

The U.S.A.-China Strategic Partnership

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 24, Number 44, October 31, 1997. View [original PDF](#) and [video](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

*The following speech was delivered at an **EIR** seminar on October 22, in Washington, D.C. Subheads have been added.*

What I shall do today, is present the evolution of the policy, which is presented to us by the coming visit of the President of China: the history of it, as I was personally involved in developing that policy over a long period of time, partly as a personal effort, and later, as an effort which began to make some impact on the shaping of the policies of the world during the course of the 1980s.

The one thing that has to be said, to put this in perspective: This is not a U.S.-China policy. This is a policy for the survival and recovery of the world. This civilization, in its present form, if it continues in this form, is doomed. We are headed, under present policies, world policies, world trends: We're headed toward a collapse of civilization, to occur, probably, by the end of this century. The Black Monday which erupted in Asia this past Monday, accidentally in a sense, echoing what had happened ten years earlier, on the so-called 1987 October financial crash: That is a world event. Even though much money was poured into markets in the United States, and Britain, and continental Europe, to try to prevent Black Monday from exploding immediately here, Black Monday exploded. And, as we stand here, it is continuing to explode in Asia.

The collapse of these markets is ongoing. This is not an Asian problem. This is a problem for Asia, but it's not an Asian problem.

In the recent period, especially during the past period since 1989, under the influence of Margaret Thatcher, George Bush, and Francois Mitterrand, who unloaded the policy of globalization—a post-Soviet world of globalization—upon the world, the world markets are so interconnected, intertwined, that there is no longer any protection, with the qualified exception of China—that there is no longer any protection, by any nation-state or its economy, from the ravages of things that break out in the international financial market. An explosion in one market, one financial market, if it's severe, is an explosion in every market.

Already we see, today, that the economy of Europe is beginning to disintegrate another ratchet-step, as a result of the explosion which occurred Monday, and Tuesday, and Wednesday, in East and South Asia. This is an interconnected world. No part can be protected from the diseases which rage in another part of the world. What happens to any part of the world, happens to *us*. Black Monday in Asia happened in the United States. And, only people living in delusions, can imagine otherwise.

Now, on the gentleman who is coming to Washington, not for a U.S.-China negotiation, but, for an attempt to reach a partnership between the leading military power of the world, and the largest nation of the world, a partnership on which the survival of civilization depends. That is: the success of this attempt at partnership, will determine whether civilization outlives this century.

Now, let's look at some of the fortunate features of this.

The President of China (of whom I have limited knowledge, but what I know of his education, and what I've seen of his character, publicly) is the outstanding figure among heads of state, and heads of government, in any part of the world today. There is no person presently a head of state, or head of government, in any part of the world, who has the personal stature, and depth of character, of the President of China, who happens to be the head of, not a world power, but of a great power in the world, and a regional power.

And, therefore, we are very fortunate, to have one of the world's powers, the head of China, who happens to be probably the outstanding head of state of any nation in the world today, in terms of educational and personal qualities, coming here.

This is a man who, for comparison, has no comparison in the past 25 years among heads of state in government. A man who belongs to the same rank, as Europe will remember in terms of President de Gaulle of France, or Chancellor Adenauer of Germany, or in a sense, President Kennedy of the United States. This is a great world figure, who has come to the top to represent a great nation. A partnership between the President of the United States, and the President of China and what he represents, is one of the greatest opportunities for turning the world around, and beginning to move the world in a new direction, under which conditions, civilization can survive. As it cannot, if we continue to go the way you want to go; if we continue to go the way that Congress is trying to push us; if we continue to go the way the British Empire is pushing us.

China has many problems, but its problems are, essentially, a legacy of the world's problems. And, it cannot solve its problems by China methods alone. It requires partners, just as we in the United States require partners, without which, we cannot solve our problems. Therefore,

the greatest occasion of this decade, is now occurring, next week, in the arrival of the President of China to deal with the President of the United States.

China: A Besieged Nation

But, China's position is not all rosy. Let's look at the first slide [Figure 1]; this is a map which we produced for a cover of *EIR* some time ago.

China is the last surviving power on this planet which is not disintegrating. Every other part of the world is disintegrating.

Europe is disintegrating.

The United States has been in collapse, since, in fact, in physical terms, since 1970. That is: the per-capita *physical* market basket standard of productivity: by that standard, the per-capita income of the labor force has dropped to about *one-half* today, of what it was in the late 1960s. The productivity of labor, measured in the same terms, has dropped to approximately half today, of what it was 25-odd years ago.

Europe has collapsed, especially since 1989. If you take the productivity of Europe as a whole, or western Europe, since 1989, there has been a savage collapse, *presently accelerating*, in the economies throughout Europe. The United Kingdom itself is a junk heap; it's a garbage dump. There's no power in England, but there is great power in the British Commonwealth and the financial institutions that it represents—the combination of financial oligarchical interests.

China, on the other hand, has in recent years, over the course of the 1980s, and during the 1990s, has had a contrary trend. China is the leading power of the world, the only one, which has had an upward course in economic development, in the recent period. There have been some interesting developments in Southeast Asia, but actually the Southeast Asia development—the so-called “Asia Tiger” development—is a form of neo-colonialism.

Remember, in the 19th Century, the colonial powers—and even in the 18th Century—but in the 19th Century, the colonial powers, led by Britain, would go into a country, and they would loot its mines, and they would loot its agriculture, for the benefit of the imperial powers. So, therefore, the investment in mines and plantations by the British, French, Dutch, and Portuguese empires, for example, did not benefit the people of the country in which these investments were made. The investment in slave-labor, or virtual slave-labor, by the European powers, and the U.S., in Southeast Asia, was not of long-term benefit to the people of those countries. Because, to invest in cheap-labor shops, and so-called “runaway shops”—as the NAFTA operation below our borders in the United States—does not benefit these countries.

For example, in Mexico, and throughout South America, the per-capita income of peoples is *half* or worse, of what it was, even as recently as 1982. NAFTA has been a disaster, not only for the people and the economy of the United States, but for the people of Mexico and South America. Things are much worse as a result of NAFTA, than they were before. And, it has been getting worse since 1982.

