the United States, coming out of the victory over the British in the Revolutionary War, we utter credit, by the Federal government—no other authority—in order to cover the loans needed to finance the recovery we need." Under Glass-Steagall, you can't do that, because

you're limited to the amount of funds you're able to salvage from the bailout.

If you want to have a recovery of the United States, you must *dump* the monetarist system, and go to a credit system, which is what the United States did in coming out of the Revolutionary War as an indebted nation. It's exactly what Lincoln did, to win the war against the British in the Civil War. It's what Roosevelt did, in his own intention, but he had the resources available, under that intention, to save the United States and save the world from Hitler.

So, that's where we are, again, and that's what we have to do. That's the Constitutional thing: This is a Constitutional principle, not an ordinary piece

of legislation. Glass-Steagall was passed as a legislation, but the principle of credit is a principle, not an ordinary law. And it's the return, by agreement, to that principle, which is the way we can save this nation from a collapse which is now about to hit it. Without that method, there *is* no recovery from collapse.

This has another aspect to it. Why is it that the United States developed a credit system, when no other system in the world, at least in European systems, actually ever developed a credit system—except for Charlemagne. He's dead, of course, and not able to do that any more. But so therefore, what we have to do, essentially, is extend the idea of a credit system to our partners in various parts of the world: All they have to do, is do the same thing we do. They now will clean up their mess, take all this cheap money, this phony money, put it in the garbage pail, and we go with the credit system, which is based on the kind of investment we need to make and implement, in order to save the United States, and in order to save our partners from other nations. The same thing.

So that's where we stand on that. That should be our policy. It should be our policy we propose to our partners.

For example, the intention of Russia, in particular, now, under Medvedev and Putin, is a serious attempt to

set up close cooperation between Russia and the United States, among other nations. And such an agreement between the United States and Russia—which means removing Obama from office, of course—would actually be the basis for organizing a group, a large group, of major and other nations together, to save the economy of the world. There is the technology available. We can catch up.

One of the things we have to do, apart from Glass-Steagall, is NAWAPA. It's a typical program: NAWAPA was a creation of President John F. Kennedy: He was the one who authored this thing, and put the backing in. And it was killed because he was killed, as part of the process.

So therefore, we have, under our law, under our system, a perfectly rational, clearly understandable method for dealing with these problems. And the fact that these are the aspirations of Russia, under the present government; that we have a similar attitude on the part of China, 1.4 billion people. A similar attitude now coming out of Korea; a similar attitude in Japan, and other nations. So, what are we waiting for? The greatest part of the population of the planet, will come to join us in this process, if we reach the agreement among two or three of the major parties in this thing.

So that's our operation.

The 'Gods' of Olympus

The problem is this: There's a theory behind this crime. Monetarism is a crime against humanity, but what is the theory behind it? It goes back a long ways—it goes back in European Mediterranean history in a particular way. That you had a class of people, who called themselves "gods." They were actually called "gods": The use of the word "god," or its translation of the same meaning, meant that there are certain people who ruled over the planet. They were the real human beings; the other human beings were not really human, they were treated as animals, like cattle. And that was the system. So the word "gods," as translated from various languages and used in the Greek, for example, was exactly that: There are some people who rule the world because they're gods.

Now, how do they do this? Well, first of all, they keep the majority of people stupid, and not too plentiful. You don't allow scientific and technological progress, the Promethean principle—you don't allow *fire*, don't allow mankind to learn how to use fire—or nuclear power, for example, which is a form of fire! And therefore, you keep the population of the human species

down to a limit, which you decide to tolerate: Don't let them have technology—keep them dumb and barefoot! And that's called the monetary system.

How does it work? The "gods," or the gods of various nations, like with the Wall Street "gods"—and you know what filth they are!—the gods of various nations decide, "We're going to keep control of this system. We're going to keep the people not too plentiful, and dumb. Stupid. We can not allow them to have fire!" Because mankind is the only species that can use fire. The only species that is willing to use fire is mankind, no other species. That's the difference between a monkey and a human being. And obviously, some people are monkeys, by that rule.

So the monetarist system is the value represented by an oligarchy, like the Wall Street conception. An oligarchy takes a monopoly on all money and declares that only *money* in that form can be used as credit.

Now, the other side of the fact is that the human species can't tolerate that, really. Because without scientific and technological progress, and without the increase of the human population in size and numbers, we can not maintain the human species as existing. Because we're living under conditions in which, gradually, the old ways of life—like take the dinosaurs for example; what happened to the dinosaurs? They stuck to the old ways of behaving, and nature took care of them—they're gone!

