

LAROUCHE WEBCAST

Your Chances of Survival with Obama Are Very, Very Low

Lyndon LaRouche gave this webcast on April 4, 2014, at www.larouhepac.com. Matthew Ogden hosted the event, assisted by Dennis Mason.

Matthew Ogden: I'd like to begin with a question that's come in from an institutional contact, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the Senate Intelligence Committee has voted in support of an unclassified version of their investigation into the torture and renditions program of the Bush/Cheney Administration. All of the Democrats on the committee voted for its release, despite the fact that President Obama has been blocking the disclosure of 9,000 White House documents on the program, as part of his full embrace of the Cheney 'Unitary Executive.' Now with the committee vote, the President must decide on whether to release the full 400-page unclassified report, or to redact it. This also comes in the context of an intensified campaign, which you have helped lead, for the release of the 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks. President Obama, on at least two occasions, promised the families and survivors of the 9/11 attacks that he would declassify the 28 pages that were sealed by Bush and Cheney, but has instead personally abetted the cover-up of the Saudi role in those attacks.

Renditions and Torture

"This week, new revelations about the warrantless wiretapping of Americans' phone calls and e-mails has

added to the outrage, and the growing climate for impeachment. In this context, we have two questions. First, what is your view on the issue of the release of the full report on the torture program? And second, should a republic like the United States of our founders ever condone such torture and renditions under any circumstances?"

LaRouche: This is not a technical offense; this goes to the very heart of our Constitution. And there is no excuse for any of this. First of all, the fact is that we do know—not by the courtesy of our government, but by courtesy of other sources of information—that the 9/11 attack was done largely under the direction of the Saudis, as represented by their diplomatic representative to the United States, but also others involved in this process. And there was, under the Cheney, etc., administration, a direct cover-up of an attack backed by the British monarchy, the British Empire, and directly conducted by the Saudi ambassador to the United States, who was an active participant in the creation of this 9/11 attack. There is no other source of the attack itself, except the British interests, the British monarchy itself, in complicity with the Saudi Kingdom and the Saudi Kingdom's ambassador. They are the principal perpetrators of this crime against the United States. In other words, this in point of fact is an act of war against the United States, conducted by the British and the Saudis.

But! But, Dick Cheney was onboard. He was onboard all the way through. There was this pathetic pic-



White House video

President Obama and his CIA Director John Brennan are continuing the crimes of the Bush-Cheney regime; they have blocked release of 9,000 White House documents demanded by Congress on Cheney's torture and renditions program.

ture of Junior Bush, this little weakling who never really had all his marbles put together again. He was the so-called President, and that's why they had this designation about a Unitary Executive, because they had to put the monkey together with the chief act. So, the monkey, who was the little President, was actually being run by the gorilla, who was the Vice President. And very skilled at vice!

The Cheney Administration, which committed these crimes, was a Republican administration, which was replaced by a Democratic administration which has all the attributes of the Republican administration, and more to boot. The current President is nothing but a stooge for the British monarchy.

For example, take all the things which are currently happening which are all pertinent to this question and what it involves. The fact is that the British monarchy was behind 9/11. It was funded largely by the British. It was done by a special operation offshore, where they raised a tremendous amount of funds surreptitiously. And these funds were then used, in part, to fund the 9/11 operation, without the complicity of the British Empire as such. But it was the British Empire because the Saudis are part of the British Empire.

So the British Empire ran this attack on the United States, and you had some people—Bush, a stupid little jerk; never had all his marbles put back together again. They couldn't find his marbles and they couldn't find

his brain; it was a toss-up between the two which one was missing.

But in any case, the Obama Administration was the set-up arranged by British Empire-directed drug trafficking into the United States and into Mexico and other places. That's how Obama got elected—with British drug funding! And everybody should know that; there's no doubt about it, the traffic over the Texas border from Mexico in that period, which was key in getting him in a position to be elected. Without that, he couldn't have been elected. So the whole thing is one—shall we say—ball of wax.

What happened is, with the exit from the Presidency of President Bill Clinton, they used the frame-up, essentially, and the set-up against Bill Clinton to create the ability to cancel the Glass-Steagall Law. The Glass-Steagall Law's cancellation was a thing that has led to every single injustice done against the American people since that time. This was a frame-up which was set against Bill Clinton, which was set up initially by a British intelligence agent operating inside the United States under the cover of being a reporter. Then when at a certain point, the British pulled him back from the United States, back to home base, then the leadership of the Republican Party, at that time, organized the set-up against Bill Clinton. The operation against Bill Clinton crippled him, in terms of his ability to function. It need not have done that, but he was totally intimidated and shocked by the fact that he was set up by that monkey trap. And the Vice President at the time had been a key instrument in setting Bill Clinton up—*Gore!*—as part of the story.

So what happened is, we lost the continuity of an elected Presidential system by this operation against Bill Clinton, who was successfully elected for two terms. Because the Bush family representative, George H.W. Bush, flubbed it so much that they practically threw him out of office at the end of his first term of office. Bill Clinton came in successfully to become the President, and was essentially an effective President. He wasn't always perfect; I didn't always agree with

him. But it happened that I had been very close to him in terms of confidences on various things. I was very close to Bill Clinton throughout this process. And therefore, because of my close relationship to him, I had a much better view of the process. Actually, what I was involved in with Clinton were certain projects, certain subjects that involved Russia and other things. And my opinion was part of the injection of information into the Presidency. I actually induced him, at a certain point, to make a decision, a very crucial decision, which was correct. That decision, which he made on my suggestion, which he stated publicly, was his new international financial architecture. That was my proposal; and he adopted it and gave it that name.

