

LaRouche D.C. Webcast: 'Now Comes the Aftermath'

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 14, 2000

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 27, Number 46, November 24, 2000.
View [original PDF](#) and [video](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

Speaking by teleconference to a Washington, D.C. EIR seminar, and by webcast to a live international audience, former Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche on Nov. 14 addressed the current electoral crisis in the United States, as a unique opportunity for dealing with the stench of corruption from the entire political process of the election. The following is the text of his opening speech, and a selection from the questions and answers.

Debra Hanania Freeman: Good afternoon to all of you. My name is Debra Freeman. I serve as the national spokeswoman for Lyndon LaRouche, who, as you all know, was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President of the United States, and is one of the most prominent living economists in the world today. I'd like to welcome you to this afternoon's event. As you know, this is a seminar sponsored by *Executive Intelligence Review*, which Mr. LaRouche is the founding editor of. The title of today's event, is "Now Comes the Aftermath." It is designed for an international audience. It is being broadcast live over the Internet, and it will be rebroadcast from Mr. LaRouche's site, www.larouchespeaks.com.

Mr. LaRouche will be addressing you today on the subject of the international crisis, which has exploded to the surface, in the immediate aftermath of last week's election. Mr. LaRouche will be addressing several of the most important issues that are posed by that crisis, and he will discuss them in a manner that I think is important for consideration by leading circles in the United States, and abroad.

After Mr. LaRouche's opening presentation, I will open for questions. What I ask all of you to understand, is that, in addition to taking questions from the live audience, we do have a phone hookup, so that people who are monitoring this broadcast globally, can also ask questions, and we do have a mechanism, whereby written questions have been submitted. So, I'm sure that we will have time for everybody to ask their questions, but I will apprise people of the order in which those questions will be presented, when Mr. LaRouche is done with his presentation.

I'd like to thank all of you for your presence here, and I'm quite sure that you will find Mr. LaRouche's remarks quite interesting.

Without any further introduction, ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to introduce to you, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche.

Lyndon LaRouche: Thank you very much, Debbie.

What I'm going to say today, will be unusual, but it's being said under unusual circumstances, and anything different would be irrelevant to the reality of the situation in which the United States, in particular, but also the world at large, finds itself, in the aftermath of the Nov. 7 Presidential elections in the United States.

What the question, which is posed by the aftermath of that November 7 event, is: How do you put the stench back inside the shell of a cracked, rotten egg? The problem we have, is not the problem of the election. We have an election crisis, but that is not the problem, in and of itself. As you probably know, I scheduled this event about a week after the election, because I then knew that the world would be in the kind of post-election crisis which it's in now. And I wished to leave about a week to pass, before I said what I had to say on this subject, because I thought it would take a week before the audience was ready, and had experienced enough frustration over these results, to begin to listen seriously to what I had to say.

I shall make seven points about this. And my concluding point will be a statement, written for this occasion, which I shall read into the record, because what I have to say is a matter of Constitutional law for the United States. And these things should be stated very precisely, as to wording.

A Cracked, Rotten Egg

Now, what happened, was not a bad election. What we had was a bad election which was the result of a corrupt and bankrupt election campaign. Nothing happened on November 7, which was any worse than what had happened during the preceding ten months. This election campaign, was, from the outset, especially from about February of this year, one of the most corrupt campaigns that the United States has ever known, at least national campaigns. We have, typical of the problem—if you were following the press in Europe, including such press as the leading press in Germany, France, and the United Kingdom itself, you would see that the two leading candidates for the Presidential election of the United States, were characterized by this leading press in the kind of terms which have never before been used, except to describe some comic-opera dictator from a banana republic. The

world is horrified, not by the results of the election, but by the candidates who presented themselves as Presidential candidates for election.

The campaign, as it was run, has no relevance whatsoever, in what it discussed, to the situation which is faced by the world, and the United States in particular, beginning now, and especially as we go into the early part of the year 2001. The candidates did speak about what they call "issues," but this was in the nature of slaves lining up at the back door of the mansion to beg for a few handouts. Nothing was said about the health-care crisis: A handout was promised. Nothing was said about pensions: A couple of handouts were promised to the slaves, which may or may not be delivered, as the case may be. The policy of the Governor of Texas, was nothing but a promise to bankrupt the United States by cutting tax payments, at a time when the tax revenue base is already going to collapse. What the Vice President promised was gobbledygook, which nobody could make sense of.

This campaign was, therefore, corrupt in every sense, both in vote-stealing, in racketeering, in the greatest amount of money ever spent for a campaign, in the conduct of the national news media—nothing was real. It was something like a Nuremberg-Hitler rally, without substance, but much pomp, and much money, and not much in the way of public speakers.

Now, the first issue to consider, in that connection, recognizing that the problem was not the election; the problem is the election campaign. *There was nothing worth voting for.* And the people who were trying to steal the vote were a bunch of crooks—so what else is new? Who should be surprised by the fact that we have this kind of situation? Perhaps no one will ever know, who actually won the election: The stealing and the corruption was that bad! So all this business with the courts, and trying to find out who stole the votes, is a worthless waste of time. We should find out who committed fraud, do something about it, but we should not postpone the selection of a President for that reason.

Now, the way we should handle a crisis like this, where nobody may ever know *who really won the vote*—because the corruption is that bad: How many judges, and how many courts, and how many trials, will we require, and how many recounts, to figure out anything, in almost any state? All we know, is it was a tie, and, as Letterman said on television: They both lost, so let's leave it that way.

