



## Executive Intelligence Review

---

Subscribe  
to  
EIR Online

*This webcast transcription appears in the February 5, 2010 issue of Executive Intelligence Review.*

### LAROUCHE WEBCAST

## The End of the Obama Administration

*This is a transcription of the opening statement Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. gave at a LaRouche PAC webcast on Jan. 30, 2010, in Northern Virginia. The transcript of the lengthy question-and-answer period which followed it is available [here](#). The webcast was co-hosted by LaRouche's Western States Spokesman Harley Schlanger and National Spokeswoman Debra Freeman. The audio and video files of the webcast are archived at [www.larouchepac.com](http://www.larouchepac.com).*

*[PDF version of the transcription of the entire webcast]*

**Schlanger:** ... As all of you are aware, the world has changed dramatically with the beginning of the New Year. And it was nowhere more clear, than what we saw happen a mere ten days ago in Massachusetts, where the people of the United States, through their brethren in Massachusetts, the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, spoke out, and said, "No!" to the fascist health-care bill of the Obama Administration. But more than that, they said they're not going to listen to this Congress any more, that they want new leadership and new ideas. And for new leadership and new ideas, there's only one place to turn in the United States, and globally, and that's to Lyndon LaRouche.


Today, Mr. LaRouche will be discussing his strategy for making sure, instead of the end of civilization as we know it, that what we're seeing is the end of the Obama Administration. And that there is an alternative: We don't have to dismantle our country, our nation, the world, to have an economic recovery. And so, I'm very happy to introduce to you, Lyndon LaRouche.

**LaRouche:** Thank you. Despite the slush, which does not affect the broadcast waves, but it does affect the highways, some people will be a bit late today in arriving, because Virginians don't know how to drive on highways when there's more than a half inch of snow—even a heavy rainfall causes confusion. They're not used to civilization, yet, in some parts hereabouts. Being close to Washington doesn't help much, either.

Today is a very special occasion, because, right now, you have two parts of the world which are in a mess: Both flank the Atlantic Ocean: on the Eastern Coast of the United States and the United States as a whole, and in Western Europe, from approximately Belarus going westward, there is not much civilization left.

Look, let's start right off with this map, which will be our centerpiece of

the discussion today, which I'll refer to a few times.



Now, what I've done, is to get a conception of what the problem is we face, the real problem—that is, the physical problem, as opposed to the psychological problem, or the physical effects of the psychological problem. The red is the area in which the emphasis, today, is on high technology, typified by the promotion of the space program, and by nuclear power, and going to thermonuclear power. That's the predominant policy, looking from across the Pacific, from North America, across the Pacific into Asia; what you see, is you see *progress*, and this includes Russia and the countries of Asia, south of Russia, as a whole. But in Russia, the basic driver for Russia's future lies not on the European border (though there's a larger concentration on the European border), but lies in Siberia. And the only way that, under these conditions I shall explain, that we shall recover from the present world situation—**We are headed, right now, into a dark age; without some very radical changes in policy, the planet will go into several generations of a dark age, in which the plans are, on the British side, and similar sides, to reduce the world's population from approximately 6.7 billion people today, to an early arrival at less than 2.**

### Obama, the New Nero

And that is the intention: That is what's behind the policy of the British, that's what's behind the European policy, that's what's behind the policy of Obama, who is nothing but a British puppet—as I warned you on the 11th of April last year, that this man is a British puppet. He's not really a loyal American in any functional sense. He's a puppet of a foreign, enemy power. He's not particularly intelligent. He's like the Emperor Nero. And if you think of what I said about him, on the 11th of April last year, and described him as a Nero, and think very carefully of what he's done as policymaking, and the way he has reacted to crises, since April 11th of last year to the present time, you know, and are warned, that what you have on your hands is a virtual copy of the Emperor Nero.

And he's getting near the point—. The real-life Nero of that time sexually assaulted his mother and then killed her; and took his best friend, and it took him four times to successfully kill his best friend. He

said the same thing that Obama has said recently, that he's too good for the American people, as Nero said he's too good for the people of Rome. This Obama is finished. He has not been removed, but his utility, his survival in the Presidency, is very short. What he'll do when he leaves the Presidency I don't know, and I don't care much. I just want him out of there. Because there's no chance for the United States, as long as he is President.

Like you get the *New York Times* today, the *Saturday Times* has a lead on the left-hand column, talking about the recovery. What recovery? What've we got, zombies? Maybe creatures from the Black Lagoon have come out and volunteered for employment? No, the whole the thing is lie.

Well, the *New York Times* does lie. I had a lot of experience with the *New York Times*, back in the 1970s and 1980s, and they used to lie about me rather regularly. When it was announced that I was running for President, for the Democratic nomination, in 1979, they did a full spread, front-page spread: "Stop this man! He's a menace to our existence." Well, in fact, I probably was a menace to their existence. I'm just trying to help the United States, I didn't care much about the *New York Times* at that time, had enough of the *New York Times* They lie all the time! If they didn't lie, how could they sleep?

But in any case, as long as this man controls the United States, there's no chance of the United States continuing to exist, or much of anything.

But go back to this map again, and look at it from this standpoint. Now, I've designated three characteristic areas, that is *types of policy direction*: One is in Asia. Asia is going for heavy, accelerated investment, in nuclear and related power, both the standard uranium reactor, plutonium reactors, thorium reactors, and derivatives of this sort of thing, including the fast-breeder reactors. There's an acceleration of high-energy-flux-density power throughout the world.