So therefore, the issue is, that the idea of a monetary system is a way of imposing a *dictatorship* over the masses of populations; whereas, a credit system has the opposite effect.

And this is the difference, the fundamental difference between the United States and the Europeans. It's not that the Europeans like this stuff, but they're taught that they have to accept the law. The law under which they're ruled, as under the Roman Empire and its successors, is that system. And therefore, in the United States, we have gone back, we reinvented it again, reinvented the credit system, as in Massachusetts and later, in our Constitution. The Europeans *stuck* to some version of a monetarist system. And that's how the Empire ruled in Europe.

Therefore, we are going to a credit system, in which the only money that is allowed to be uttered in the name of the United States government is a credit system. And thus, that credit system now becomes the means for organizing employment.

What do you have now, like in the farm belt? The



American Farm Bureau Federation, Texas

“The agricultural system of the world is being starved by illegal methods!,” LaRouche charged. “Like Monsanto. What Monsanto is doing is rape of the United States and other nations. It’s illegal! It’s unconstitutional. It shouldn’t happen.” Shown, effects of the drought in Texas, 2011.

agricultural system of the world is being starved by illegal methods. Like Monsanto! What Monsanto is doing is rape of the United States and other nations! It’s illegal! It’s unconstitutional! It shouldn’t happen! But therefore, we now have the means, by control of the monetary system, to starve whom we wish to starve—by channeling money, by asserting its value in other terms. So we control what is perceived as the “value” of money, we control what is considered in monetary terms the “value” of various kinds of products and services. Therefore, *we are under that kind of dictatorship.*

And we, in the United States, who have been *unique* in leading this kind of revolution, which is why we came here in the first place: Because Nicholas of Cusa recognized that the European system was not salvageable; that we had to go across the waters, and bring our culture to other parts of the planet, and to develop a system which would meet the needs of the people, and then go back to the old European system and tell them, “Good news, we’ve got the solution for your mistakes.” And that’s what we have to stand for.

So therefore, we need that kind of thing. The United States presently *will not continue to exist*—with or without a thermonuclear war—will not continue to exist, without going to a credit system in place of a monetarist system: What has been done in terms of the bailout, has reached such enormity, that even Glass-Steagall could not save the United States, *unless* we applied to Glass-Steagall the standard of a credit system. And without

that, we’re not going to survive. Those who wish to survive, will agree with me. Those who don’t agree with me, do not wish to survive—because they will not survive, if they rule.

We’re Going to Mars

Okay, now: Those are the only Constitutional principles that I am pushing at this time. I have other notions of Constitutional principles, which *should be* incorporated in the law of the United States as part of the Constitution, or interpretations of the Constitution. But, I didn’t want to do that now, because I didn’t want to open the gates for a flood of wild-eyed, cock-eyed ideas, like from the Austrian school of finances, or some ghoul like that. These nuts will call *that*, that, so therefore, I did not want to open the gates to allow this kind of fraud, like the Austrian school of fraud, which I think Mitt Romney is part of, or he’s close to people who believe in that. And therefore, he can’t be President of the United States. That can not be allowed, unless he has a complete conversion to something more sane. But that’s typical of the problem.

What are we going to do? We’ve discussed money, we’ve discussed the politics of money, things like that: What are we going to do with this poor world? Well, one thing we’re going to do, and we have to do, is, we’re going to have, as some people know, here in the room and elsewhere, we’re going to go to Mars. Now, we’re not going to pack our bags, and go to Mars—that’s not the way this thing works. But what we’re going to do, is we’re going to take a technology which we now have, but which needs a little perfecting. We’re going to take those tunnels in the Moon—we will probably send people directly to Mars, but they’d be sacrificing their lives in doing so, at this time. Their lives would be shortened considerably. But we’re not going to chug-chug-chug-chug-chug-along to Mars, either.

We’re going to have to go to a method of power which will enable us to reach Mars within a week, from Earth. Now, this is going to change man’s understanding of mankind. And it’s something which we will be working on now. There are several principles which I’m working on right now: First of all, we realize that the thermonuclear-fusion driver, for travel between Earth and Mars, is necessary. We also recognize that to go efficiently to Mars, we have to make a little intervention, which was understood by some German scientists,

back in the 1920s: We have to go to the Moon, first.

And therefore, we aim at the Moon, where we build up resources, which we then shoot, at longer distances, and thermonuclear-fusion-driven rates. In other words, acceleration out, deceleration down, and we can do that in about a week. That's what our prospect is.