The Southeast Asia-Asia Tiger miracles, is part of this runaway-shop operation, into cheap labor markets. A hit-and-run operation, in the same spirit as the plantation operations and mining operations, looting operations, of the imperial colonial powers during the 19th Century.

So, China is special in that sense. It has some of this; it has some runaway shops; it has some cheap-labor operations. But overall, there is a movement in China, which is upward. The only nation-state on this planet, which has had an upward movement of this type, during the past decade, and over a longer period.

Now, you recall what happened in 1989; that I'll come to again. But, since 1989, the former Soviet Union, and the nations associated with it, have collapsed. For example, the conditions of life in the eastern part of Germany, the former East Germany, today, are savagely worse than they were under Communism. Throughout eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union, the conditions of life are savagely worse than they were under Communism, and they are rapidly becoming much worse.

This did not happen accidentally. It happened because certain powers decided to *do* that to that part of the world. For example, Maastricht was imposed upon Germany, not to develop the eastern part of Germany: as condition of reunification. And, not to do anything, which would allow the former Soviet Union, or eastern Europe, to recover, or to grow, after the 1989–1991 period.

The intent of the people who did that to the former Soviet Union, especially from London, the intent is to do the same thing to China. China is the only power from the pre-1989 period, the only power which has not been destroyed, or largely destroyed.

And, they *intend* to do that.

Now, that doesn't mean that some of these people in London, or in western Europe, or the United States, the enemies of China, do not intend to do business with China. Yes, they *want* the business. George Bush, for example, who represents the enemies of China, today, in terms of present policy, makes commissions anywhere he can, on Asia trade. Other people make profit on business deals with China. But they do not want a partnership between the

United States and China, a partnership of nations, which might secure the long-term economic strength and stability of China.

The intent of London, the intent of the British Commonwealth, is to do to China what they did to the Soviet Union. That's their policy. Above all, they do not wish to allow the United States to enter into a partnership with China, which is an alliance, in effect, among two nations seeking to find global stability and global economic growth.

And, thus, China is besieged and threatened on every border. That's changing. What's happened on Taiwan recently, with George Soros and company collapsing the Taiwanese economy, as he participated in collapsing the Southeast Asian economies, has had a political effect in Taiwan. But, from every part of Asia, we can trace British intelligence operations, supported in part by some scoundrels from the United States, such as George Bush, and his brother Prescott, which are *attacking* China, and trying to destroy it.

You have a pro-British faction in Japan, which wants to make trouble. You have in the Congress, members of the Congress, who never had a passport before they entered the Congress. And they're now trying to make foreign policy! Most of them don't even know where countries outside of the United States, *are*. But they have strong opinions on the subject. Their ignorance strengthens their opinion.

This instability in Central Asia: It's a cockpit of trouble. There are threats to China, from all around it, launched, largely, by British intelligence, and by the British Commonwealth operations.

So, China is a besieged nation.

What Must Be Done: The Eurasian Land-Bridge

Some years ago, my wife and I, and others, developed a policy for the situation, which I'll devote much of today's remarks to—and Helga, also, in her way.

What we developed: [**Figure 2**] And, this, as you see, is a global policy. It's not just a question of a relationship between the United States and China. It's a *change* in the entire world policy, in which the relationship between United States and China can become the essential pivot and keystone for a global change, a much-needed global change, to keep the world from collapsing into a New Dark Age in the coming years ahead.

What we proposed, and what is at stake, is the development of a global infrastructural system, which had its genesis in the work of the Lincoln Administration in the United States, beginning 1861. That is, under the influence of the world's then-leading economist, Henry C. Carey, the American economist. The United States entered into a development program

internal to the United States, called the transcontinental railroad. We set up a network of transcontinental railroad routes across from the Atlantic to the Pacific, of the United States. These were not simply transportation routes, but these were designed as development corridors, such that for a distance of 50 to 75 kilometers on either side of the rail link, you would have agricultural and other development, would be occurring.

And, therefore, we transformed very rapidly—In the late 19th Century, we transformed the wasteland, or relative wilderness areas, of the middle and western United States, at a rapid rate, into a developing area. And, from which came, in part, the great internal strength of the U.S. economy.

In 1876, Europeans, including Germans—Germany and Russia—a group in Russia around Mendeleyev, and later, around Count Sergei Witte, adopted this policy. The model of the United States, from 1861 to 1876, became the model for a revolution in Germany, which made Germany a world industrial power, beginning 1876; which made Russia begin to become a world power, through the programs of railroad building, including the Trans-Siberian Railroad, led by Mendeleyev, and led, in part by Witte. These policies began to transform the world.

What we did, and have revived—I'll describe how that happened—is we revived this kind of policy, to say that we must have a Eurasian Land-Bridge, based on the development of transportation routes. And, the corridors along which these transportation routes would lie, would become *development corridors*. Because, when you have transportation, power, and so forth, moving through an area on trunk lines, then on either side of those trunk lines of power distribution, transportation, and so forth, you have the possibility of economic development of that area, to a distance of 50 to 100 kilometers on either side of that route. A highly competitive potential for development, with supporting infrastructure.

What we propose to do, is to take the vast wastelands, the undeveloped areas of Central Eurasia, and by crisscrossing them with a number of routes of development from Central Europe, from a Paris-Vienna-Berlin triangle, with a concentration of machine-tool potential in Europe, to move these development routes across Eurasia into the United States, into the Americas, into Africa, and thus, create a global development program, to turn this undeveloped area of Eurasia, at last, into an area of development and stability, including the less-developed areas of China, and to bring the whole world together in one large-scale economic development program, which can be the basis for the revival and prosperity of the world economy in the coming century. That's the policy.

And the thing that will determine whether the summit agreement, or meeting, between the President of the United States, and the President of China is successful, will depend upon

how that plays into making this possibility. This, and what it implies, is the only hope for avoiding a collapse into barbarism on a world scale during the coming century.

We must do it now. And, the possibility of doing it lies in the hands of two men, who are going to meet next week, again—the President of China and the President of the United States. That is what is at stake. Nothing else is important. That is important: the future of humanity. And, this summit will determine it. And, therefore, I get very nasty when somebody starts to try to upset, or spoil, or ruin, or undermine the success of this attempt at partnership between these two nations. This is crucial.