Now, the opposite group, the really hard-core green group, has repudiated *all high technology*, for their population. They're going to windmills for power, windmills and solar collectors. Which is the doctrine of idiots, as I shall explain.

Then you have an in-between area, the brown area, in which the situation, in terms of present policy and trends, is a hopeless one.

In other words, Western Europe, from about west of the border of Belarus, is presently doomed! And the doom is coming down today! For example, the key thing is the European Union. Now the European Union is a colony of the British Empire. That is, every nation which is part of the continental European Union, is a puppet and merely a colony of the British Empire, of the British system. There's no freedom there, no sovereignty there!

Of these nations, none of which is sovereign on the continent of Europe, you have four nations which are called "PIGS": PIGS means Portugal, Ireland, Greece, and Spain! These are four nations, which under the present condition, can not continue to survive as viable economies. They can not continue to exist as viable economies, because of the European Union, and the loss of sovereignty, and relative changes in Europe since then. Right now, today and

tomorrow and the day after, there's a great crisis, because the fear is, or the realization of what you should be fearful of, is that this crisis of these nations—a group of nations, called the "PIGS"! Openly called the "PIGS"?! Portugal, Ireland, Greece, and Spain are called the PIGS! And there's real *Schadenfroh* as they say in Germany. And the collapse of the PIGS, to keep that from spreading as a general collapse of *all* of Western Europe, in a chain-reaction collapse, is the concern. And the question is, who's going to bail out and pay for the debts, of nations which *can not* pay these debts, which they call the PIGS? And that's the crisis right now. And that's what you get in the green area of Europe.

In South America and the United States, you get two areas: The green area is the area where the drug trafficking has taken over the economies. The brown area is a mixture of red and green: some elements of progress, and a lot of elements of degeneration. **The United States is a brown area; the United States and Canada is a brown area! Especially under Obama!** There are some elements of progress, still in policymaking, as long as Obama has not succeeded in removing them all! But also the green policy, the anti-nuclear policy, the windmill policy, the solar collector policy, is clinical insanity! And that's the policy of the United States. The space program is just about to be eliminated, by Obama. They talk about private space ventures, that's nonsense. You can not have a private space program; it's not possible!

**So the United States is being headed for the junk pile, as long as people like Obama are controlling the policy. Western and Central continental Europe is a junk pile. The British Isles, which sits on that, is a parasite. And parasites don't live long when their food supply is eaten up, which is Western continental Europe.**

You have parts of South America which still have some elements of progress in them, as Brazil, Argentina, and so forth. Colombia is still fighting against drugs. But you find the green area in South America is largely areas of drug trafficking; nations such as Venezuela which are promoters of drug trafficking are green otherwise. That's our problem.

In Asia, you have the possibility, provided the United States joins in this possibility—which means, really, eliminating the Presidency of Obama. **The United States will not continue to exist unless Obama is replaced.** Now, it's not much of a problem, really, practically. It just takes the guts to do what most Americans would like to see done.

### **Mass Strike in the U.S.A.**

**See, Americans don't hate Obama very much: They *despise* him. Because they don't think he's really responsible. They're willing to accept the fact that they've got a President who is a pig, or whatever Obama really is; they're willing to admit that. But what they hate—you know, you hate the member of your family who's gone against you, more than you hate the outsider. Obama, for the American population generally, is an outsider. He can't betray you, because he never was part of you. The hatred of the American citizen, by and large, is *directed against the members of Congress, who support Obama!* You saw that clearly in the Massachusetts vote, recently, on the replacement of the deceased Senator Kennedy. The hatred of the people out there is against the members of Congress who support Obama. They hate what they consider their friends, their**

representatives, who have *betrayed them* to the enemy, to the outsider Obama!

This process has taken the form of a mass strike, which became clear in August of last year. People came out, at these town hall meetings, so-called, they came out in masses, and they said to the members of Congress, "Shut up! We want to tell you something, you stupid jerk! You betrayed us! You're supporting policies that would kill us! We don't like you any more! But we want you do the right thing, for a change." And then, afterward, people in Congress and so forth, said, "Oh, that's over! We just won't talk to our constituencies any more. They're not behaving nicely, we're just not going to talk to them, we're not going to listen to them. We're going to listen to our friend—Obama!" Huh? And they think that they solved the problem of their unpopularity?

It has been obvious that the unpopularity of Obama has not only increased since that time, since August of last year, but that it has changed its character. The people are no longer thinking of screaming at the guys who are supposed to represent them, and saying, "Now, do the right thing." They're saying, "We want you out!" They want the elected members of Congress to disappear! Especially, the Democratic members of the Congress, they want them gone! And they're beginning to think about, maybe *they* should do something about selecting, immediately, replacements for both the policies, and the personalities of the members of the Congress. They look at the members of the Congress as either criminals, or stinking cowards—weaklings, foolish weaklings. They hate them! And you see that they're dropping like flies. They still are voting for Obama on this and that piece of legislation, but the people out there, hate them.

And this process, is a process which was described by a famous lady in her time, from the 1890s on: Rosa Luxemburg. She was the daughter of a famous organizer of an organization called the Bund, which was a cultural movement, a political, trade union, and cultural movement, in places like Lithuania, spilling into Russia, Poland, and elsewhere, and spilled into Germany. And she became the leader. She was otherwise, an absolutely brilliant economist, one of the most brilliant economists of her time. And she did an analysis—she used to regularly ridicule the German Social Democracy: They would say, "Yes, we can have a mass strike—when we decide to call it! Then the people will turn out, as we order them, and they'll come out and they'll march in the streets, and we'll call that a 'mass strike!'" She said, "No. A mass strike is not like that."