That changes everything! It changes man's relationship to the Solar System. It changes, implicitly, our relationship to the universe. And these are things which we can not realize overnight, but we can set into process the motion which will enable these things to happen. We will then no longer be poor human beings, sitting vulnerably on this poor planet of ours, waiting for our extermination. Humanity will be moving throughout the Solar System, and finding ways to live and develop in the Solar System. We'll be invading the galaxy, at least in some part of the galaxy; we'll be developing things and the future of mankind. They will happen *long* after I'm dead, but they will happen, and that's what's important.

So we have a number of things that go into this. First of all, that's the big one. Right now, the big one is that: Mars travel, with the development of the tunnels of the Moon as the way in which we build up the capabilities logistically of supporting the Mars operation and going further. We're going to go out there, to save mankind—what Obama would not allow! We're going to prevent asteroids from crashing into Earth, and killing human beings. That can be done. We have to develop the capability of doing it. Russia and China are working on that kind of problem themselves.

So we're going to go out there, and we're going to do a lot of useful things. But at the same time, we're going to do the Mars mission, we're going to do some other things: We now have a situation, where there's a melting of the Arctic. Now, the Greenies would think that's terrible. Well, let them freeze their what-off, if you know what I mean. We are going to enjoy this thing, because we're going to go with the right stuff, and all these kinds of things. We're not going to have our *** frozen off.

NAWAPA and Beyond

So therefore, we have NAWAPA: When you put together the space program and NAWAPA and some other programs, which are of the same nature, where you are developing the ability of the Earth to defend and sustain human life on Earth *and beyond*, then you've created a real economy.

And more than that, you know, we human beings, we live a certain amount of time. The British think I've lived too long, for example. But we human beings, the problem we have, is we think that when we die, which comes along to us, sooner or later, we think that means that life is over, or the meaning of life is over. Well, life is over, but the meaning of life is not over. When you think about traveling the distance from Earth to Mars in a week, and think what that means on a larger scale: That means that mankind is now connected to generations ahead, by these kinds of improved means. That the meaning of life has changed for mankind, from what most people think it is now. They see the true connection between scientific progress, the discovery of the increased power of mankind in the universe. We understand what that means in terms of what we discover today, which is realized down the line today, several generations down the line. But that several generations down the line today, when you think about flight from the Earth to the Moon, you realize that we've changed the relationship among successive generations.


And, that is where we have to go, and where we have to think: We have to redefine what most people think is human life, and the purpose of human life. We've got to change that! We've got to realize that you may be dying in the morning, but before you die, you will have unleashed something into the future, which means your life *means something for a long time to come!* And that's the difference in the way mankind thinks about man, which we have to realize today.

So this defines, essentially, to some, a galactic option. We are now, as mankind—and we who are working, in the Basement Team and so forth, our Basement Team—are thinking in exactly these terms. You're going to see some things coming out in our publications in the coming period, which is more and more of this: We've really got the bit in our mouth on this one. I'm not particularly urgent about getting to Mars myself, personally. But I'm very much concerned about the success of those who will take that journey. Their life, their success, and the fruits of their influence.

So that's where we are. And when we want to think about the United States, we have to think, not about a nation, how you “manage a nation,” like some grocery store or something. You have to think about what a nation is. It's the repository of a continuing process, of development of powers of mankind in the universe, to accomplish things that mankind *can* do, or will be able to do, under this kind of program. And when we talk


LaRouche Offers Pathway to Economic Recovery

To build our way out of the existential crisis that faces mankind today, Lyndon LaRouche outlined three exciting economic/scientific challenges which will take us, and the generations who follow, far into the future: the great water and terraforming project NAWAPA (the North American Water and Power Alliance); development of the Arctic; and a Moon-Mars-oriented space program. These great projects will prepare us to confront our “galactic destiny” and create “something greater, more beautiful, more satisfying, than anything you’ve ever dreamed of before.”



NAWAPA

“When you put together the space program and NAWAPA and some other programs, which are of the same nature, where you are developing the ability of the Earth to defend and sustain human life on Earth *and beyond*, then you’ve created a real economy.”



about the purpose of life, we talk about the meaning of life for our children and grandchildren, *that's* what we should understand. Not some futile cry, "Oh, you're dead, you're gone, I can't reach you any more! My life doesn't mean anything any more!" No! It should mean something! If you're contributing something to the future of mankind, across future generations, and help to make that leap by this kind of technology, this kind of science, your immortality is not to be doubted. Because what you can do while you're alive, *here*, or some other part of the system, what you can do will reach across generations, directly, from what you are.

And it's that sense of your own value, in that kind of role in life, which must be the mission, which we, and Russia, and China, and so forth, must share in common.