That's when they went after him. What they did was frame him up in such a way—humiliated him—and then they brought in a clown as President. A foolish, stupid little clown. And they brought in Dick Cheney, who was managing the monkey. And that's what happened.

So, since that time, because of the Glass-Steagall cancellation, the greatest swindle against the United States which had ever occurred was conducted under Dick Cheney. I call him "Dirty" Dick Cheney, which I think is the best appellation. And this clown [Obama], who is nothing but a British stooge, brought into the Presidency on the basis of drug money, steered into the United States by the British Queen, who says she doesn't push drugs. She does nothing *but* push drugs; sometimes they come with heads on them.

So that's what this is all about. We lost the continuity of the integrity of the United States as an institution largely through aid of this mechanism.

The time has come when we must throw Obama out of office for crimes he has committed. And most of his administration has been a criminal one that involves violations of the Constitution, of which this case is one. His complicity with Cheney in this operation is one of the operations which has sunk the United States so far. And therefore, to maintain this man and his crew in office, to me, is tantamount to treason against the United States.



Cheney was in on the 9/11 attacks on the United States, which were orchestrated by members of the Saudi royal family, whose role continues to be covered up by the Obama Administration. Here, Cheney with friends in Saudi Arabia, 2006.

On the Verge of Thermonuclear War

Now, this has another aspect to it—you could say, a comic strip aspect to it. But it's not a comic strip aspect, because it's real and it involves the United States and our own integrity as a nation.

And that is, if we do not throw Obama out of office, first of all, we are already on the road to a thermonuclear war on a global scale. You see recently this has gone beyond this faking of an operation against Russia, and has now gone to an open attack on China, and there will be others. There are also major attacks of this type being planned for the Eurasian region. We're on the verge actually of a thermonuclear war, if you read everything that we know. There are people inside of our government, inside institutions of government, who are blocking the ability of Barack Obama to launch a thermonuclear war. He's doing everything possible step by step to taunt Russia, and now China, into a circumstance for thermonuclear war.

So anybody who is defending Obama—the number of defenders is shrinking rapidly. You have many people from the Democratic Party who are leaving the Democratic Party to support the Republican Party. Why? Because they can't stand the odor of the current President. If you were to throw Obama out of office now—im-

peach him—you would find you had an influx of Democrats coming back into the fold. And you would have an assured replacement of Obama by a Democratic-elected team, which would complete his term and the next one. That would be the means to save our United States.

The evidence and facts exist that that could work. If you throw Obama out of office for cause—and the causes are clearly here and exist—if you throw him out of office by people with the guts to do so, and you recognize what kind of leadership we need. We can't have the Republican leadership; not because the Republican Party is not qualified to run for control of office, but because they're being crazy. They're insane right now! Their policies are clinically insane. You know the famous slogan, "His politics are insane!" And the Republican politics are clinically insane at this time.

They are talking about waiting until the next election! We're faced with the threat of thermonuclear war *now*! We're already in a general financial breakdown of the United States economy *now*, and they're talking about doing nothing until the next election! And they're trying to bring another Bush into the Presidency! Now I would say, as Moses would say, "Let the Bush burn!"

Who Is To Blame?

Dennis Mason: Our next question comes in from a former Democratic Party official in Texas, who is closely following Kesha Rogers' campaign and has defended her in the past:

"Mr. LaRouche, up until recently, I was skeptical of the talk from some that President Obama's foreign policy has been a continuation of former Vice President Cheney's policy, due to his reliance on former Cheney crony John Brennan, who is now the CIA director. I had attributed many of the bad policies to the fact that so many hard-core neo-cons are still holding positions of influence—such as Victoria Nuland.

"However, it is clear that those like Nuland, and Brennan, were both part of the Cheney 'stay-behind' apparatus. And now, with the vote in the Senate Intelligence Committee to release the torture report, it seems that Senator [Dianne] Feinstein and other Democrats have created an opening for the President to dump those neo-cons.

"But I am hearing that the President will do whatever it takes to protect Brennan, even though doing so has already provoked a Constitutional crisis.

"What is Brennan's hold on Obama? Is it possible

Brennan has something incriminating on the President? Or, do the two of them just share the same worldview?

"And if Obama continues to try to block Senator Feinstein's exposure of the criminal behavior of the Bush-Cheney policies, does that constitute an impeachable offense?"


LaRouche: Well first of all, let's get the facts straight. The fact of the matter is, that since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, there has never been a secure representation of the interests of the United States from the Presidency of the United States. The closest we came to that was with the administration in which I played a part; but that didn't work out too well, because the President in question, Reagan, was subject to an assassination attempt. He was taken out of office in terms of function, because of the recovery from the attack, which was intended to be terminal.

I had been involved with him and even after that point, and his team, in creating an institution which was called the Strategic Defense Initiative. Now the Strategic Defense Initiative's purpose was to negotiate—and I did the personal negotiation with the relevant Soviet representations at that time—to come to an agreement on what was called the Strategic Defense Initiative, in which Russia and other nations, such as Germany and France and others, would be participants. And this agreement would be considered what Franklin Roosevelt had intended to be the resolution of World War II.

However, of course, this didn't happen. And the Cheney types, but this time Bush people, the Bush League, actually screwed everything up. So that became part of the operation. For example, the Soviet system collapsed, because they brought in actually a British agent, who took over the key position, and the Soviet Union rejected the agreement it had made through me. It was done by a British agent, who was actually a Soviet agent also, but he was a double agent—one of these British-Soviet types of agents.