A mass strike is what has been happening in the United States, visibly, since August of this past year. The American people sense they're being betrayed. The tipoff is, they don't express this in the form of rage against Obama, because they have *contempt* for Obama, whom they don't think is one of our people. They don't think of him as an American. There's a tendency to think he must have been born someplace else. "He couldn't have been born as an American"—there's the desire to believe that, on the part of many Americans. They consider him a stranger; it's like a fruitcake walked in—you know, a fruitcake with legs. And all pits, and no raisins! So they don't view him as theirs. They don't view him as an American. They don't like him. They thought that, somehow, because he was not Bush, that was a good thing. But actually he was worse than Bush. And that's why the Republicans are having a good time; they say, "Well, yes, Bush was terrible, but not as bad as Obama!"

So, he's not a factor. What you're getting is not a mass strike against a Bush or a Cheney. Bush and Cheney were hated, for good reason; Cheney especially so, very good reason. It was personal, a *personal hatred of them* by the American people, those that had the guts to express that hatred. In the case of Obama, it's different: Obama's a mass-strike process, in which the people are reacting against a sense of betrayal of them, by those whom they elected to represent them as their friends. And when you go through that, there's a reluctance, at the first step, the people react in that way—they don't know quite what to do. They're clear on the fact that they're being robbed, abused. Everything they think valuable is being taken from them—they're aware of that. Their immediate reaction is to blame those whom they designated—it's like you're going into court to sue somebody, and you find out the lawyer's working for the other side? You don't hate the other party's legal team, you hate the lawyer who's betraying you. And that's what's happening out there. That's what happened in Massachusetts.

Somebody tried to say, "Coakley made a mistake." Coakley made a mistake by being a Democrat at that time! And she had not been elected previously—in that way. So therefore, she was irrelevant to the outcome in Massachusetts. The voters wanted to punish the people who had betrayed them: the Democratic elected machine. That should have been the warning! Of a mass strike.

What's the next step? We have to not only remove these guys. Maybe we should remove the President, remove him, replace him? Get him impeached somehow, get him to quit.

So it's that kind of lawful process; it's not some mechanical thing that can be manipulated. When people know they've been betrayed, they know they've been betrayed. And they go through various steps of, "We voted for this guy, what're we going to do, kill him? We want to lynch him? Or, do you want to give him a warning—change his ways?" He's betrayed you. Then you get more angry. Then you begin think about what you're going to do about this: What're you going to do? They're not sure, but they're moving in that direction.

And what's driving them wild, is the lies that're coming out of Obama. But what enrages them most, is the lies coming out people they voted for as their representatives. *They're still not quite sure, what to do.*

### **Get Rid of Obama, and Then ...**

Now, is our challenge to try to encourage them to move toward what they should do? In a way, yes, but that's not going to be a solution. We have to be capable of organizing the measures needed to change this. We must have Obama removed from the Presidency. We don't have to remove everybody in the Presidential team; we just simply take out Obama, and those people who are prototypes, the so-called behaviorists. We have to get rid of Bernanke. We have to get rid of Geithner. You have to get rid of all these people of the team—you have to get Rahm Emanuel out of there, get his brother out of medicine before he kills more people, and so forth. You have to take that particular element, inside the Presidential institutions, and *get rid of them. Go! Scat!*

And then you will find, that, in the institutions of the Presidency, including part of the permanent bureaucracy, which is very important,

and other elements of it, you have people who are perfectly capable of doing the right job, and under the right leadership will do the right job. They may need some guidance on that, but the institutional potential, within the institution of the Presidency, and its extension into the House of Representatives and Senate, especially the House of Representatives, is capable of assuming the responsibilities for a recovery program, and other remedies.

### **What Does the Planet Need?**

But there's something else that's even more crucial: There is not enough—again, this map—there's not enough in the red area. Red means nuclear power, high-intensity power; it's the only thing that'll work, and I'll get back to that later—but at this point, there's not enough power there, politically, to make the changes in the planetary policy which are required. What we have to do, essentially is, we have to go back to an understanding of what productivity is. And productivity is essentially physical, but physical doesn't mean just physical, in the sense of muscle, or such: It also means in brains, in the way we think, in the organization of scientific research, development of technology, these kinds of things, which are the source of the increase of productive powers of labor per capita and per square kilometer.

Now, they're committed to that: China is committed to that, India is committed to that; China, India, and Russia, are moving very close together, with nations there, such as Japan, South Korea, nations of South Asia, and so forth. And this is a great part of the human population. They have understood that, despite, as in the case of continental Asia, as in India, where about 70% of the population is not very productive, because they don't have the skills, they don't have the resources to be productive. In China, you have about 80% of the population that is not particularly productive. Mongolia has potential, north of China, a very important potential, but it hasn't yet received development. Northern Siberia—Russia, that is—has tremendous resources, tremendous natural resources, and it also has a tradition, a Russian tradition which goes back to the 18th Century, to Peter the Great, in terms of technology; it also has, in its territory, vast natural resources, such as mineral resources of great importance for civilization, vis-à-vis a very poor level of natural resources developed in the southern area of Asia, as in Africa. Africa has vast resources, especially in the Southern Shield, in terms of mineral resources, but the development of that is, you just ship the resources out of Africa as fast as possible—don't let the people of Africa have anything to do with that, except producing this stuff.