The Common Aims of Mankind

Now, one final note on this thing: We've reached the point where it's been demonstrated, and it was already true in the 1920s, even then; but now, in the 1970s and beyond: The development of methods of warfare, such as nuclear warfare, and thermonuclear warfare, and other systems, which are now coming online, means

that it's not possible, as the present case before us, the question of the British intention, together with Obama, to slaughter most of the human race in Asia, *right now*; that we can no longer have war, in that sense, in that way. Because we can not put the existence of the human species at risk, when it is the essence of our existence! We can not destroy the essence of a human existence, as a species! Particularly, since our species is a creative species, explicitly so.

Therefore, mankind is too precious to be killed. That does not mean we can't have quarrels. That does not mean we shouldn't have sovereignty of nations. Yes, we should, because only with the sovereignty of nations can you actually develop the mind of the people of nations. This idea that's going on in Europe, of so-called "governance": Do you realize that most of Western and Central Europe, *those people have no government? They have no sovereignty.* They're not allowed to have sovereignty!

I'm concerned to get the British out, and give the people in Europe their sovereignty back: The Greeks are about to take it, out of desperation. Italy's ready to take it, not out of desperation, but out of rage and anger.

So therefore, there is a meaning of life, there's a meaning of human life. We can not put mankind at risk: The way we avoid that, is by adopting *common missions* for mankind. There was an old curmudgeon, who was a sort of funny friend of mine [Edward Teller], back in the late 1970s and early 1980s—he's now deceased. But there was a conference which was held on behalf of the SDI policy, on this, talking about "the common aims of mankind." There is such a principle as the "common aims of mankind."

And under the common aims of mankind, such things as an alliance between Russia and the United States, which is now available: Get rid of Obama, do some of the things we want to do; with China, it's there; with Japan, it's there. There is such a thing as the common aims of mankind, among different, respectively sovereign nations.

And it's that principle of law, the higher principle of law, the higher principle of sovereignty, which must rule. We can no longer risk the kind of wars, that that babbling idiot, that rageball Obama, and the Queen, are pushing. That is the ultimate crime! Because, by implication, as well as by direct cause, they are committing a *crime against humanity, per se*. And they must be removed from office and from power! Because we can not allow these clowns to control the fate of nations, any more.

NAWAPA 1964

PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 14, 1963

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary "NAWAPA 1964" is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early '70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it

... until now.

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

Dialogue with LaRouche

Matthew Ogden: We have about one-hour open to us for questions and answers. We've already received a number of questions from across the planet, and I'm going to give priority to a number of very high-level questions that have come in from Russia.

The first is from a well-known strategic analyst, Prof. Igor Panarin, who's a doctor of political sciences at the Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Professor Panarin starts with some short comments. He says:

"I appreciate what Lyndon LaRouche and his close collaborators do, because many people in the world, including in Russia, are beginning to recognize reality. Like Lyndon, I also believe that the main threat to both the U.S.A. and Russia, and to the whole world, is a group of private individuals in London, who, for hundreds of years, have been organizing bloody wars all over the world for their own gain. These London bankers organized the world narcotics trade, which is killing hundreds of thousands of people every year. I think that all clear-headed intellectuals worldwide, from different countries, should unite their efforts to save the world from the chaos into which the London financiers are taking it."

Now, Professor Panarin has two questions:

First, "What measures should be taken immediately to prevent the destabilization of Russia? I consider Gorbachov responsible for the demise of the U.S.S.R. and I think that he always championed British interests. And now he is being used to actively break up Russia."

And his second question: "How can the situation in the United States be changed, so that people would come to power who realize that the British bankers have been secretly running America for a long time?" And he asks, is there any possibility that Ron Paul could win? He's demanding the elimination of the Federal Reserve System, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan and Germany. Thank you in advance."

LaRouche: Well, first of all, I'm not recommending Ron Paul for anything. I know the gentleman very well, and he's of the Austrian School, and that's not the kind of thing we want to spread around this planet. Let Ron do what he wants to do, but don't make him President, or anything foolish like that. He does not understand anything about economy; he does not *wish* to under-



Igor Panarin gives a press conference in 2009 under the auspices of the newspaper "Izvestia."

stand anything about economy. We're in an economic crisis; we don't need his advice!

On the more optimistic part, we can do it now! As the professor knows, there are people in relevant institutional positions in the United States, who agree with me on this thing: We are not going to have a war! We're not going to have a war in Syria, we're not going to have a war in Iran, we're not going to allow it! We're going to hold back those damned fools who want to play with this kind of stuff. Because the only result they can create—remember, the weapons capability exists, and people in Russia are among those who understand that. You can not have that situation. You can't! Because it would mean the extinction, or virtual extinction, of the human species.