So this led to a crisis, and I said, well in five years, the Soviet system is going to break up, as a result of this; and it did, in exactly five years. But this led, as a result, to a whole series of events, which we are now feeling.

First of all, there was no reason *not* to have the SDI agreement with the Soviet Union. This had been consistent with the intention of Franklin Roosevelt in his negotiation with the Soviet leadership while he was still alive. So, what happened, is the British interests reversed that and went to a point of conflict. And the Brit-



"We have been in a permanent war against our enemy.... The Queen of England, the Queen of the Empire, the British Empire, is the perpetual enemy of the United States," LaRouche declared.

LPAC

ish interests actually launched an attempt at nuclear war, but also thermonuclear war.

This created a new situation which resulted in an economic and otherwise political crisis throughout the planet, which was totally needless. If we had gotten through the SDI, as I had actually been supported by the administration, and particularly by the intelligence services of the administration of Reagan, even before he was President. We had created this operation, and I had been assigned to design it. So I had designed it, and I had conducted the negotiations directly with the Soviet representatives, because the key to this was getting the Soviet Union to agree to the SDI. And they did agree to it! I had repeated discussions and negotiations with the Soviet officials on that account. And that was also done back in Moscow. But this thing got totally fouled up by the British intervention.

British Imperial Strategy

Therefore, we have to understand not only what these incidents were, as incidents. They were not merely incidents: They were British imperial strategies, done to *destroy the United States*, which the British had

always intended to do, ever since we had the Revolutionary War. They had tried to screw us up; they killed our Presidents, repeatedly. Abraham Lincoln was killed by the British Empire, personally! Other people were killed. Our best Presidents were often *killed* by British agents, like Aaron Burr, who was a British agent, who assassinated a great figure of ours, Alexander Hamilton.

We have been in a permanent war *against our enemy*; the greatest of all enemies of the United States has always been the British Empire! The Queen of England, the Queen of the Empire, the British Empire, is the *enemy of the United States, a perpetual enemy of the United States*.

So, when you start to talk about this stuff, don't talk about this guy and that guy, and this guy doing this, and this other guy doing this—forget it! We're dealing with an empire. Look at the map. Look at how many territories A, B, and C: The British Empire itself, the core of it: British. Then go to a secondary layer, semi-British—actually a part of the British Empire, but a different category, a sub-category. Then, a third category, which is not formally a part of the British Empire, but

in point of fact is: It's totally controlled by the British Empire.

So, we have the largest empire on this planet, which is now controlling our Presidents, since what they did to Ronald Reagan, what they did to Bill Clinton, what they did to others; an enemy of the United States! And *the control of the Presidency of the United States*, under the Republican Administration of Dick Cheney and under Obama, a British agent, is the essence of the problems before us now.

Don't talk about "these guys might be complicit." It's not that they "might be complicit"; they are the *authors* of the problem! Cheney is nothing but an *agent* of this interest. Obama is nothing but an agent of this interest, he's not an independent character. He's a slug, crawling up and down the walls of the premises of the White House. He's nothing. There's nothing there. There's no substance there, there's a creature, a puppet, called Obama, run by *the Queen of the British Empire*.

When Americans wake up to face these realities—. During an earlier time in history, including the period of our own struggle for our independence of the United States, we had clearly understood these matters. But we got a bunch of prostitutes, usually Wall Street money. And remember: New Amsterdam. New Amsterdam was the Dutch center of the planting of the British intelligence/financial interests in the New York City area. And we've had a set of inside agents, inside our government ever since. They've been complicit in assassinations against our Presidents. If you go through a list of our Presidents who were really patriots, were really heroes, like Abraham Lincoln, or Alexander Hamilton, and a number of others—they were all assassinated by British agents. The most important figures, in large degree, among our Presidency, were assassinated by British interests.

But the propaganda is, "No! The British are our closest allies, our closest friends! We owe much to them. We've caused them to suffer—by losing control over us." This is the fact of the matter. And every good, patriotic American who's well informed knows that.

Now, we've got a British Empire that's out there right now. What do you think is going on in Europe? What do you think is the threat to China now? What do you think is happening against Russia now? Where's it all coming from? It is coming from the British Empire! And what of Cheney? And what is also, this present President, Obama? They're nothing but stooges for the

British Empire. And every American with a real brain and a gut to match knows it.

Just Plain Cowards

But what we have is a bunch of cowards. Americans who are just plain cowards, politically cowards. It's not that they're bad. They often have very good ideas; they have good impulses. But they're intimidated. They say, "What can we do about it? We can't do anything about that! I've got problems at home. Don't bother me with this stuff."

So, right now you have an exit of former Democratic voters, to the Republican Party. This is really a farce, because the Republican Party is planning to run an election campaign for another Bush! Another Bush, in the next election!

In the meantime, we're on the verge of a thermonuclear war, under this President and this Queen, and it's coming on fast.

What's happened is, the Democrats, who are disgusted with the Democratic Party as such, because they know the Democratic Party is controlled by not only Cheney—who's still in there—but also Obama. So they turn against the Democratic Party, because it is supporting Obama. Now if you get rid of Obama, then the Democrats would come back to the Democratic Party. But what they're going to, is a silly bunch of Republicans. They are absolutely silly. Here we are on the verge of a general collapse of the entire world economic system, and these clowns are saying, "Wait until the next election, and we will elect the next President." They are intimidating and driving honest Democrats into the clutches of the Republican Party! And that's what's happening.