Origins of the Land-Bridge Program

Okay, now, I'll have played briefly, a section from a televised press conference, which I conducted in Berlin, on Columbus Day, October 12, 1988, at the Bristol-Kempinski Hotel: This is the same televised press conference which was later re-broadcast, in the United States, during October, the same month, as part of a nationwide election campaign—my campaign. This is the actual genesis—this broadcast and what led into it—is the actual genesis of the program I've just described, or identified. And is the genesis of the policy thinking which must go into the design of the agreements reached between the President of the United States and the President of China.

Proceed.

Come with me to Berlin, where I delivered a major press conference, on the morning of Wednesday, October 12:

“Under the proper conditions, many today will agree, that the time has come for early steps toward the reunification of Germany, with the obvious prospect that Berlin might resume its role as the nation's capital.

“For the United States, as for Germans, and Europe generally, the question is, will this reunification process be brought about by assimilating the Federal Republic of Germany into the East bloc's economy, or economic range of influence, or can it be accomplished in a different way? In other words, is a united Germany to come into being, as a part of a Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, as President de Gaulle proposed, or, as Mr. Gorbachov has desired, a Europe from the Urals to the Atlantic?

“I see the possibility, that the process of reunification could occur precisely as de Gaulle proposed.”

What I forecast, in the remainder of that address, was that, during the coming months, that we would see the disintegration of the former Soviet bloc, for economic reasons. This

disintegration would begin, politically, in Poland, would spread through eastern Europe. And, that the United States and Europe, western Europe, must prepare for this process of disintegration, of the Soviet-dominated economic zone. And, that the United States must support the early reunification of Germany under these conditions. And, that that proposal should be made in the context of offers by the United States, and others, to assist the states of eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union, in economic recovery, by helping correct some of the faults in their system.

It happened, as you know, the following year.

At that point, I turned to my wife, Helga; and we discussed the implementation, which had to be—this was at the point that the Wall was beginning to crumble—the measures which must be taken by the United States and Europe, western Europe, in order to deal with the disintegration, which was ongoing in the former Soviet bloc.

The proposal that came from that, first, was called the “European Triangle Proposal” [Figure 3]: That, there is an area, in western Europe, an approximate spherical triangle, whose key points, whose vertices, are Paris, Vienna, and Berlin. This represents the historic concentration of infrastructural and related economic and technological development in Europe, which has been the greatest in the world. Here was embedded, in 1988–1989, the greatest potential for machine-tool technologies’ radiation, from Europe into Eurasia.

And, my proposal was, the United States had to enter into an agreement, with these nations of Europe, in order to establish partnership, with this Triangle zone, in order to extend development corridors, based on transportation corridors, including the technology of magnetic levitation rail—rail substitute—into St. Petersburg, into Moscow, etc.; down through Italy, and so forth, and beyond, as a great development project.

And, we designed some of the specifications of the development of this program. These reports were published in 1990, 1991, under the title, first, of the “European Productive Triangle,” that is, the development of the entire Eurasia area, and other areas, on the basis of mobilizing the lingering potential in this part of Europe, particularly the machine-tool-design capability.

The Machine-Tool Principle

On this, you must remember, that apart from Japan, and to some degree Korea (but that’s a special case), that the problem of Asia, is that the majority of the world’s population is concentrated in East and South Asia. And, yet, only in Japan—in the whole region—do you have the machine-tool capability, in terms of per capita of labor force, sufficient to sustain a modern economy.

You can not simply go into a barren desert, and set up a factory, and expect to have a productive economy. You must, first of all, provide infrastructure. You must provide economic transportation, water-management, power, and so forth. You must have educational systems, health systems: all of these infrastructural elements which are necessary for a successful modern economy in that locality. That is, you must measure the density of infrastructure, in terms of per capita of labor force, in terms of square kilometer of relevant area. In this respect, Asia is poor.

This ability to transfer technology, and to develop it, depends upon the ratio, of the number of persons employed, productively, in a machine-tool-sector industry, to the total number of persons employed in the economy. That is: the ratio of the rate of technological progress, per capita, in the machine-tool sector, as compared with the projected rate of technological progress per capita in the labor force, as a whole.

This is the key, the indispensable key, to economic progress: Without it, you can't have it.

Therefore, to deny Asia, as it has been denied, access to dual-use technologies, machine-tool technologies: For example, in Southeast Asia, you have virtually no machine-tool capability. What happens if repairs are required? Where do you go, to the machine-tool capability, to maintain your operating plant? Where do you go, to the machine-tool capability, to adapt a technology to your productive process?

The problem is, that through European colonial, and other policies, East and South Asia, with the exception of Japan, and to some degree Korea—South Korea, a special case—has been subjected to technological suffocation, by being denied the means to develop, and apply, and maintain, modern technology, at their own discretion.

We used to have some technology, for example, in the Philippines, associated with the two U.S. military bases, Subic Bay and Clark Field, especially Subic Bay. There were small machine shops and machine-tool shops, in the area of these U.S. military operations, which were sustained there, because they helped to support the U.S. military operations. When the United States overthrew President Marcos, and put the Philippines through a rapid spiral of technological and economic collapse, since then, the United States pulled out of the Philippines, that technological machine-tool support capability. Destroyed it.

As a result, the typical problem in Southeast Asia, is a lack of machine-tool capability. The problem of overcoming the obstacles to rapid growth, in the interior of China (as opposed to some areas, which are high-development areas), depends upon having the machine-tool capability necessary to transform and support the transformation, of the relatively economically more backward portions of China, into modern portions of China; in order to

increase the productive powers of labor, at a sufficient rate to fulfill the social objectives of China, and the Chinese government, today.

And, therefore, the crucial thing, to all of these parts of the world, whether it's Africa, South Asia, East Asia, is to provide to these sectors of the world, the right to development. The right to development, involves education, infrastructure development, and, above all, the machine-tool design capability, without which you can not have continuous, sustainable development.

Thus, that was the principle of the sector: that, by developing land routes of efficient, high-rate, high-speed transportation, throughout Eurasia, and using these routes, not only to support trade and industry, but to support the transmission, at a high rate, of the machine-tool-design sector, into these countries, then and only then, would it be possible to lift the greatest part of the world population, which is concentrated in South and East Asia—and also in Africa, secondly—to lift these parts of the world, out of the legacy of 19th-century imperialism, and the legacy of second-class citizenship in world affairs.