And therefore, anybody who wants to go to that war, including Obama, who is a lunatic already—he's insane! I diagnosed him back in April of 2009, and everything I said about him has been true. He is a modern reincarnation of the Emperor Nero. That's his mentality! His behavior is that. He's not fit for human company: Let him have a basketball and play someplace on a court, and let him bounce his balls forever! But just keep him out of our government.

So, the issue here, is we *do* have the need, for the safety of the people of this planet, not to have a thermonuclear war; if we allow a thermonuclear war, humanity is in danger of extinction. Anybody like Obama, with a Nero-like mentality? Bah! Don't give him that power! Don't give it to him: *Get him out of there now. He's nuts. He's nuts!* And there's no excuse for tolerating him in office any longer. The only

excuse is the lack of guts of people to do something about it.

Under those conditions, given the great poverty which is striking the world today, given what nations such as Russia, China, India, and so forth, as important powers, can do, the need for cooperation in economic progress of the type I've indicated today, here—that direction of progress is what *all nations need*. The Russians I know, because I know what their attitudes are, in part. They understand that. China is coming to a richer understanding of that. India will understand that in its own terms. Japan recognizes that in its own terms; Korea is now coming to the same thing.

So why should we be at odds with each other, in a military way? We can resolve our problems, by keeping the subject-matter on what *we need in progress*. We don't have to quarrel about taking something away from somebody else. What we have to worry about is the need, that *we* participate in assuring peace, by helping the creation of those means, by which the needs of mankind are assured.

And I agree with his position totally; naturally, there's no secret about that.

Ogden: I want to read another question which is rather short, and then pose a third from Russia.

The first is from another gentleman whom you know, Mr. Alexander Nagorny, who is the deputy editor of the *Zavtra* weekly newspaper, which is based out of Moscow. He asks questions which have implicitly been answered by what you've said. His first is: "My first question is a future-oriented one: What are the prerequisites for far-reaching U.S.-Russian political, economic, and financial cooperation?"

His second question is: "Is there any possibility that a future administration will take strategic steps such as ending the power of the Federal Reserve and returning it to the Congress, along with a return to the Glass-Steagall law?"

A Foul Ball in Moscow

Now, the next question contains some important strategic intelligence which pertains to Professor Panarin's question about the destabilization of Russia.

This question comes from a longtime Russian political and human rights activist. He says:

"Mr. LaRouche, decades ago, you warned of the current world financial crisis, and you demonstrated that free-market liberalism is a dead end, imposed by an anti-human, parasitical, transnational, so-called elite. Now this crisis threatens to become a global catastrophe. And when that elite can't get what they want by force, blackmail, and agentry, they attack national sovereignty under the cover of demagoguery about democracy, freedom, and human rights.

"Our country has been attacked using all of those methods at once.

"Now we have a shameful farce, where some members of the ruling caste, liberals like former Minister of Finance [Alexei] Kudrin, former Governor Boris Nemtsov, the oligarch Mikhail Prokhorov, and the Yale University-trained blogger Alexei Navalny, are parading around as the would-be leaders of citizens (who actually do have good reason to protest). In this situation, my concern is that the current Russian leadership will either voluntarily capitulate to this opposition circus, or will be forced out after attempting to carry out something like Gorbachov's perestroika policy. Russia could disintegrate during such a process, with ethnic conflicts and separatism.

"As you know we have a Presidential campaign under way, from which representatives of the patriotic opposition, like Gen. [L.G.] Ivashov, have been excluded.

"Not long before the campaign started, the Obama Administration named Michael McFaul as Ambassador to Russia. He is not a career diplomat; he is a Russian studies specialist, who for many years has been tied to the 'liberal reformers.' People whom I know were told by McFaul personally, that when he came to the Soviet Union in the late 1980s and early 1990s on various 'democratization' projects, he was never interested in achieving 'democracy' as such, but rather in the collapse of the Soviet Union.

"On Monday of this week, McFaul presented his credentials. On Tuesday, he met with representatives of the liberal opposition to the Kremlin.

"My questions are:

"What political circles does McFaul represent? What are their goals in appointing McFaul as Ambassador to Russia at such a moment of tension? Has Michael McFaul been sent here with the same intention of breaking up Russia, as he had toward the Soviet



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis
Alexander Nagorny



Michael McFaul, the new U.S. Ambassador to Russia: “A totally British pedigree,” said LaRouche.