And so, in this red area, what you're seeing is the application of nuclear power and related aspects of power and technology, high-energy-flux-density power, taking the mineral resources of the Eurasian continent, and also the mineral resources of the southern part of the African continent, where you have many poor people who don't have much in the way of productivity, in terms of their labor. *But!* But, at the same time, if we apply tremendous amounts of high-energy-flux-density power, and the technology to use it, to these populations which are very poor, in their technology and skills and so forth, we can make them, effectively, reach new leaps upward, in their productive power.

For example, simple things: water, potable water, adequate supplies

of potable water—crucial problem; sanitation—crucial problem. For example, in India, you have now a threefold nuclear power policy, and the investment in nuclear reactors is accelerating, while they're shutting down in Western Europe, and they're shutting down in most parts of the Americas, including the United States. We're being destroyed, by our own hand: That green area—and green, *as in death, as in mass death!* As in calling four nations of Europe, "PIGS."

So therefore, what we do, is we make clean water. We build water systems, for clean, safe water. We introduce power as a factor in sanitation and productivity. We introduce power, for reduction, in order to convert materials which are of marginal quality, into high quality. And thus, you take people who are, by culture and education, still deprived, but by bringing in the effect of the changes in the environment, to a nuclear power environment, to a high-technology environment, you take people who still remain limited in their skills, but you give them a *factor* of increased productivity, per capita and per square kilometer. In that way, you launch progress.

### **The American System**

Now, this has happened before, in U.S. history and elsewhere: For example, in Massachusetts, up until about 1688, you had significant progress in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. It was the first part of the world to develop a *credit system!* A workable credit system! One of the first iron works was in Saugus, Massachusetts, just north of Boston, and it was based on a credit system.

So, Europeans who were failing in Europe, moved over into Massachusetts, as a part of getting away from the problems of England; and you find that this people, with a high level of culture among its leadership, was able to pioneer important advances in technology and the conditions of life at that time. And even though we were defeated, back then, by the effect of James II and William of Orange, and subsequent things, nonetheless, the legacy of what was done in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in the 17th Century, provided the foundations, combined with the ideas of Leibniz important to this process, to create what became later, the United States.

We still have that legacy embedded within us, or the benefits of that, which include later things, like the banking system, the idea of National Banking. The developments by John Quincy Adams, while Secretary of State, in particular; or the Lincoln revolution, the great railway development, the transcontinental railway. The development toward Asia, across the Pacific, after doing this and so forth. We still have the legacy of what started, from Europe, by people leaving Europe, to start places such as Massachusetts, in the 17th Century, to build the United States as a unique conception on this planet. There's been nothing ever done, to equal the importance of the creation of the United States in this process. It's a cultural legacy which we have, which we can revive within us, again, and Europe does not have that. In Europe, there's too much softness on oligarchs—Sir This, Baron This, and so forth—that kind of nonsense. We don't think like that: We think like citizens, not like underlings for some oligarchy! And that's in our nature.

I mean, for example, apart from the stinking government we've had recently, we take people from South America, who are very poor, and

we know, from the poor performance we've had in bringing these people up in their standard of living and productivity, that if we had a real policy, a *real* American policy of the type we've not really had, since Kennedy or since Roosevelt, that we would increase the rate of improvement of the productive powers and conditions of life, of these immigrants coming in from the Spanish-speaking area to our south. It's obvious. We find that also in other populations. Our tradition is to absorb people from other parts of the world, and to create an environment in which they, in one or two or three generations, can raise the cultural level and performance of these people to a level which is *in our tradition*. Because to us, people are people. We don't believe in classes. We believe people should develop and find their way up, and find a meaningful existence in their life while they're on the way up.

And you don't have that in the same way in Europe. You have people in Europe who like that idea, who go in that direction. But again, and again, and again, and again, this *affection for the disgusting British royal family*, disgusting European oligarchs—Count This, Sir That, Duke of This—it's awful! It's disgusting! It's *un-American!*

But nonetheless, we have demonstrated the potential of doing that, better than any other culture on this planet. We are, after all, essentially a European culture, a culture which came from Europe to get away from what remains in Europe, still today, to get away from the oligarchical tradition. And we were very good at it, when we were allowed to. We saw our last good touch of that, in the case of Franklin Roosevelt's Administration, that kind of uplifting of a population.

### **The Enemy Is the British Empire**

Now, that's recognized, and it's recognized by the British Empire. And don't talk about the British as being this, or not being that. The only basis for the British power in the world is the British Empire: *It is an empire!* It's an empire based on a system of money, and all European empires since the fall of the Persian Empire, *have been empires, based on monetarism, on a money system.* For example, *free trade: Sell your neighbor. Sell him into slavery. Free trade.*

The argument is, that no government should have the authority to create and regulate the value of a currency. That's free trade! Well, then, if the government is not allowed to regulate the value of a currency, *who is?!* You say, "bankers," like Venetian bankers! International bankers. Wall Street! Wall Street's a part of the British Empire! It's not American, it's a disease that has infected us, it's called Wall Street! We should have wiped them all out. If we'd done the right thing, back in 2007, we'd have taken my policy, my legislative draft, the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act. We would have had no foreclosures, we'd have sorted the thing out, we'd have frozen things that had to be frozen, and we'd sort it out at leisure. We'd keep the people in their homes, the communities stable.