The SDI: An Example of Statecraft

Now, how did this happen?

The key event, which is relevant to my role in this, occurred, beginning December 1981, and through a period through 1984. In December 1981, I had run as a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, in 1980, against Jimmy Carter. And, thus, because of the position I had there, in that respect, as a former Presidential candidate (pre-candidate), and because of other things I'd done, it was decided by some people in the U.S. government, that it would be wise to have me, as a private citizen, respond to a Soviet probe, which had requested that an additional back-channel discussion be setup between the Reagan Administration and the Soviet government.

So, I agreed to undertake this exploratory discussion, but made one recommendation, which was conditional, in the sense that I said, "If I'm going to be useful, in this kind of discussion, there are certain things *I* should discuss, which are of concern to me, which will become the basis for this kind of exploration."

I had been concerned, for some time, with two things.

From my time in military service, in the China-Burma-India theater, during World War II, I'd been concerned with establishing economic justice for the world, after seeing Asia. And, that had been my personal commitment: that we must change affairs, so that the so-called underdeveloped, or former colonial regions of the world, could participate in justice.

And, so, I'd been involved, heavily, with Third World questions, and had gotten myself into a great deal of trouble, in certain circles, because I had been an advocate of the Third World. At one time, the FBI was going to have the Communist Party of the United States assassinate me—there's a government document on that subject—back in 1973, as a result of this kind of thing.

But, in this, the second thing I was concerned about, was that the agreements on détente, which had been reached, specifically reached, during the course and aftermath of the 1962 Missile Crisis, were themselves, a danger, a risk, to civilization: that the system of détente, that is, of nuclear mutual deterrence, had become the potential trigger for an accidental war; and that, therefore, we had to concern ourselves with this problem of ballistic-missile defense.

So, this policy, which I had devised, which was part of my 1980 Presidential campaign, a key (shall we say) plank, in that campaign, was that: the United States should propose, to the Soviet Union, and other powers, that we agree on developing an efficient ballistic-missile defense, to be common to all powers; so that no longer would we face the threat of thermonuclear extinction, with no defense against thermonuclear warhead missiles. And, that this collaboration, among the United States, the Soviet Union, and other powers, should be technological collaboration, extended to all nations, to the purpose of using these technologies, which were then called (in diplomatic language) “new physical principles,” to the benefit of all mankind, with special emphasis on what was called, then, the developing sector.

This was the policy, which I used as a pivot of my exploratory discussions with the Soviet government, during a period from February of 1982 through February of 1983. I had indications from the Andropov government, that this would not be acceptable to Andropov; but, they were interested in the economics.

The President of the United States, in various ways, adopted this idea, as a good idea—President Reagan—through his people in the National Security Council, with whom I was working. And, on March 23, 1983, as you recall, the President of the United States, in a concluding segment of his televised broadcast, announced what he called the “Strategic Defense Initiative,” whose content was to propose to the Soviet Union, exactly what I had outlined to the Soviet government in my back-channel talks.

That action, by the President, changed world history.

It didn't change it the way I wanted it changed, because, very soon, the mice—including the Heritage Foundation mice—got at the operation, and turned the SDI around, and changed its purpose.

And, of course, as you know, Gorbachov put me on the hit-list as Public Enemy Number One, worldwide, as a result of that policy.

But, the fact that the policy was presented, shook the world up: particularly, the organizing we did around that in 1982 through 1984. The leading military, and other institutions, of western Europe, the United States, and so forth, as represented by people of senior rank, in the intelligence and military institutions, were part of the groups of people who participated in supporting my policy proposals on this question.

And, I got into one, big, lot of trouble, over doing that.

But, that concept, of using these most advanced technologies, which still exist, potentially, and using these as the shared technologies, shared among various nations, technologies based on expansion of the world's machine-tool-design capability in terms of these new technologies, should be used for transforming the world, into the kind of world, which, among others, President Franklin Roosevelt intended to put into effect at the end of the world war, had he lived to do so. President Truman had opposite policies.

And, that's the genesis of this particular policy, and my commitment to it.

Oligarchism vs. Republicanism

Now, let's just talk about this issue, talk about the issue of statecraft right now.

It is the oligarchical tradition—not an American tradition, but an oligarchical tradition—to propose that people who are appointed by an oligarchy, as the selected representatives of an oligarchy, to occupy the positions of government, and the institutions of government, are the highest-ranking authorities in shaping world policy.

Now, that's not true. And, that's not legal, under our Constitutional system.

The highest-ranking authority, socially, under the American system, under our Constitutional system, is the individual citizen. The most significant figure in our history, U.S. history, never occupied elective office: His name was Benjamin Franklin. He was the father of the American Revolution, and the American Constitution. Everybody who played any significant role, in establishing this nation, was a member of a group under the direction of Benjamin Franklin. The Declaration of Independence, while written by Jefferson, as the clerk of the sessions, was dictated by Benjamin Franklin. The Constitution of the United States, was directed by Benjamin Franklin, a citizen of the United States, who had this acting Postmaster General position, which he inherited from a lieutenant governor of Virginia, but was, nonetheless, a citizen.

If you look around the world today, as I referred at the outside, and look at the people who occupy the highest positions of government, or state, you find a miserable to mediocre lot, even by the standards of the 1950s and early 1960s.

You look at the populations, which, presumably, elect these people to office. Why do they elect mediocrities? Why do they elect people, who are not capable of dealing, intellectually, emotionally, with the fundamental issues of our time? A case in which Jiang Zemin, the President of China, is an exception, an outstanding exception.

Why are our politicians so bad? Why do we think of the neo-conservatives in Congress as the castaways, the ones that weren't sold at a rummage sale? Junk! Absolute junk!

Why are our institutions so corrupt? Why are the people in them so mediocre, so corrupt?

Because the nations have become corrupt! Because the people have become corrupt! Because the majority of voters have become corrupt!

Why do voters in the United States have contempt for their government? Because their government allows people like them to vote!