My view is, if our Democrats, that is, the real Democrats, would stop and think, for at least *one brief, inspiring moment*, that maybe this whole thing is not a good idea; that maybe the Democrats ought to throw *Obama* out of office and get a new President, then maybe these problems could be cured. That makes sense.

Waiting until the next election, when there is not going to be another election—and you've got a bunch of Democrats joining support of the Republican Party, for the hope of winning an election against the wrong candidate, at a time when, already, the United States would be finished, by this operation. How silly can our people get?

So, what it takes, is people who stand up, as I have to stand up often, and tell the truth, and hope that some people have the brains and guts to see it, and to tell it.

What It Means To Be an American

Ogden: I want to pick up on the theme that you just raised. You've written a new paper, called "Democrats in the Next Election, The Prospect for a U.S. Future: Build the Real, American Party." And you make the point that you just made, that there would be no prospect for survival of the United States, other than a Democratic Party making the decision to impeach Obama, redeeming itself and preventing the Republican Party from exploiting the widespread popular hatred of Obama, as their electoral strategy. And you state that, "to elect the Republican Party in response to the voters' clear hatred of Barack Obama, would be comparable to trying to end a headache by removing one's own head."

Now, I think the campaign being run by Kesha Rogers in Texas is exemplary of precisely what you're saying the Democratic Party must do. Kesha is proving that the American people will respond to real leadership, if you're willing to go through the wall of fire and refuse to go along with the party line, to stand up to Obama and to stand up to Wall Street, as she has done.

For example, she wrote a reply to an article that was published in the *Huffington Post*, and they ran her reply. She said the following: "Democrats should be more concerned about what President Obama is doing to destroy the party and the nation, than about what I am doing in going after him for that. When a senior Democratic Senator, Dianne Feinstein, goes after Obama on the floor of the Senate, for interfering with her committee's investigation of Dick Cheney's torture program, one has to wonder, who, or what, is Obama really supporting? Will the Texas Democratic Party now attack Feinstein as 'not a real Democrat'?"

"It doesn't take a rocket scientist to read the handwriting on the wall," Kesha says. "The Texas Democratic Party must stop their antics and follow my lead. Or they will continue to self-destruct, and so will the nation."

Now, one thing you stressed in this new paper is that the problem is, that our citizens have been turned into sheep, and that they no longer have a sense of their own self-interest, and therefore, they refuse to fight. The only interest they have in mind, is their master's interest, and they don't want be overheard offending him.

You also make the point in this new paper, that Wall



CSPAN

When Dianne Feinstein, a senior Democratic Senator, goes after Obama on the floor of the Senate, for interfering with her committee's investigation of Cheney's torture program, one has to wonder, who, or what, is Obama really supporting?

Street's very existence is a violation of U.S constitutional law, as Hamilton defined it, and of natural law, in terms of the systemic distinction of man from beast. And for this reason, you say that "the typical American citizen lacks any competent insight into the actually physical principles of economy, which distinguishes the intention of the American Revolution from that of the British Empire." And that "the belief in myths that have been peddled by the historic enemy of our republic, is the source of our citizens' slavery, today."

So I think in light of the fact that you titled your new paper, "Build the Real American Party," the question to be asked is, "What does it really mean to be an American?"

LaRouche: Well, there are several things. First of all, we represent the institution which was created by people such as Nicholas of Cusa, and this effort, which created the foundation of all modern science, and similar kinds of things, gave a completely new conception, beyond all the evils that had gone on before. Now in the course of time, new forces of the old evil forces, came into power and ruined the Renaissance forces, headed by, in particular, Nicholas of Cusa, who was the leader at that point. But you also had Brunelleschi. And the combination of Brunelleschi and Cusa, together, created a system which led to the discovery of the nature of the universe. A discovery made by a student of Nicho-

las of Cusa and also of Brunelleschi. Johannes Kepler, was the discoverer.

Kepler was the only person who ever discovered, independently, the existence of a Solar System. Nobody else knew what a Solar System was, until he discovered it. And the Solar System is not simply a gimmick, not a mathematical gimmick, because there is no gimmick for it. He understood a principle of the universe.

Now similar things have happened; we have one in process right now, which came up, beginning with Carl F. Gauss, who carefully withheld talking about certain things that he believed, because he knew they wouldn't sell at that time, so he limited his discussion of these subjects to certain matters, and would say, "I'll give you an example of how this worked." He wouldn't tell them how he had made the discovery, he would say, "I'll show you how it worked." And then a young fellow came along, Bernhard Riemann, and Riemann continued the work of Gauss, and opened up the gates to make a mockery of all the foolishness that was dominating that 19th Century.

This led to the discoveries by great scientists, Max Planck, who discovered, again, the minimum; and you had the one who discovered the maximum, Einstein, 1905.

And immediately, during this period, the British Empire launched a campaign, with Bertrand Russell, one of the dirtiest pigs in modern history, most evil, and they ran an operation to cancel the acceptance of the idea of physical science, to replace it by arithmetic, by numbers.

What happened during the course of the 20th Century: The scientific acuity which had prevailed increasingly, over the course of the 19th Century, was reversed; and beginning in the 1920s, Bertrand Russell, with his pigsty of methods, actually became a leading force and a leading force for global war, and then global nuclear war, and then global thermonuclear war.