We'd also protect the banks which met a Glass-Steagall standard. The Wall Street banks? We don't need them! They're parasites! They're leeches! But, with what's happened, we have allowed ourselves to be leeches, by treason by our Presidents! By George W. Bush, who was effectively a *traitor* to the United States, in this respect. He wasn't smart enough to figure out how to do it, but he supported the people who did. Then we got Obama, who also is not

intelligent enough to know what he's doing, but also he works for the British Empire. And what's happening now is, we have, as we saw with the recent reports from Britain and here: The policy is, no longer, "Will there be sovereign nation-states?" There will be a world, a global system. Who will run the global system? The intention is, **the bankers, centered in London, will run the global system, in exactly the way they're running the European Union.** The continental European states, who are associated with the European Union, now, *have no sovereignty*. They have no right to generate credit, with which to improve and maintain their economy. There is no remedy for the situation of the countries which the British now call "PIGS," Portugal, Ireland, Greece, and Spain. These four countries are now in danger of being crushed and looted, if we allow it to happen. That's what's happening.

**And that is exactly what the Obama Administration intends to do to the people of the United States, now!** And therefore, the average American, out there, doesn't really hate Obama: He *despises* him! Especially the African American; the African American reaction to Obama today is characteristic: They despise him, because he *does* pass himself off as black, and since he's a traitor, and they're blamed for him, they hate him more than anybody! And they say so! Because **he's an enemy, he's a traitor.** And they expected great things from him. And they feel, more than any other part of the society, they feel that he, personally, is a traitor. You get some reaction like that among Hispanics, the same thing, Hispanic background.

So therefore, the problem here is of that nature: We no longer have sovereignty on this planet. The British say so, the European Union says so, the implementation of their policies now, which is the present crisis breaking out in Europe right now—it's a social crisis, it's a political crisis—and what's breaking out in the United States, is that.

We say, we have to save the international *monetary* system. The international monetary system *is* the empire. **The British Empire is not an empire of the people of England, or the United Kingdom. The British Empire is an assembly around the British monarchy, of a system of international control of monetary affairs.** It's a real empire! You have to let free trade work. You have to let environmentalism work. **And what's been the policy of the British monarchy, what's Prince Philip's policy? To reduce the world's population to less than 2 billion, from presently 6.7 billion. How does he propose to do that? Well, you see the President's health-care policy: That's a policy of intentional genocide. It's a direct copy of the policy that Adolf Hitler put into effect, beginning September-October [1939] at the beginning of World War II.**

This was what we talk about when we talk about the 6 million, and that was only part of the total number of dead [in the Holocaust]. That's what you're talking about! You're talking about the British. And the Obama Administration, with a health-care policy and their social policy, are doing exactly the same thing as Adolf Hitler—but on a grander scale! **And some people say, "Well, maybe Obama's a good man." Good for what? Kindling?**

So that's our problem.

## **A Four-Power Alliance**

Now, look at the map again, from this standpoint. What have I proposed we do? Take this red area there: I say, that's good. The problem is, there's something missing. Now, look over in North America, at the United States. We have the tradition, the economic tradition, of Hamilton and others, to know what to do with this world. If the United States, as a powerful nation-state, joins with Russia, China, and India, and adjoining countries, on the basis of a global agreement on high-technology development of the entire planet, through long-term credit agreements among these nations, to rebuild this world as a whole, we have enough power—the United States, Russia, China, and India, and their partners—have enough power *to crush the British Empire out of existence*. Also, in doing that, we would do a general reorganization of the currency, to eliminate all monetary systems, and replace them with a credit system of the type prescribed by Alexander Hamilton.

We would reorganize the U.S. banking system, on the basis of a strict Glass-Steagall standard, but we would take the Federal Reserve System, which is no damn good—and instead of just getting rid of Bernanke, we would keep Bernanke in the Federal Reserve System, but sink *that!* And then send all the valuable assets, and people who are valuable inside the Federal Reserve System—that is, executives who perform a function, and are capable—and we put them under a resurrection of the American National Bank, which was started by Hamilton. It would be the Third National Bank.

We would take all these assets which are in reorganization, we'd go through a Glass-Steagall purge *of everything in banking*—legitimate, commercial banking and the auxiliaries of commercial banking of that type, such as savings banks and whatnot, would be protected, even if they're in bankruptcy. We'll protect them, because we need those doors open, and we need those banks functioning. Why? Because we need to create a mass of credit, Federal credit, through the Congress, by getting rid of this false debt, a mass of credit for investment in large-scale projects, such as a national railway system, national water systems, things of that sort, which will be the drivers of the resurrection of actual industries which have now become almost extinct.

### **FDR's Approach: Civilian Conservation Corps**

Look, for example, let's take the poor population of the United States, from this standpoint. **In the poor, so-called black population, we have an impossible situation: utter lack of skill!** They live in social conditions, where they can not be organized to be trained as skilled people, because their social culture is not one of productivity. They have been **cast out of that!** **We have a large section of the Spanish-speaking population of the United States—youth—in a similar condition. You can not open up jobs for these guys, on an ordinary basis! And have them show up for work, on their own volition, each day? You'll get nothing out of them.**

We have to do what we did in the 1930s, under Roosevelt, with the CCCs. We have to take these young people, and put them into camps where they will be fed, cleaned, and educated, and given access to work. We're going to have to have qualified people, working in these areas with these guys, and finding out what they're good for—what can they do? What can they learn? What are they capable of accomplishing? As we did with the CCCs!

So you're going to sort them, then. Those who are prepared to become functioning, productive people in society, we will have to connect them to job opportunities, and give them some backing for their continued development. Those who are not so qualified, we'll have to do more in the direction of socializing them. We've done it before; it was done with immigrant populations who came here as refugees from poverty in Europe. We're going to have to do it again. So, we need a program, because we're going to have to rebuild—we had never finished our water system. Our Western water system was never developed. We have allowed our river systems and water systems to decay.