As a matter of fact, anyone who is even competent in politics—and I know a number of people, who have—the President of the United States, for example (I've never spoken to him), but I know he's a man of ideas and principle. Why doesn't he stick to principle? Why doesn't he make an honest decision on issues? Why does he waffle? Why does he backtrack? Why does he waver? Why does he adopt one policy, and then the exactly contradictory policy? Why does he do that?

Why are the leaders of European governments— Why is the French government such a stinking mess? Nobody wants anything to do with the French state. The French state is probably, after the British state, the most corrupt on this planet! There's no morality in it! And, I know France. I can tell you: The present government, the present state, under Chirac, the present government under Jospin, is the most corrupt since Napoleon III.

Rotten. But, this is not exceptional: This is the general condition of governments, today.

Now, what happens, is, people will say, as individuals, or, influential people will say, "Well, there's nothing we can do about it. It's up to the politicians. It's up to the elected officials of government."

And, you say, "Well, but shall we stand by the side of the road, knowing that this civilization is being destroyed, and do nothing? Simply because we're not elected officials of governments? Are we that immoral, that we will see the world go to Hell, and say, there was

nothing we could do about it, because we weren't elected?" Is that what Benjamin Franklin did? Is that what Alexander Dallas Bache did?

How many offices did Abraham Lincoln hold? Probably the greatest President the United States ever had. Once, he was elected to Congress, to Federal office; and once, as President of the United States, for which he was shot. The greatest President in American history.

What was Lincoln's influence, during most of his adult life? The influence, which caused him to become the President, which caused him to become, in fact, the greatest President the United States ever had! It was his role, not as a public official, an elected public official: It was his role as a citizen. Like Benjamin Franklin.

And, you'll find that's true in most nations.

Sometimes, in good times, or in fortunate times, a person of great capability, moral and intellectual capability, becomes elected to high office. But, usually, especially these days, especially in this century, that is not usually the case. Usually, we pick the worst people to become the elected officials. If you're not corrupt, you can't be elected. Truthfulness is a disability, a competitive disability, in any election campaign in the United States: If you tell the truth, you're in trouble.

Many people, whom I know, who are professional politicians, have retired from office, because the situation is hopeless, morally hopeless. If you tell the truth, you're doomed! Since you're not allowed to tell the truth, or act truthfully, or honestly, retire from office.

How are people elected, today, in the United States, for example? They're not elected by a democratic process. Bunk! Most times, most citizens, and most political candidates, never meet each other. How do they meet each other? Through the media! Through orchestrated operations, slushes with money. How do they get the money, to run the campaigns? They sell themselves, to the people who have the money. Now, who has the money, in the United States, today? The worst people! The very worst: the Wall Street crowd.

So, the Wall Street crowd, or Hollywood, has the money. These are the great concentrations of financial power. And, since the candidates no longer have an efficient relationship to the population, and the population has no efficient relationship to the candidate, they don't meet together, and discuss policy; they say, "Well, I saw a slogan. Somebody told me on a news broadcast, this was a good man. I see his name in the press. I hear good things about him, from the rumor mill, on the gossip circuit. My neighbor, next door, who raises turtles, told me, this is a good man." That's how we get our politicians! You don't get truth.

Corruption of the Justice System

For example, the justice system in the United States is monstrously corrupt. The idea of truth? For example, let's take the highest level, as an example: Let's take an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, probably the most influential person on the Supreme Court—Antonin Scalia. Antonin Scalia is a Satan-worshipper, who calls himself a Catholic. He's a Manichean. What he says, is: "I have my principles—my religious principles, my moral principles—but I am not allowed to see any moral intent in the U.S. Constitution, or U.S. law. The law must be what the marketplace demands it be! The marketplace of finance, the marketplace of opinion. What I perceive to be majority opinion, is law."

Where's truth? Where's justice? What do we mean by injustice? We generally mean that the power, entrenched power, has committed an offense against the rights of an individual or group. That's injustice. We talk about human rights, which means that official power, has either persecuted people, unjustly, or has tolerated it. That's called a violation of human rights. Who does that? Well, the majority does that; or, entrenched power does that. Therefore, the question of justice can not be separated, as Plato insisted, through the mouth of Socrates: You can not separate the question of justice from the question of truth. What kind of corruption do you have, then, when the highest court of the United States, says that truth is of no concern to it! When it votes, and says that people, who have claims, evidence showing their innocence, shall be executed, for the sake of public opinion and procedure? Explicitly no truth.

There is no justice in the United States, today, on principle. Because, there's no principle of truth. You can not bring evidence of truth into a court, and win the case: You will lose it, if the court perceives, that public opinion—as it chooses to perceive it!—has a contrary view.

So, in such circumstances, it is immoral for the private citizen to say, "There's nothing I can do about it. You leave it up to the politicians, the elected officials. They have the authority."

Where does this idea come from, about elected officials having some kind of exclusive authority? The idea of the republic is, that the citizen controls elected officials. By exerting that control, not by sitting back and saying, "I can vote for them, or against them," but by actually exerting control on the discussion and formulation of policy; of holding the institutions of government accountable, for a truthful representation of the issues of policy. A real public opinion—not the kind we have, that you get second-hand, from the press.

They have, across the river over here, they have a thing called a mass-media museum: It's called a Newseum. Now, these guys ain't got no class, because their signs point "Newseum." If their signs had class, they would say, "Ad Mewseum!" Because, that's the character of the news media, and that's where the people get their opinion—and from Hollywood.

Hollywood 'Morality'

Take the case of: "What is Hollywood?"

Hollywood is very corrupt. It pays virtually no taxes. Why? Because Hollywood films, as you might guess from looking at your television set, are actually funded, and organized corporately, in the drug-money-laundering centers of the world, such as the Caribbean islands. So, you set up a corporation, in a place like the Cayman Islands, or the Dutch Antilles, or someplace like that, where Russian is spoken, because the Russian gangsters are all over the place, the Russian mafia, laundering money! Laundering drug money, and getting their drug deals. They set up corporations, and some of the leading actors set up corporations there; they set up a company to create a film. The film is a piece of junk, because the purpose of the film, is to launder drug money! That's why you have so many! And, you suspect, "Look, this film was not prepared by a writer. These things are not even actors; they are something. But, kicking somebody in the head, or getting undressed and performing sex before a screen, is not exactly high-quality, Classical art!"