Union over 20 years ago?”

LaRouche: Exactly. And McFaul is not really an American. His pedigree, his political pedigree is totally British, and of course, [U.S. Ambassador to the UN] Susan Rice is his sidekick. So we know exactly what this is: This is a foul ball, put into office as a diplomat now, by a foul ball called the President of the United States, and Susan Rice. And if you know what Susan Rice is—

Now, I’m perfectly free to say the truth about these people, because what they have done against me, and against Russians, at the same time, is a known fact. These guys are foul balls who don’t belong in office in any nation. And the sooner we understand that, the better off, the safer we’ll all be.

The British and the Malvinas

Ogden: Now, switching from Russia to the Southern Hemisphere, this question comes from Argentina, from Rosina Castillo, and she asks: “Recently, in Argentina, we’ve had a series of mysterious deaths of public officials, and also our President, Cristina Kirchner, has had a serious illness, because of which she had surgery. We are still operating under our Vice President, to this day, due to that illness.

“We can not see these developments as separated from the context of the real world history, as you have defined it. We’re at the verge of thermonuclear World War III, and the British will do whatever, to unleash chaos in the world. Until now, we thought that given the recent moves from the Russians to stop the Southwest

Asia ‘new Balkans’ from getting into a war, maybe now the British will look into other places, like Argentina, to start a war.

“As you know very well, the conflict about the Malvinas Islands is escalating, and today, the British Prime Minister accused Argentina of being ‘colonialist,’ and said their [Britain’s] Security Council will meet to straighten the security of the islands, given that the 30th anniversary of the Malvinas War is very close. So, we want your comments on the strategic situation in Argentina, and help the political circles here take the strategic perspective.”

LaRouche: I’m very well aware of the Malvinas’s history. The Malvinas was stolen from Argentina by the British, at a time of weakness in the United States. The British never had a legal claim to the Malvinas: They just *stole* them. It played a crucial part in the history of the administration of Ronald Reagan, because you had people in the Reagan Administration, including the Secretary of State and others, who were nothing but British agents. And so, the problem was, Reagan backed off on this thing; there was hesitation on his part at a certain point, and that was a point that I was rather close to the inside of certain of these circles of the Reagan Administration—not as a part of the administration, but as, shall we say, a friendly advisor, on SDI and so forth.

So the point is, the British have no decent, legal claim to the Malvinas. But they do intend to crush every part of the world that has sovereignty. Look at Africa, for example: *There is no sovereignty in Africa—none!* There’s only one worse tyranny than another. And it’s British. Now, you’ve got people in Europe, forces in Europe, which are also in charge of Africa, but they’re all agents of the British interests, the British colonial interests.

So the thing we have to do, one thing, which is to an unpleasant group of people, the British oligarchy: The British oligarchy has to be removed from power throughout the world. Let the people of the United Kingdom—or of Wales and Scotland and England; but especially Ireland and Scotland, and so forth, and England—let them each have their sovereignty, and we shall do just fine. We don’t have to torture people for the pleasure of the Queen of England and similar kinds of people. And this is exactly that.

We have some foul balls, who are more British, than they are Americans, in high positions in the United States: I think we ought to swap. I think we ought to



Presidency of Argentina

Argentine President Cristina Fernández pays tribute to those who fought in the 1982 Malvinas War against Britain.

take some British fellows, who are nice people and know how to behave themselves, and invite them to the United States, and give the British agents inside the United States the option of living in Britain, which we would more than strongly encourage them to do!

Getting the Snakes Out of Ireland

Ogden: Well, on that note, I think I'll take a question from Ireland. This is from our friend Gene Douglas, who's watching from Armagh, Ireland, currently, and he wants to ask you about the British Empire's Green fascism. He says:

"Our developing organization in Ireland has adopted you as our founding father, since you have returned to us our famous bold imagination, and given focus to our historic fighting spirit. You have reminded us that just because Ireland is a small island, doesn't mean we have to be small-minded. So thank you for your ongoing encouragement, as we lay plans to get Ireland back on its feet through the real republican concepts of physical development and credit system economics.

"And thank you, too, for the frequent kick in the arse, when you set us to scratching our heads, such as now, as we wrestle with the idea that we can overthrow the accepted notions of fixed space and time, and instead, bend them to our free will.

"When you laid out a conceptual map, outlining the new frontiers of the Arctic as the key to a world economic recovery, we eagerly accepted the challenge, and began to consider how Ireland could play its part. We undertook a study of shipbuilding, with the intention of building real, working ships, cargo ship and icebreakers for the work ahead. In so doing, we intend to override the oppressive sectarian legacy of the Belfast shipyard, whose first ship, the *Venetian*, was followed by warships for the British Navy, and of course, the ill-fated *Titanic*.