Look, go back, say, to the 1960s. At how many urban locations in the United States, could you drink the water from a faucet, without taking a life risk? Where do you get a drink of water today? From a faucet? Not generally, not from a public faucet. We don't have a safe water system! We've lost it! Over the past 40 years, we've lost it. We don't have a reliable mass-transportation system. Highways? You've got people driving to work an hour and a half, two hours, each way, each day, five days a week at least—and maybe working a few more jobs. What kind of family life do you have? If you have to spend up to four hours a day on commuting, and more, what kind of a family life do you have? What kind of a relationship do you have with your children? What kind of a community relationship do you have? Things we used to take for granted—we don't.

So therefore, very simply, we have to go back to the idea of becoming a high-technology nation again, and start with what we have, save what's valuable that we have; take a few large projects, such as a national and international mass-transit system. We don't want all these cars on the highway, because the cars are killing people. Why? Not just by the accidents, or by the run-downs. The cars are killing people, because people are spending up to four hours a day, five days a week or more, commuting. And if they have children, what kind of life do the children have? There is no normal family life. There is no normal community life, among families. Or it's very impaired, very limited. There's no cultural perspective, of the type we used to have, in organizing communities. It's chaotic. So we have to start with the social process, of taking the things that we really need, which are water systems, power systems, mass transit systems which are rail-based or similar, and use these large-scale building projects as the places of employment of developing a high-technology, high-skill labor force, again.

That will take a couple of generations. But you'll be on the way up, not on the way down. And at the start, as Roosevelt did, we can have a very sharp impact, simply by changing to do some things we should be doing anyway. So, we need a commitment by our government to do that.

## **Nuclear Power and Space Exploration**

Now, we also have a great opportunity, in terms of increasing cooperation among nation-states; especially, take the case of Asia. By increasing our trade relations, and development relations, between, say, North America and Asia, in that way, you are opening up possibilities for exploiting, or developing, our potential, and theirs, as well.

For example, let's take the case of nuclear power. I won't go through that today, but it's a big process—nuclear power and related power programs, really, are the future of the United States and the world. The surge in Russia, China, and India, and other Asian nations in particular, for nuclear power, *is beyond anything you ever imagined before.*

We are now at a breakthrough with the first stages of getting into thermonuclear fusion, including the laser-driven nuclear fusion. We're already getting there! We're going through the greatest leap in potential, in that area, in all of modern history—under these terrible conditions.

One of the things that's interesting, is when the first American astronauts landed on the Moon, they found traces of a particular mineral, an isotope of helium, called helium-3. Now, from further follow-up on that discovery, which was a surprise at the time, when the discovery was made, the fact is, that the helium-3 which is deposited on the Moon in large quantities, relatively speaking, comes from the Sun. The Sun is a nuclear furnace, a thermonuclear furnace, and the Sun generates a large mass of isotopes of various types, including helium-3. So the helium-3 which is radiated from the Sun, throughout the Solar System, lands on various planets and moons in the system, with a fair concentration on the inner planets. Now helium-3 is the most effective, most efficient of all the items for thermonuclear power. And thermonuclear fusion power is several orders of magnitude more powerful than any nuclear power.

Therefore, it means we're making a leap in the amount of power available, per capita and per square kilometer, for the territory in the Earth, in the Moon, and so forth.

For example: If you want to have travel to Mars, from Earth orbit to Mars, you would actually go from the Moon. First, you go up to the Moon, and you build up an industry on the Moon, largely automated industry. You take the raw materials on the Moon, because it costs a great deal to move heavy raw materials in large quantities, or otherwise, up to the Moon. The first thing you do, is build a manufacturing facility on the Moon, which utilizes the raw materials on the Moon itself to develop the elements of materials and devices that you can ship to further destinations, such as Mars.

Now, theoretically, with helium-3 as a fuel, you are approaching the possibility of a rate of acceleration—acceleration *of* acceleration—of an impulse toward Mars, which we have estimated as about three days, from Moon orbit to Mars. That doesn't mean we can do that, exactly; it means that we have a mode of power which enables us to do that. And without it—we can send things to Mars now, if we're willing to wait 300 days or longer for the arrival of that package from the Moon to Mars. But if you want to send a person there, 300 days in a spacecraft between here and Mars, is not recommended for the health of anybody. Their bones would sort of disappear, and if they were alive at all, they might end up there as a blob, and they probably would have some difficulty in making the return trip, if it were possible! So there are problems we have to solve in this connection. But we couldn't do anything better than that, under a nuclear-impulse-engine kind of thing—we'd have to have a fuel tank much bigger than the whole object you're pushing! Not a very practical idea.

So therefore, with the access to a thermonuclear fusion approach to the power base of action in the universe, we're going through a completely different dimension, which we should reach some time during the latter part of this present century, where we will actually have some form of human colonization associated with Mars. And beyond that, there is no visible limit to what mankind might be able to do, after overcoming this particular first hurdle.

So we're moving in that kind of direction, and you're seeing that in what's happening in Asia. If you look at the nuclear power development, in Asia, in Siberia, you look at the vast railway development. Now, the railway development in China is extremely important. The railway development in northern Siberia, in Russia, is important; in Mongolia, it's significant. You have great talent in South Korea; you have significant relative talent in Japan. And we have the potentiality in our culture, in the United States, to participate with them, in joint international, technological projects, which will change, very rapidly, within one or two decades; it will make a revolution in the conditions of life in the United States, and can save Europe from itself at present, and save other parts of the world.