In this whole process, the education system of the United States, went into a phase of successive degenerations, and each generation of students, going into, for example, scientific studies, was poorer in quality generally, than the preceding generation had been. Every decade you would have a general downslide, in the quality of the public education system and the university education system in general. In this particular direction, the same thing as Hilbert, who had started the first freak show in 1900 in France, and the follow-through a short decade later by Bertrand Russell, who



NASA/Jet Propulsion Lab

"We used to have a space program, which Obama killed," LaRouche noted. "So what happened to our space scientists? They're out there lingering on the edges of subsistence, while the skills of our people vanish." Shown: Technicians at the Jet Propulsion Lab in Pasadena, Calif. work on a module for the Cassini orbiter.

had to work busily to catch up with what Hilbert had done before.

And so, the problem is that we live in a society, in which the intelligentsia, so-called, is not exactly intelligent. What we have are people who have specialized capabilities, as scientists, and are devoted to it, but they usually are on the underside of popularity. We used to have a space program, which Obama killed. So what happened to our space scientists? They're out there lingering on the edges of subsistence, while crap goes on, and people get poorer, the skills of our people vanish. Most people are incompetent to do any job, today, in the United States. Most people have lost the competence to perform useful work! Not their fault, but imposed upon them by this trend, this British imperial trend.

That's the way you have to understand this: We're in a fight, to bring back an understanding of what science is. Because most of the stuff that's called science today, is not really science. It's a package, which you can buy or sell, or discard. The degeneration was introduced at the beginning of this last century, by Hilbert; Hilbert was an absolute fraud, an absolute fraud, but he set the model for the entirety of the following century, in science.

I've been involved with people who were scientists, real scientists. But the number of them who have any power to influence science policy, is greatly diminished. If they're lucky, they get a hearing. If they're lucky, they can get something published. If they're lucky, somebody will listen to them. If they're lucky, somebody will give them a grant—but on conditions.

The green policy is essentially a policy of *preventing science from existing!* You can not have science under a green policy. We get fracking instead, in which Cheney is a specialist. He's no fracking good! And that's the way you can put it.

So, we're in a situation where we *do* know, some of us know, that the resources exist, the historic resources exist, to understand what science is, and what this means for the future of the human species. But remember, the most important thing is, the greenies do not believe in the human species. They don't believe in the characteristics that distinguish the human species from the bestial.

And we are dominated, today, politically, in the United States, by such as Dirty Dick Cheney, himself. No more science, no more truth about science, no more truth about the economy. No more truth about the destiny of mankind, while the British Queen squatting up over there, has decreed a policy of reducing the human population of this planet, from a recent level of about 7 billion people to less than 1: They haven't reached that, yet, but that's where they're heading. And if you look at the policies of the Obama Administration, the survival chances of people living under Obama conditions, without any support for the unemployed, for the long-term unemployed—no support, losing everything! Losing health care! Being given fake health care as a surrogate for real health care.

Our people are being *murdered* under these policies, and under these Presidencies, now. *This* is the fact!

What's lacking? Two things: brains and guts.

Money Has No Intrinsic Value

Mason: There's another thread which I want to pick up with this question, which is financially, particularly

the bail-in. Last Spring, about one year ago, the Cyprus bail-in operation was run, which defined a new phase of the global economic collapse.

Between then and now, the line went from "this is a one-off deal" to "maybe in certain circumstances we have to do it" to now what Deputy Governor Sir John Cunliffe of the Bank of England said to a Chatham House meeting last month, that in "resolving global systemically important banks and ensuring they are international in death as well as life, mutual trust has to be built on common standards and rules to ensure banks have debt that can be safely bailed-in in the right amount and location."

Now, during your Friday broadcast on Feb. 15 of last year, a couple of weeks *before* what happened in Cyprus, you warned of this intent. [<http://larouchepac.com/webcasts/20130215.html>] You said that the intent was to "*dump the existing financial system itself*, ignore the system they canceled, and put in *their own* new system. Which would mean the vast amount of debt, which is represented by the monetarist operation, would be *canceled*. In its place they would have a *new* system of finances, which ignores entirely all the obligations associated with the old! Which would mean that most of the people of the world would be starving to death, quickly."

You went on to say: "The amount of debt outstanding on account of this bail-out system, a monetarist system—a financial easing, a monetary easing—it's got to be canceled. So, there *will* be no such money available. There *will* be no such reserves. What will happen will be: An international cabal will create a *new* system of money, which will be much smaller, much more feasibly handled than the present one."

Again, this was *before* what became known as the Cyprus bail-in.

Now, Lyn, in discussions with associates last night, you said that the bail-in operation only has weeks, and that the British are thinking that, with the pressure on, if the rest of the world goes down, they won't get hit by the bail-in; there'll be nobody around to have to pay off.

Which I think this gets at the point of the timeliness of the thing, moving much quicker than people think, and also the drive for world war. Could you elaborate on that?

LaRouche: Sure. Well, this is why the war scheme is now. I mean, wars—usually, people think of gradual processes, they think in terms of trends as such. But most history has nothing to do with trends as such. The

sudden fall of great empires, for example, is not a result of a trend: It's the result of a self-destruction built into a system, under certain matured conditions, from which it can go from great might, to complete turbulence and collapse in a very short period of time.

Money itself is an evil. Money is not only the root of evil, but money is intrinsically an evil, when it is made independent.