Why do they do this? Because, these are vehicles for laundering drug money!

So, how is it, that some people get so rich from this stuff? Because, they're rich by laundering drug money!

Why doesn't Hollywood pay taxes? Because, the great profits on distribution of these films, internationally, go into the drug-money-laundering centers! Not into the distribution of films, based in the United States. So, as long as the distribution costs match the money retained, by the Hollywood, or so-called domestic U.S. filmmakers, they don't have to pay much in taxes.

So, therefore, what do you have in the Hollywood mafia? The actors, who, through these arrangements, with the drug-money cartels, have millions of dollars to spend! The great funders of campaigns; the great moral paragons of the United States. "I want my daughter to look like this actress." "I want my son to look like that." "I want to dress like that." "My son wants to marry a woman, who looks like that actress." "My daughter wants to marry a man, who looks like that actor."

This is a surrogate royalty, for the illusion-ridden American.

This is an example of our moral degradation!

Our educational system: Most young people, coming out of the educational system today, even universities, would not qualify to graduate from a decent secondary school back in the

1960s and 1950s. They don't know anything! They haven't been taught anything! They've been taught junk! They've been put through a sociological drill, of political correctness.

We Are Watching Our Nation Be Destroyed

So, we sit, and we watch our nation being destroyed. We sit and watch our children being destroyed. We sit and watch genocide!

Take the genocide case: Well, we're becoming demographically aged, because don't know how to make babies anymore. Only if you're uneducated and very poor, you haven't unlearned how to make babies. So, what happens to us? If you get sick, you're likely to die. Why? For the greater profits of the insurance companies, who move in and make rules, whose purpose is to accelerate the death rates among people who have severe illness, or who are simply old.

What is going on in our hospitals and our medical system, through the health management organizations and through the insurance companies, and behind them, is a systematic mass-murder, which differs in no principal respect from what went on in Nazi Germany in the 1930s. Mass murder! The morbidity rates, which are among victims of disease and at-risk age groups, is rising. The hospital system we built in the postwar period, over the period from the late 1940s into the middle of the 1970s, is being destroyed.

People are being murdered, for the sake of Wall Street's profits, today. This is upheld, as being legal. Statutes are written to favor this operation! Government budgets are designed to favor this operation! The latest one, is to eliminate pensions, altogether, on demographic, economic grounds.

So, we have this immorality, which takes over government, and becomes recognized as mainstream opinion, and the government defends committing crimes, and stupidities, in the name of the "authority of mainstream opinion."

Just like this anti-Christian Manichean! It's like, you could say, of Justice Scalia: Just because you want to be a good church-goer, doesn't mean you have to be a Catholic. You don't have to be a Christian, to be a good church-goer. Just have to keep up the appearances, and stick to mainstream opinion.

So, what do you do?

America's Leibnizian Heritage

Well, where's the American idea come from? You look at the history of the founders of our nation: The influence which shaped this country, was that of Gottfried Leibniz, specifically in opposition to Locke. Our culture, our political culture, does not come from the British

empiricist system, or from Locke, or Adam Smith. Our culture comes from the European tradition which was transmitted through Leibniz. The ideas, the philosophy of Franklin, were those of Leibniz. The Declaration of Independence enshrines the principles of Leibniz, which Leibniz composed in opposition to Locke. The Preamble of the U.S. Constitution, the Federal Constitution, is a statement of Leibnizian principle, in opposition to Locke; and that's the highest law, Constitutional law, of the land.

Where do we get these ideas?

Well, our founders, the best of them, the leaders of them, were educated in Classical Greek. And, our ideas of the citizen, came from study of the aspirations of a society, based on citizenship, as expressed in Classical Greek—particularly, the case of Solon, the great tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, and especially Plato. The idea of the philosopher-king. The citizens, who developed intellectually, morally, who developed the responsibility, especially as they aged, the responsibility for taking care of their people, and their government. The so-called “Good Samaritans” of their society. The people, whose mission in life, whose adopted and developed mission in life, is to take care of their nation, and its people. And, to take care of humanity as a whole. And, to try to make their nation a good nation, for the benefit of all humanity. It is we, who have to do this.

Fortunately, for various reasons, I developed a very strong sense of that kind of purpose; and, thus, in the way I indicated, and also in other ways, became internationally somewhat significant, as the philosopher-king, as a citizen—not elected to any office—but often dealing with governments, and dealing with influential people; travelling around the world, communicating around the world, trying to make this country a good country, not only for itself, and its people, but a good country for all mankind. A good friend of all mankind. A good friend of all the nations and peoples of this planet.

And thus, I developed these concepts, and have been involved in these operations, like this one. (And, I call upon all of you to do likewise, if you can!)

What Is a Human Being?

Now, let me just turn to the next slide [Figure 4].

What is a human being? That's the question, that really is there. I think that the President of China is a man who could understand this; probably already does. The President of the United States, if he could get rid of certain problems, could also probably understand this. (It might take a wrestling match, but he can probably end up understanding it.)

What is a human being? That's what's at issue, in this! We have a planet, over 5 billion people! What are they? We have people that say that human beings are nothing but animals.

We have this guy, Peter Singer, an Australian, who was essentially kicked out of a conference, because he's denying human rights, in favor of animal rights.

People no longer know what a human being is!

Some people, like Prince Philip, the Consort of the Queen of England, says that man is nothing but a higher ape. And, I say, "Well, are you speaking of your children, sir?" People have those ideas.

What is man?

The economists lie: Every brand of economics generally taught, and practiced in the world today, is based on the assumption that there is no difference between a man and a monkey. Because: where is the difference between man and ape located in the design of those economics? Since, all apes, together, combined, never had a potential population in excess of several million individuals, under the conditions which existed on this planet in the past 2 million years. Never!

How did we reach the level of a couple hundred millions world population, during the Hellenistic and early Roman period? How did we reach several hundred millions population, worldwide, by the 14th Century? And, how, from the 15th Century, have we had an ascending growth of population, and standard of living, on this planet, of over 5 billion people, today? How did that happen? Why aren't we down to just 3 million or 4 million, as we should be, if we were merely an ape?

What's the difference?