### **Nation-States, Not Imperial Methods**

We can only do this, of course, with sovereign nation-states. You can not do it with globalization! Because the creative powers of the individual, which we require for this purpose, are a function, not of mathematics, but of Classical artistic composition. That is, the way the human mind creates—it does not create things through mathematical inventions. It creates things, through discovering physical principles, principles of nature, such as Kepler's discovery of gravitation, which was a discovery not made by mathematics; it was made by a quite different method, of the creative imagination. We have no artistic development in the United States, today, no competent Classical artistic development. Therefore, we're very low in our quality of creativity. That's one of the things we're going to fix: We're going to have to fix the system to have more emphasis on human creativity, *real* creativity, artistic creativity, which is where the spark for actual scientific discovery comes from. So, we can move in that direction.

The contrast, on the other side: The way we're going now, if the United States does not join with Russia, China, and India, and other nations, there's not much chance for this planet. Because, with the lesser combination, without the United States, while Russia, China, and India will do good things, what they could do is not big enough. It's not a big enough part of the planet to do the job that's required. So the United States must *junk everything*, which gets in the way, of practical cooperation with Russia, China, and India; and other nations will automatically come along with that, such as South Korea, such as Japan, such as nations in South Asia.

And we have to get rid of this idea, that we've got to find the enemy and go out and kill the enemy, like, you know, the Vietnam War? Who lost that war? Almost everybody, but especially the United States: We almost lost the United States in continuing the war from the end of 1965, until 1975. Ten years in Southeast Asia, we almost lost the United States. We did lose it culturally in that period. How did we lose it? Kennedy was assassinated.

Why was Kennedy assassinated? Well, there were two things about

Kennedy they didn't like. I don't think the Kennedy family has talked about that too much, today, and I can sympathize somewhat with that. But John F. Kennedy, whatever faults he may have had otherwise, decided that his Presidency, his Presidential campaign, was going to be based on the return to the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt. The first crucial manifestation of his action in that direction was in pulling down the steel barons.

Now, what was at stake there, was not simply the question of who's going to control this or that price. The point is, the steel industry, the Wall Street aspect of steel industry, was about to shut down the U.S. steel industry! Why were they going to do that? **Because of a British policy! A British-directed Wall Street policy! To defang the United States, by getting the United States to *abandon* its steel and related industries, its heavy industries, in order to rely upon cheap labor from other parts of the world, and take away the power of the United States to develop an advanced technology, and to destroy the labor force capability which we had. Kennedy won that fight. That could have gotten him killed, by Wall Street and London.**

But something else got him killed: He decided, on the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and I believe the cooperation with Dwight Eisenhower, that the United States would not engage itself in a long war in Indo-China. The British were determined to have that war, that the United States should fight that war. Somebody killed Kennedy, and then we had that war. Which killed us.

**The British have always destroyed us, by a method known to imperialism generally, before the British. The way for an empire to destroy nations, which they don't like or which they think are getting in their way, is to get these nations to fight each other!** Now, the British may participate directly, or not, in these wars they organize, such as 1763 Peace of Paris, which was a result of a Seven Years War, and that was the beginning of the British Empire: the Peace of Paris.

**Since that time, the British have repeatedly destroyed the nations of Europe, by getting them engaged in mutual warfare! Napoleon was actually a British agent, whether he knew it or not, because Napoleon organized the wars in Europe, the so-called Napoleonic Wars, which ruined Europe, and consolidated the British Empire! Bismarck referred to this: World War I. The war against China: The British organized Japan, for a war against China, which was launched in 1894, and continued to 1945—including an attack on the United States and a war with Russia in the meantime!**

**The way the British Empire, like other empires in the European tradition, have controlled the world as empires, is to get other nations to kill each other!** And the British would sometimes involve themselves directly in fighting some of these wars, in order to make the wars happen—or not! But most of the wars we have—somebody says: "This is the enemy," like Iraq! "We've got to destroy Iraq, it's a threat to us." So what did we do to ourselves in Iraq? We ruined ourselves in Iraq! We ruined our military capabilities. What are we doing in Afghanistan? Who insists upon it? The British? And the facts of that matter are McChrystal clear: We shouldn't be there. Our concern is to isolate the Afghanistan problem, and protect Pakistan from destabilization, because the disruption of Pakistan would trigger a problem for India. And we can not *have* that problem. We have to have peace.

We don't want conflict! Some people say, "Well, Russia is our enemy!" What are they talking about? Why do you want to fight a war with someone who's willing to cooperate with you? Who may be displeased with you, because you insulted them too many times? But that's all right, you can fix that! We've got to establish the rules of cooperation among sovereign nation-states which are needed for this planet, for its development. And we can not allow ourselves to be sucked into wars among groups of people who shouldn't be shooting at each other at all! But somebody has whipped up the idea that "this is our natural enemy" at the time: "We've got to fight this enemy, we've got to have nuclear weapons against this enemy," or something of that sort. And that's how we're defeated.

We have to understand that the existence of the United States, as a nation, depends upon cooperation of *that type* with Russia, China, India, and other countries! It means that we want to *free* continental Europe from British slavery, called the European Union. We want those nations to get out of the green category, and back into the red category of nuclear power, railways, high technology.

### **The U.S. Institution of the Presidency**

That's what we must do! We can do it, there are people in the United States' system, outside the government, but they're part of the system; they're part, essentially, of the Presidential system; they're people who participate in the role of the Presidency, whether as private citizens in some capacity, or otherwise, in diplomacy, or otherwise. Some of the most important diplomacy on behalf of the United States, is done by private citizens! Especially private citizens of special influence, who, because that's their commitment, go out there and conduct what amounts to diplomacy, on behalf of the United States and the nations with whom they negotiate. And it's through such channels, that the United States is often able to get things.