"Now we intend to unite our nation around a new flagship, an icebreaker called *The Gael*, and I assure you, it will not be wind-powered, but nuclear. And we hope the concept of this mission, even before a rivet is fastened, can inspire our island-nation."

Now, here's the question: "Just because Ireland is known as the 'Emerald Isle,' doesn't mean we should be putting up with the most vicious form of British Liberalism, the Greenies. So, let me ask you this question, Lyndon: Wouldn't the crushing of the Greenie movement, representing, as it does, the very worst of genocidal thinking, be a very effective and necessary step in restoring to the world, the power of reason?

"Thank you, Gene."

LaRouche: Well, as I say in the same tone that he has sent the message, that there are several points to be made here. First of all, that the *Venetian* was named for a leading figure of the Venetian Party, who became the King of England [William III]. And this was a very evil force, who went into Ireland and did a general slaughter of the Irish. So, the point is, I think we ought to recognize that William of Orange, and his descendants, should take a very modest posture in matters of world affairs: Keep their mouths *shut* most of the time, and don't scheme while they're keeping their mouths shut. Because this thing can not be tolerated.

This is the oldest evil, that we from the trans-Atlantic community know, this thing that led to the Roman Empire, which led to, again, other forms, which led into the Venetian system, which led into the collapse of civilization, and which launched the whole damned operation of the long, religious warfare, from 1492 to 1648.



King William III (1650-1702), who imposed the rule of the “Venetian Party” on England, Scotland, and Ireland.

That whole warfare was organized by what was called the “New Venetian Party,” and William of Orange was an official of the New Venetian Party, who had conducted, earlier, the wars against France. And this was all a process of rebuilding the Roman Empire, around a New Venetian model. That New Venetian model *is* the British Empire, it’s the soul and other parts of the organs of the British monarchy, today.

And therefore, one ought to understand that. These guys have had too much time on this planet. Let them take a more modest position, a more humble position, when they can learn what it feels like to be under tyranny.

‘The Point Is To Change the Subject’

Ogden: Okay, we have one more question that came in from Europe. And this is from a gentleman named Claudio Giudici, who’s becoming very well known right now. He’s the leader of a taxi union in Florence, Italy, and he’s also an activist with the MoviSol, our organization in Italy. And he’s currently leading a national strike against the financial dictator Mario Monti, and his policies of liberalization and austerity. Giudici,

as people might know, if you’ve been watching this website, has grabbed national headlines. He’s been interviewed on several national television networks, and he’s currently escalating his fight with prominent calls for Glass-Steagall and the policies of Mr. LaRouche (see interview, this issue).

So, here’s his question: “Dear Mr. LaRouche, one of the false myths pushed by economists is competition. Using linear approaches which are easily understood by many, we can say that competition is not the only issue to be addressed, but only one among several issues, including, for instance, protection and promotion of quality; labor rights, like minimum wage; protections introduced by civilized society for workers, efficiency, and others.”

He refers to an Encyclical by Pope Pius XI: “The social doctrine of the Church deals with the question of the failure of approaches that are centered around competition only. In paragraph 108 of *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pope Pius XI describes hyper-competition as a sort of virus, that first leads to the creation of oligopolies, then to domination of economic powers over politics, and ultimately to conflict among states.

“These descriptions are important because they help to understand the processes as a sequence. However, I wonder if the issue could be dealt with from a higher standpoint, not just a sequence, but a unity, an *unicum*, not so much like a Gothic church, but rather, like the Florence Cathedral. Thank you, Claudio Giudici.”

LaRouche: Well, the point is to change the subject entirely. That the question is the progress of mankind, the ability of mankind to survive. Now, the beacon today for that is Mars: that mankind must be developed, so that mankind has the power to reach Mars, and to develop it, and to develop larger parts of the Solar System. That’s *it*. So it’s that kind of purpose, not some kind of thing of some individual with his little scheme someplace—and they usually cheat a lot. And somebody who buys these things usually thinks so.

So that’s the point: It’s the increase of the productive power of labor, through the development of the intellectual powers of the mind, which is the vital interest. And it’s *that* which must be the test of what is right and what is wrong. That which promotes an improvement in the productive powers of labor, to do human good, *that’s* the Good. And whether something is more liked or disliked or so forth, *is irrelevant*. *It’s garbage!* And mostly, it usually involves cheating. And you find a lot of the people in the Republican Party are very good at

that. The Democrats don't like to admit it, they're also a little bit sloppy at it, but they do it too. And we can do without that stuff.