The difference is, what we call scientific and technological and cultural progress.

Where does this come from? Where does this progress come from?

It comes from the discovery of principles: Such as, principles of physics; principles of the universe; scientific discoveries; cultural, artistic discoveries. That's where it comes from.

Where does this come from? Why can't monkeys do it? Why do you allow people to monkey with our government?

Because, the individual personality has a quality, which is absolutely different from that of any animal. Only a human being can discover a principle, an idea. Only a human being can unlock the secrets of the universe. Only a human being can unlock the secrets of the powers of the human mind, itself, as we do with great Classical art.

Therefore, that is the source of power. That is the source of economy.

What is economy? Economy is man's relationship to the universe. That is, man's existence in terms of man's effective, willful relationship to the universe.

What do we do, when we discover a principle? We change man's relationship to nature. We increase man's power over nature, by unlocking the secrets of nature, through the powers of discovery, which are located in the individual mind!

What is history? Real history? It's the history of ideas. Ideas, which represent the accumulation of discoveries, which have been made by those who came before us. History is the history of those ideas.

Education, the Life-Blood of the Republic

What is education? Education is allowing young children, whether in the family, or in schools, to reexperience the act of discovery, of those great principles, which are the heritage we have from generations before us.

What do we produce by education? By that kind of education? Not textbook education, but that kind of education? You must re-live the act of discovery. We produce a mind, which understands what a human being is: because, they have relived an essential part of the history of all humanity, through re-enacting these discoveries. We have a mind which is trained: to do what? To use the power it has, and which it has developed, to make new, and better discoveries, than those who came before.

What do we call that? The generic term for that, is "education." Or, to distinguish it from the kind of mis-education people get in schools today—or, I guess they call it, Ms. Education, which you get in schools, today—you would call it, Classical education, because it's based on the Classical conception, which we attribute generally to Classical Greece and European civilization: the tradition of Plato. That you must re-live history. You must re-live it, in terms of how man's relationship to nature changed; how man's relationship to man improved. That's real history. And, therefore, we call re-living that (in the student, re-living history, the history of ideas), "Classical education."

So, therefore, the center of economy, the first principle of economy, is that.

Now, what do we do in good education, particularly in higher education? You produce young people, as Lazare Carnot and Gaspard Monge did, in France, prior to 1814; in brigades of young people, taken in from the farms, and so forth, as talented young people, and made into the great scientists and engineers of France, in that period. You take part of the population, you put through an educational process, and you produce people, thinkers. Great thinkers. They develop new discoveries.

Now, when you make a discovery, you have to prove it, don't you? You think you've discovered the solution. You have to prove the solution. What do you do? Well, in modern times, you create an experiment, sometimes called a "crucial experiment." Sometimes it takes the form of a laboratory experiment; sometimes it takes the form of working with a telescope, or something else—but you produce an experiment. You design an experiment.

The experiment is designed to test whether or not you can prove, that the principle you think you've discovered, actually works. Now, you keep doing that, until you get this thing right. When you get this right, when you get a very good, refined experiment, which proves things, one way or the other, what do you do? You walk over to a machine-tool-design shop—probably the same one that helped you build the laboratory equipment—and at that machine-tool shop, they say, "This principle works." Now, they proceed to develop new kinds of designs of products, new kinds of productive processes, based on this Machine-Tool Principle.

So, therefore, once you start with the idea that there's something sacred, and special, about the individual person, this creative potential: now, you create an educational system, and a social process, which is centered on that principle, the principle of the citizen. The citizen which is born with a divine spark of reason, in each individual. To cultivate that citizen, and to develop that citizen, that individual, as a true citizen, a thinking person. A person, who knows how to think. And, the citizens then choose among themselves, in a good society, who their leaders shall be, in terms of government and other functions.

That is a true republic.

But, economy comes from that: the successful economy comes from that. So, we educate everybody: Give every newborn child that kind of education. And, you produce a powerful society; because, every person is powerful. You no longer have two-tier societies, which have oligarchs on top, some lackeys, who do errands for them, like military and other lackeys, and then, the people, who are treated like human cattle: who do their job; who are not taught anything, except what they need to do, to do the job assigned to them. Human cattle. Serfs! Slaves, or similar conditions.

No. We say, "Everybody in society, every newborn child, must have this kind of development." And, this development must go, if we can do it, we can afford it, to the level we call the university level, today. In order to develop every personality, to the fullest potentiality—moral, and intellectual, and scientific potentiality—of that mind; which, in a sense, the President of China exemplifies that kind of objective, in a personality, as other leaders of China, whom I know, have that kind of quality.

Conditions for Progress

Now, on the basis of developing artistic, or political, statecraft, or scientific ideas, you now go into changing production. Why can you change production? Well, you apply the Machine-Tool Principle, to make new designs of products, better infrastructure, better productive processes.

Why does it work? Because, on the other side, the labor force you've educated, is qualified to go in, and be confronted with new technologies, and to be able to make them work!

For example, you had, in the Soviet economy, which I had studied for many years: You had a two-tier Soviet economy. On the one side, you had the military-scientific-industrial complex. Now, this was one of the best scientific cadres, in the world. I have certain criticisms of their philosophy, but they worked; they made things work. They made junk work; worse junk than we produced: They made it work.

But, then you had those, in the Soviet society, who didn't have that level of education, lived on another tier: the civilian society. These were the people who were resistant to technological progress, which the Soviet officials, privately, used to call the "peasant problem." You had people who, because of the lack of cultural development, were unable to cope with technological progress; who had an attitude of refusing to cope with technological progress, if they could avoid it.

And, that was the inner weakness, the greatest inner weakness, of the Soviet economy: the "peasant problem." The inability of large masses of the population, employed in the civilian sector, to be able to match the level of performance, which was achieved in the military-scientific complex.

How do you overcome that?

It's a problem with China, it's trying to deal with now. How do you create the circumstances, given a population of over a billion people, how do you create the circumstances in which you can uplift the poor family, into this level of dignity and education? You have to have the means to do so, you have to have the economic means to do so—the physical economic means. You have to have the life-expectancy and conditions of social life in the family, so this can occur. Which the Soviets never faced, never actually specifically addressed.