Now, our constitutional policy was set by Alexander Hamilton, who was the Treasury Secretary of the United States, and in four measures which he presented, defined the possibility of maintaining an economy of the United States. Without those four measures, the United States would not have survived the first term of office of President George Washington, because the international debts of the United States, if not reconstructed in an orderly way, would have prevented the United States from continuing to meet its foreign obligations, and thus would have meant the disintegration of the United States, in front of the British Empire. So Hamilton saved the United States, by a scientific insight into the worthlessness of money intrinsically: that money has no intrinsic value, and never did!

Hamilton, however, made a compromise. The compromise was of the following nature: At the conclusion of the hostilities, in which the British Empire had caved in on continuing the war, because it had been defeated on the field of battle, the question was, how would the foreign debts to the governments which had supported the financing of the Revolution, how would those debts be treated? That was the famous problem. And Hamilton defined the solution to that problem; that's why we will have a United States at all today, because of Hamilton.

Now, what he did, is, he divided everything, and said, money as such has intrinsically no value. What has value? Well, some people would say "labor," the Marxists would say, "labor." But the Marxists didn't know anything about science, so they made a big mistake. It doesn't work that way.

What happened is, if you have a society like the American society, say in New England, when we still had the Massachusetts Bay Colony structure, you had a system; and this system of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was the foundation for the design of the United States, as an entity. The founding of Harvard University was an integral part of this process; and we had the Winthrops and so forth, and they did their job.



Wikimedia Commons/Yale University Art Gallery

The founding of Harvard University was an integral part of the process that established the Massachusetts Bay Colony, which became the foundation for the United States. This engraving by Paul Revere (1767).

What they did is, they built up the fastest-growing productive enterprise on the planet at that time, built up with a limited number of people, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, under the Winthrops and Mathers. This was what worked. This succeeded, beyond anything that was ever done on the continent of Europe at that time, the rate of progress—the Saugus Iron Works, for example, is an example of this. The ability to build a small country, a very small country, with a very small population still, in the New England area, was typical of this achievement, and it was an understanding of a principle, which *Europe never has yet, to the present day, understood!* No nation of Europe has ever understood the genius of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Benjamin Franklin understood that. But the colony was crushed by the Dutch—and it was the Dutch that really created the British Empire, just as most of the problems of New York City come from New Amsterdam, which was the instrument of the same Dutch, who massacred a lot of people, the Irish, for example, and did similar crimes, and that became known as the British Empire. I don't know what kind of a joke that was, but it was the Dutch Empire actually calling itself the British Empire; and that joke has been going on ever since.

So, we reached a certain point, and we had to have a solution, at the point we would form the Presidency of the United States and establish its security, as such. Well, the system was that. Hamilton recognized, as the Massachusetts Bay Colony itself had already recognized, that by increasing the productive powers of

labor, you are able to create a margin of growth, of physical-economic growth, which would raise people from a primitive state of existence, which is what they found themselves in, in the *Mayflower* landing and things of that sort, and growing up to a higher level of productivity.

The exemplification of that was the Saugus Iron Works: There was nothing comparable to the Saugus Iron Works, as a national or institutional feature, before then. So this was typical of the system, of the New England system, under the Winthrops and Mathers. Harvard University was created then, in that time. Harvard is not quite the same institution now, not quite as brilliant as they used to be, back then, but it still exists as an institution, scrapes along somehow or other. And it's there.

So we, in the United States, coming *out* of Europe, taking what Columbus had done in crossing the ocean—but it was not Columbus who had created America. It was the colonists, especially those from the New England region, who actually founded a system called the American System.

And the possibility of that, the engendering of that, was created by a couple of great people. One great scientist, Brunelleschi, who discovered almost everything in physical science in his time, and another one, Nicholas of Cusa. And these two figures, together with their progeny, politically and economically, created modern science. And the founding of modern science was the discovery of the principle of the Solar System, and that was done by Johannes Kepler. Johannes Kepler, based on the work of these two scientists, the one, Brunelleschi, and the other, Nicholas of Cusa, their combined work, on the maximum and the minimum principle, led to the solution, the first understanding of the existence of a *Solar System*!

Nobody else had ever known a Solar System, as such. You had some elements of that earlier, in terms of some great scientists who were probing in that direction, in discovering how to measure the Earth, measuring the distance of the Earth from the Sun. But that was the approximation. So this was what made possible this idea, this conception, this view of science: The view of the mission of science, to perform for mankind in the future, was absolutely unique, and it came in as an American institution, and it was enhanced by people like Benjamin Franklin. Benjamin Franklin created the coal and iron industry of Britain: He did it! This kind of genius of Benjamin Franklin continued the legacy of

the Winthrops and Mathers, for development of a new nation, inside the territory of what we now call today, the United States.

Therefore, our motivation, the conception of our society, is absolutely different than the conceptions of European nations. Some European nations have adopted the American model, and that has been a good thing. But Europe as a totality has never accepted that; Germany has done a good job in that direction, in technological development; some features of France have been good, useful in their time, apart from the disasters that have occurred otherwise. The Gaullists generally tend to do a good job, the Socialists are lousy. Don't get a Socialist government in France, it'll be a disaster! I don't know if we can still find some Gaullists left around. . . . But so, that's the sort of process. You have the Soviet phenomenon, it's a very ironical kind of phenomenon.

Now we have development coming out of, not the trans-Atlantic region, but out of the Eurasian region: You see the development in China, refractions of the same thing in India, a tendency to look at this kind of thing in other parts of Asia. You see that the chance of a rebirth of what the United States had come to represent in its early foundations, is being replicated today, in some degree in the new leadership in China, for example, explicitly, that group which I've been watching, and so forth.