I've been involved in that kind of work, personally, to some significant degree. I tried to avoid a nuclear war, between the United States and the Soviet Union. It was a famous case. At the time when I did that, there were certain people who were high ranking, people who had been in the intelligence service, the OSS, during World War II. And while I was not part of that intelligence group, I was in political affinity with these people, and we came together in the course of the 1980s, and I made a proposal. And they jumped on it. And they said—one of them, Casey, became the head of the CIA, and when I proposed what became known as the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative], he was favorable to it. And I negotiated as a private citizen, I negotiated with leading military officers in Germany, leading military officers in France, in Italy, and elsewhere. I met with representatives of the Soviet government. We put together what became known, named on Reagan's behalf, as SDI. And if that had happened, most of the Hell that had happened since, would not have happened.

Unfortunately, Yuri Andropov, who came in as the Soviet leader, was a nut! And Gorbachov was a worse nut. And you see what happened to the Soviet Union and Russia, as a result of their nuttiness! If Andropov had not rejected my proposal, after Reagan had defended it publicly, and followed up, we would have never had the mess we've had in the United States, or that Russia has experienced since then! We would have achieved cooperation which was understood by the proper people on both sides.

Let's get rid of this Cold War! Let's get rid of these threats of nuclear warfare! Let's get nations involved in this thing. Let's stop these long wars, for which there's no reason!

So, we were defeated. We were defeated largely, because, on the Soviet side, Andropov and Gorbachov, typified people who made absolute fools of themselves, and led to great suffering of their nation, as we have seen since 1989, in particular, as a direct result of their rejecting what I and others from the United States, and some people in Russia, supported, then!

So, citizens don't act simply on the basis of becoming Secretary of State or something like that, in these matters. Citizens, in the American tradition, think in those terms, and present and develop ideas which are needed by governments, to solve some of these problems. Without the voluntary role of citizens who are concerned with the future of this nation, the future of mankind, *good things tend not to happen!* It's when you build a constituency, even a small one, demonstrating the feasibility of an achievement, as we did demonstrate it up until then, 1983, it was very clear: I was *right*, I got support, I got support from leading groups in various nations, including some in the Soviet Union itself. You had for example, the famous physicist [Edward Teller], out in Erice, the meeting there—talking about "the common aims of mankind," and they were among my supporters in this. The feasibility of using nuclear cooperation, not only to produce weapons which can nullify terror weapons, but more particularly, developing the industries, and agreement on cooperation on technology, by which nations, through cooperation, can achieve a *defense of their right of sovereignty*, not give up their sovereignty, but *defend* their right to sovereignty, promote their right for sovereignty, and build up the moral strength of their own people in each case. And the moral strength which is fostered in that manner is what we need.

### The Common Aims of Mankind

But we need to recognize, at the same time, to return to this map again—we have to recognize, that what this map shows, is first of all, the Atlantic Ocean is no longer the bridge of progress. The destruction of the sovereignty of Western continental Europe by British intervention, has meant the *end*, for the time being, of the role of Western Europe and the relationship to the United States, in the future of humanity. The destiny of mankind today now lies across the Pacific Ocean, in the tradition set by John Quincy Adams when he was Secretary of State: to move the United States into a position of being a *solid nation*, between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and the Canadian and Mexican borders; to develop this territory, through the development of water systems and national, transcontinental railway systems; and to *move across the Pacific*, to engage the people of Asia, in cooperation. We can do that again, today, take that course, again, today.

And that's what we have to do: We have to *bring the United States across the Pacific*, to the nations of Asia—forget the Atlantic; the Atlantic is a problem area, now—but across the Pacific, to Asia, to Siberia, to China, to South Korea, to Japan, to India, and so forth, and to the Indian Ocean coast of Africa. We have to do that. Once we do that, *then* we can move! We can build an international network of high-speed rail magnetic levitation systems, which will connect most of the continents of this planet, except for Australia, will be connected

directly by rail systems. And that is the way in which John Quincy Adams, and his followers in the American tradition, wanted to go.

So bring these nations together around the technology of nuclear and thermonuclear fusion; develop the cooperation for recovery of the planet in this way. And in that process, go back to what rails really mean: *a higher technology of transportation, of inland transportation, which unites all the principal continents of the planet! And leads to their full development, but as sovereign nation-states on this planet!* Because, the ability of the powers of imagination, to produce scientific creativity, lies in Classical culture. Classical culture is embedded, traditionally, as a sort of hereditary principle, in the language-culture of a people. The unity of a nation lies essentially in the language-culture of the people, through which they are able to transmit *creative interactions*, which they can not do, except in a cultivated form of language. Therefore, we must *unite the cultures of the planet, as national sovereign cultures, toward "common aims of mankind."* That's our mission.

We have to eliminate the idea that we have "natural enemies" among nations. There are some nations which act like natural enemies, but we don't believe in that, as a system. That's not the way to organize the planet! Our job is to bring nations together, for common aims of mankind, among respectively *sovereign nation-states*, not some globalized system. And the *common aims of mankind*, become the vehicle by which we share ideas, and share intentions and practical intentions, for the development of mankind.

*We don't need globalization: We don't want globalization!*

Globalization is what you do, when you send somebody to float in space for one year, and all their bone tissue breaks down—then you have globalization. And I'm not advocating it!

Thank you.

[Question-and-Answer Session]