So, therefore, by having a developed labor force, engaged with technological progress in the workplace and similar places, you have the formula for success; the formula under which the cost of producing an individual is less than the productivity of the society, as measured in physical terms. Those are the conditions of progress.

What we have to do, is do that on a planetary basis.

The Oligarchical Two-Tier Society

Now, in the oligarchical society, what is the famous statement? You hear it in the United States; you hear it in Europe: “Don’t educate people above their station. Do not provide people an education, which might equip them to do something, the kind of work, or live the kind of life, they’re never going to have the opportunity to have.”

This goes back, in European history, to the Code of Diocletian: If your father was a baker, you must be a baker. And, you must use the same methods your father used, and your grandfather, and his father before him, and his grandfather before him.

It was this philosophy, which destroyed the Byzantine Empire from within; which depopulated it, with this policy of zero-technological growth.

“Stay in your place. We don’t want to educate everybody, because they’re only going to be paper-shufflers, or do service work. We don’t want to over-educate people!”

And, thus, you create and have the mentality of a two-tier society.

Similarly, you say, in politics: “We don’t want the people involved in deciding policy. We want government to do, as government is told to do. We wish to control government. We wish to determine who can get into government. We wish to control them”—whether by legal harassment, as they’re doing to Clinton, or something else. “Control them! Threaten them! Break them! Get rid of them! If they don’t do our bidding!”

The constituency of government then becomes, as in the United States: Hollywood and Wall Street. If Hollywood, the daily mass media, and Wall Street, do not want something to happen, it is not supposed to happen. This is called “the Establishment.” The Establishment decides what kind of government you shall have, and who shall occupy the seats of government.

The people have given up; 51% of Americans, at least, eligible voters, don’t register to vote. They probably consider that an act of corruption, of condoning this rotten system. And, they’re partly right: They’re morally wrong, but their judgment on the system is correct.

So, that’s the kind of system that’s wanted.

For example, Lord William Rees-Mogg: He’s a madman, but he was formerly chief editor of the London *Times*, which is the publication which broadcast British foreign policy, before the British Foreign Office knew about it. And, this gentleman has said, the objective is, to create a society of the type that, people like Alvin Toffler, and Newt Gingrich, or Al Gore,

want—a new type of society, which would be called a “New Age” society, a “New Era” society; “information society.” In which only 5% of the population will receive any education at all, and they will control the world through “information,” while the 95%, the rest, will receive no education.

This is kind of society, which is described in the last story of Jonathan Swift’s famous *Gulliver’s Travels*, which is really a story about a visit to early 18th-Century England, in which the society was governed by rear-ends of horses, and the masses of people were called Yahoos—not to be confused with Netanyahuos. And, the Yahoos spoke no articulate speech. They did all the work, manual labor, and spent the rest of their time, rutting in the ditches. And, they were going to castrate poor Gulliver, because they thought he was a talking Yahoo, and they didn’t want any of those; so, they were going castrate him, so he couldn’t breed any more of that kind.

That’s the kind of objective; that’s the kind of way they think.

So, you have a government, which is based on the oligarchical principle, in which the citizens, who are not in the Establishment, who are not controllers of the mass media, who are not Hollywood actors and actresses (whatever sex they have); that they will keep their mouths shut, except if they’re elected to official positions of government, in which case, they will do as they’re told, or be thrown out.

That’s the kind of society we have: an oligarchical society, run essentially by Wall Street, the Establishment, and Hollywood; and the British.

We no longer have a society, which is functioning as the United States was Constitutionally designed to be: A nation based on citizens, who had a sense of truthfulness, and commitment to knowledge, who would decide, and take care, like the Good Samaritan in the New Testament, would take care of the nation, the people, those who had fallen by the side of the road; and, would care that their nation, above all—just as they cared what they became—would care also what their nation became, and what their nation was in respect to other nations. Was it good, beneficial to the world? Or, was it bad?

And, that’s what we must do again.

And, that’s what I’ve done.

The Few Good Samaritans

And, because of this situation, we’ve come into a time, when there’re very few of us—and, know the world, I think, very well; better than most. I’ve dealt with many countries, over many decades, increasingly. I know most of the governments of the world: how they think;

what they've done; what mistakes they've made; what traps they've fallen into; what foolishness they do today.

Very few people know what is happening to the world. They know less about economics than anything else, where they do the most talking about it. And, the higher you are in economic policymaking, generally, the less you know, the less competent you are. Because you don't recognize that economy is based on the principle of the individual, the individual creative powers of the individual mind. Profit doesn't come from cheap labor! Profit comes from the development of the individual mind, and providing the conditions of life, which are necessary to the development of those conditions of mind.

All the accepted economics is totally incompetent! But, people accept this. Sociology is taught: incompetent! Virtually everything taught in our universities today, is incompetent! It's rubbish!

And nobody cares. They care about passing the course, not whether they're learning anything, or not. They want the job! They're like the musician who sings to earn his supper, not for the benefit of music. They don't care.

So, the number of people on this planet, who are well-informed and well-organized, at least, in relative terms, are very few. And, they're mostly outside of most governments. You will find very few people, a very tiny percentage of people in any government in the world today, who are competent, even by the standards of the 1970s—early 1980s. Virtually none.

Any leading politician, from the 1960s, '70s, or '80s, would, and does, look with contempt upon the majority of the politicians who are elected today. And, justly so! We have a junk-heap. We have a swamp, not a Congress—a swamp—and, we're not quite sure what species are in there.

Therefore, it falls upon those of us, who do know, who are few, to do what we can, like the Good Samaritan, to ensure that the ideas that are needed, are provided, and to provide leadership.

And, that's the role I play. That's been my motivation, my concern, in doing what I've indicated. Now, as I say, the time has come, in which the meeting between the two Presidents, is to be a turning point in world history: up or down. If the summit were to fail, if it were to fail in establishing the kind of partnership, the understanding, between the two powers, which is needed for this world, then I wouldn't give you too much, for the prospects of the entire human race, over the coming decades.

And, thus, we have to be concerned, at this point, to provide, to such few leaders and others who are willing to hear, to provide the policies, the programs, the outlooks, which are

needed, at a time when virtually no one on this planet—none of the institutions in power—have the slightest idea of what has to be done, to save this world from Hell.