So therefore, the idea of doing this exists.

But the central thing to consider is that there is no such thing as monetary value. You can give value to a monetary entity. But the monetary entity has no intrinsic value whatsoever.

Now, what have you got with Wall Street? And how's it affect us right now? First of all, Wall Street should never have existed. It should never have been formed. It would not have been formed, but for some swindlers, Presidents who should not have been elected, who were scoundrels, worked for British interests, foreign interests—and I do mean British interests, specifically. Based out of New York and coming down and organizing our society, and creating the basis for the Civil War in the United States.

So, what's happened to us, is we have lost our connections to our roots, which go back to the days of the formation of Harvard University, for example, the Winthrops and Mathers. There was a conception there, which came from Nicholas Cusa, in particular, and also from the influence of others, as well: And this was an

idea of escaping from the Eurasian system of that time, the system of serfdom, which dominated Europe at that time, the system of bestiality which dominated Europe. And to create a region of freedom: Nicholas of Cusa had been the great inspiration of this. Brunelleschi had been very crucial in forming this, through scientific discoveries. And Kepler was wonderful, because Kepler was the first person to understand that there was a Solar System, and his understanding of the Solar System's existence was fine, it was excellent! And the greatest achievements of European civilization have depended upon these people.

You take these three people, Brunelleschi, Cusa, and Kepler: There is no place in history, in which these people, these geniuses, do not have a key role.

All right. So, Hamilton and company represented those Americans who had this insight into how to make the future. Not on the basis of money; the idea of a currency, yes! But money as an intrinsic value, *no*.

The assumption is, that in a society in which creativity is occurring, the productive powers of labor are inherently increasing, through the intellectual development of the people of that society, and through the development of means by which they can exploit nature to the future advantage of the human species. That means, that the policy of Hamilton, in particular, and the basis of his whole conception, is, that you must have an increase in average productivity per capita, throughout the entire productive process: in agriculture, in industry, and in development in the basic infrastructure of the economy as such, the development of the minds of the people, the educational process. So that every time you make a turn, mankind must make an advance, an advance in technology and achievement: That's the American System!

Now, since the assassination of John F. Kennedy, there has been not one penny of net increase in the productive output of the United States per capita, *none, absolutely none*. In fact, the direction has been *downward*, especially under Cheney and Obama. So the idea of money as such as having a value, is a *great fraud*.

Money has no intrinsic value: rather, the principle is, as for Hamilton, that production must increase the *productivity* of labor, which means that people are going to higher skill levels, to greater technologies, to these kinds of advances. In the same way, the history of mankind is distinguished from the animals!

Mankind is a *creative species*, which has risen! Mankind was the first one to cook its own food. No

beast ever cooked its own food, only the human being cooks its own food. And mankind used fire, as for cooking our food, in order to increase the power of fire, at the disposal of mankind, to increase what we call the energy-flux density per capita and per unit of territory of the members of the human species. So it is the noetic principle of humanity which is absolute, generally. I mean, animal species do evolve, they have evolved, but this kind of evolution is different than human evolution. Human evolution is the willing, intelligible, increase of the productive powers of existence of a species, and it's not that just of labor, it's of a species—to rise to a higher level of existence of the human species than ever before.

Which means we are going into space. I don't recommend trying to take up residence there, that's not a good idea. But to take our machines, and the power that we can put into space, and put it to work for us, in nearby parts of the Solar System—that we can do! *That we must do!* And that will mean we're going to ever higher energy-flux densities in power: We're going to increase the power of mankind per capita, beyond anyone's dreams, ever before. That is available to us, through thermonuclear fusion, the enhancement of thermonuclear fusion with helium-3, things of that sort.

We are going to do things, and *must do those things*, which take mankind's *power* in the Solar System *beyond* mankind's occupation of Earth as such. We shall reach out, and change conditions on the Moon. We shall reach out, and deal with Mars. We shall reach out, and control these things that are floating out there, that we're afraid of; we're going to bring them under control.

We're going to create an environment around mankind, in the nearby Earth parts at first, and going to reach further, to Mars and beyond, to take control of this part of the universe. This part, a mere part, a tiny smidgeon in terms of the Solar System; and almost a mere speck in terms of the galaxy. But that's what mankind *can* do; that is what mankind *must* do. And the principle of Alexander Hamilton in economy is an expression of that same principle, which we must regard as our sacred obligation, for present and future humanity, right now.

And we need to get rid of Wall Street and everything that smells or looks like it, once and for all! We're going back to productive existence. We're going back to mankind as a genius, as the genius of creativity who creates new states of existence, for mankind, in mankind's

power, and for the good that mankind must do to enhance the parts of the Solar System with which we are associated.

Martin Luther King and Immortality

Ogden: Lyn, I want to ask you one final question, which might be somewhat provocative: As people know, today marks the anniversary of the assassination of the Martin Luther King, on April 4, 1968. And obviously, the collective trauma among the American people, of first, the murder of President Kennedy, and then, the killings of Dr. King and Robert Kennedy, in close succession, still acts as a source of cowardice, and fear, especially among those Americans who were young adults at that time.

You recently wrote a paper, titled, “The Wicked Witches of Obama,” and in the first section, which you titled “The Issue Is That of Immortality,” you quote Shakespeare saying,

“... thus conscience doth make cowards of us all:
And, thus, the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o’er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment,
With this regard, their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action.”