On Mitt Romney

Ogden: On that note, I have two questions that have come in from people who are watching the webcast, here in the United States. The first is from Jim, a retired pilot, a long-term supporter of the LaRouche movement. He says, "It seems to me that there's several comments which liken Mitt Romney to Obama. Do you see a Soros factor operating behind the scenes, i.e., with Obama nose-diving, the empire shifts popular attention to his fascist, nominal opposite?"

LaRouche: Right on the mark! Exactly on the mark! Every bit, every fact is exactly on the mark. It's exactly that. That's the story on Mitt Romney. And we've got a study on his operations and how they were run: That's *exactly* what it is. Enough said.

Ogden: We're pulling together some background intelligence on this case, right now.

But, on a similar question, now, people are worried

obviously, because you have a bunch of clowns who are supposedly the opposition to Obama. So, Natalia, who's also a LaRouchePAC supporter in the Midwest, says, "Mr. LaRouche, I would like to know, how can we find, finance, and positively get elected a new FDR, and is it too late in the election year to able to do that?"

LaRouche: It's never too late to win a war, when you consider the alternative. And this is a war. It's a war against oligarchism. And we're trying to get people to get the guts—.

What 'Democracy' Should Mean

Now, you know, people make a mistake on "democracy." Democracy's often a badly used word. Because people don't understand what it *should* mean, as opposed to what they think it means. The essential thing is that mankind must progress. For man to progress, that means that mankind must develop. That development is partly physical powers, but it's primarily intellectual powers, it's a development of the intellect of the human individual, which is the essence of this question of proper power.

LPAC-TV Weekly Report



Each Wednesday afternoon, Lyndon LaRouche sits down with LPAC-TV Weekly Report host John Hoefle and two guests from the "Basement" scientific team and/or the LaRouchePAC editorial staff, for an in-depth discussion of the most important issues of the week, be they political, economic, strategic, or scientific.

www.larouchepac.com



JPL/NASA

“The beacon today is Mars: that mankind must be developed, so that mankind has the power to reach Mars, and to develop it. . . .” Shown, an artist’s representation of the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter.

Now, therefore, some people will say, the number of people who vote for something means the law. It shouldn’t! It shouldn’t. Now, you don’t do that by decree, but you do it by scaring the shame out of anybody who’s on the wrong side on that question. As I did today: These people, these members of Congress, some of whom I have a liking for personally, but they’re acting like asses. They’re cowardly asses! And you know, you say to them, “Let us bray,” and that’s what—. The point is, you can ridicule, or whatever you have to do to get these people to stop being stupid! And the people do not have a right to be stupid. They shouldn’t wish to be stupid! And therefore, you’re not oppressing them when you tell them not to be stupid.

But what we have is, people are being stupid; they’re being corrupted. They like something, they want the sense of pleasure. They get a little more money than the next person—it’s pleasure; they get something they think is fancier than somebody else is wearing—they think it’s pleasure. And they don’t think about the fact that real pleasure is something that comes to you when you know you’re about to die: It’s the pleasure of knowing that you lived a good life, and

you’ve made a contribution to the future of humanity. And those thoughts—that’s what must be taught in schools. That’s what must be taught in politics!

I’ve often seen, in my own experience, in management consulting and so forth, that the greatest pleasure, in this sort of thing, is to take somebody who’s confused, but they want to accomplish something, and to be able to assist them in accomplishing something which they can claim is their own. You may have inspired them to do it. You may have helped to teach them to do it, but it’s *their* right, it’s *their* accomplishment: It belongs to them! And you want people to grab for what really belongs to them and should belong to them, their

own sense of their achievement in life. And they’ve got to have a sense that what they’re doing, *also*, is going to be reflected in what the people down the line are going to benefit from.

And therefore, the idea of doing good: Sometimes the phrase “to do good,” which was often used in the United States—that’s the term—it’s often made silly. But to do good, is what Benjamin Franklin did, in actually creating the United States, with his leadership, from having left the Boston area and gone into Pennsylvania, and been the spark, internationally, that made the United States possible, resting on what had happened in the previous century. And that’s goodness. That’s a good product. And the good product is a human being who makes the world after him or her, better.

Ogden: I think Franklin said, at the end of his life, to his son, or his grandson: If you think that what I have done has been useful to the world, you can thank Cotton Mather, because when I read his *Essays To Do Good* when I was a young child, that’s what shaped my entire life.

LaRouche: Good.