Many people are familiar with Martin Luther King’s last speech, which he delivered in Memphis, the night before he was killed, his so-called “Mountaintop” speech. But I think equally important was a speech that he delivered a few months earlier, in November of 1967, in Atlanta, in which he demonstrated that he, for one, contrary even to others who worked very closely with him, he did not suffer the Hamlet problem. And I’d like to read a short excerpt:

Martin Luther King said this:

“You may be 38 years old, as I happen to be. And one day some great opportunity stands before you and calls you to stand up for some great principle, some great issue, some great cause. And you refuse to do it,



Martin Luther King, Jr., the year before his assassination on April 4, 1968, gave a speech in Atlanta, in which he made clear that he was prepared to give his life in the fight for justice, and by doing that, he became immortal.

because you are afraid.... You refuse to do it, because you want to live longer.... You’re afraid because you will lose your job, or you are afraid that you will be criticized and will lose your popularity, or you’re afraid that somebody will stab you, or shoot at you, or bomb your house, so you refuse to take that stand....

“Well, you may go on and live until you are 90, but you will be just as dead at 38 as you would be at 90. And the cessation of breathing in your life is but the belated announcement of an earlier death of the spirit. You died when you refused to stand up for right. You died when you refused to stand up for truth. You died when you refused to stand up for justice.”

So, Lyn, you’ve emphasized that the real sickness that breeds intellectual smallness, and fear, is the belief in sense-

perception as the standard for truth. I’d like to ask you to elaborate on the contradiction between the belief in sense-experience and the immortality of the mind.

LaRouche: Well, often the thing is treated backwards. The question is, what is the purpose of human life? Now, the animal has an implicit purpose in life, which is to breed its own species. But the human intention is far different. Now, many people lack that human intention, and that’s what you are pointing to when you talk about Martin Luther King’s remarks, in the later part of those remarks, exactly that.

Now, I’m a forecaster: I believe in creating the future. I’ve always spent my life in that direction. I knew that the educational system stunk, I knew it from a very early age, because I knew I was being told, “Learn after me, learn after me.” And “learn after me” people, are dead people, because they will never go any place, except waiting for you to make the next step.

Whereas we, who are human beings, say, well, we have a very short life, and it doesn’t take a great genius to understand that the human individual has, in the scheme of things, a very short life. So therefore, what is

the meaning of your life? Is the meaning defined within the mere moments of your actual existence? Or is the meaning of your life located in what you, as a human being, contribute to the society, from which you are about to depart?

What were all the great scientists, the great scientific discoverers, what did they do? The great poets, the great artists, the greatest insight, in Classical artistic composition, for example? What's the meaning? What was the meaning, for example, in Classical music, to go from Bach (which is not the beginning, but was a relative of the beginning), and to something else, beyond Bach, but it depended upon Bach! And it went from there, next, to Mozart. It went beyond Mozart to Beethoven. It went to the later realization of Schubert. It went to the accomplishments of Brahms. It went to the great compositions they produced, and these compositions themselves represented a magnitude beyond anything that had existed before.

And then, suddenly, at the same time, poor, idiotic mathematicians were saying: There is no future, cancel the future, cancel invention, cancel discovery, it's all a fixed system. It's all numbers, buddy, it's all numbers. There's no life, there's only numbers!


So, what's the meaning of life? What's the meaning of life, if you, as I do, think back to ancient history, and think to the great accomplishments of mankind before, and think of the things that were created before, but were destroyed, or crushed—but then, rediscovered or amplified in a new form? Then, mankind rose beyond what it had been before, into something better.

You see, what is a human life?

Well, the human life is a spark. The human life is a speck, an infectious spark, which induces into the coming period of life of mankind, it produces a new concept, and it's the creative process. Now, take the typical guy in the university, the typical guy, a student in a school, what do they believe in? Pass the course. What's that? You take Ex-Lax for that?

Or, is there some other meaning besides Ex-Lax for passing the course?

Is there not the possibility that you can discover something which nobody had ever discovered before? And therefore, you're not dealing with the same old you-know-what, as you were taught before? Is it not the fact that mankind has progressed, as the principle of chemistry demonstrates progress? Mankind is the instrument of progress, the biological instrument of progress, the intellectual instrument of progress. We rise,



LPAC-TV

“What’s the meaning of life?” LaRouche asked. “The meaning of life, is to foresee what the future can bring, and to make sure you educate and train people who will light the fire that you have sparked. That’s the meaning of human life.”

from the poor guy who cooked his own meal, and somebody said he was monkey: He said, no, I'm not a monkey, I'm a man: I'm cooking my own food. Do you want to be cooked?

So mankind is the creature which rises to a *higher state of qualitative existence*, by virtue of *this commitment, to human creativity*. And to all the progress, as chemistry demonstrates that—what's the whole principle of chemistry. Now, chemistry, you can explain it in many ways—many people do. But, what does it *really* mean, though? It means that the power of mankind to utter and recognize states of nature which have not been previously known to exist, and introducing those new states of nature into creating a higher energy-flux density, the perennial fire! The power of fire, to go to ever higher energy-flux densities, and do things on those levels which have never been done before.

And that's what you think, when you think about Max Planck, you think about the mission of many great scientists, and to Bernhard Riemann: Riemann was a torch-bearer! He carried the torch, from Gauss to the great scientists who followed him. Without that connection, it wouldn't have happened.

So what's the meaning of life? The meaning of life, is to *foresee* what the future can bring, and to make sure you educate and train people who will light the fire that you have sparked. That's the meaning of human life.