Electoral College: Stick with the Constitution

Now, what do we do? We simply pass the problem over to the legal, constitutional process, which is called the Electoral College. The Electoral College is supposed to convene, by communication from various states, on the 18th of December. This is not yet the 18th of December. There's nothing yet to worry about! It begins on the 18th of December, when the

Electoral College will meet. Now, the Electoral College as created by the Constitution has been modified in some respect, but it's still the original intent. We've had election problems before, election crises: In the year 1800, the selection of Thomas Jefferson, was done through the Electoral College process—the intent of Congress. The election of John Quincy Adams, was done similarly. In 1877, we had a similar crisis, in the Hayes-Tilden runoff, which was done under provisions of the Electoral College. So, when you have two candidates, neither of which is elected, you have two processes to go through. First of all, you have the Electoral College, which is constituted as a deliberative body to decide who's going to report as the elected candidate. So, no matter if the vote is bad, the Electoral College, as constituted, can still decide the choice of President and Vice President. If it's hung up in the Electoral College as of January 5 or 6 of this coming year, when the Electoral College reports to the Congress, then if the Electoral College has not made a decision, as to who the next President would be, then, in that case, the Congress has procedures to go through, specified by law, to select *who shall be the next President*.

If, by chance, when January 20 rolls around, and the selection of a new President has not been made by either the Electoral College or the Congress, in that case, we do have a national constitutional emergency. Something will have to be done. And, one would hope, that somewhere between December 18 and January 5 or 6, people will begin to think about that kind of problem: What do we do if neither the Electoral College nor the Congress can select the next President by January 20, when the present President's term runs out?

Don't worry about it too much, but think about it. I'm sure they're thinking about it at the White House and elsewhere. Think about it, but we have time. We have a Constitution. We have a procedure for selecting a President. Don't panic. Don't run to the courts. Don't create confusion. Be calm. We'll find a solution. But begin to realize that you've got two bums, and you don't want either of them to be elected. Most of the voters who voted for either, were just voting to get rid of the greater evil, which they thought was the other. The lesser one, they were going to vote for, not because they thought they were any good, but they thought the other was worse!

Now, what happens when the public is choosing between the lesser of two evils, what do they get? They elect evil! In this case, evil had a standoff. So, we would hope that the Electoral College would do better by us, than we have—in terms of the contenders for the Presidential designation—by the Electoral College, the Congress, or whatever.

So, that's the situation.

Now, anybody who tries to get rid of the Electoral College process, who tries to short-circuit it, they will create a chaos, a constitutional chaos, which their children will curse them for,

for two decades or so to come. You might destroy the nation, by trying to overturn the Electoral College. The Electoral College route is the only way to ensure that *we do not create chaos*. So, whether you like it or not, stick with the Electoral College, and fight for the Electoral College to make a rational decision. That is the institution which goes to the next step, in selecting who will be the actual President. If they find no virtue in the Presidential contenders, they may look for the Vices, as the alternative to the lesser evil. Then, if the Electoral College fails, count on the Congress. It's a procedure. It will give us certainly something better than the mess we have now. Stick with it.

Origins of the Current Crisis

But, how did the present crisis come into being? How is it, that the United States, after spending the greatest amount of money on Presidential candidates ever seen—they even had to invent money for the purpose; there wasn't enough otherwise going around—how is it, with all the news media, and all that money, that all you could pick is two bums, who were described as comic-opera dictator-types, by the French, German, United Kingdom, and other leading press? And they knew what they were talking about. And why was the European press so upset about these two bums, these two bozos, running for President?

Go back a little bit in history. Remember that Kennedy was assassinated, and that Johnson got into trouble because he supported two Civil Rights bills, including his personal backing for pushing through the Voting Rights registration law, in 1965. At that time, the Republicans, led by Richard Nixon, came up with what's called the "Southern Strategy." Now, the Southern Strategy of Nixon, was to meet personally with Ku Klux Klan representatives, and people such as Trent Lott, who he considered an honorable, or dishonorable associate of the Ku Klux Klan. So, the Republican campaign for election in 1968, was based on an appeal to the Confederacy, of the legacy of the Confederacy. An appeal which was based largely on the racist rage at President Johnson for having pushed through the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

In the middle of the 1970s, the Democratic Party, in choosing Jimmy Carter as the candidate for the Democratic nomination and election, extended the Southern Strategy of Nixon, in a Democratic Party form, into the Democratic Party itself. Over the course of the period since the ousting of Jimmy Carter, who became disgusting to so many voters that he created "Reagan Democrats"—other than that, we've had a gradual takeover of the political institutions of the United States, the top level of the parties, and much of the political processes, by party machines, which were Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee. Both Democratic and Republican branches of the pro-racist Southern Strategy launched by later-President

Nixon, in 1966, in his meeting in Mississippi and elsewhere, with Klan representatives, and with people such as Trent Lott, who is now the Republican leader of the Senate.

The takeover of this process, of this party process—Republican and Democratic—amounted to a unification, in both parties, of Dixiecrats and Carpetbaggers. The Carpetbaggers being the Wall Street crowd, the upholders of what is called “shareholder value.”

In other words, if you go back to the Confederate Constitution of 1860–61, you’ll find that the Confederate Constitution is based on the arguments of the enemy of the United States, or the enemy of what the United States was founded to be: John Locke. And John Locke was for slavery, as was the Confederacy, and they were also for something which we call today, shareholder value. What has happened is, people in the upper 20% of the family-income brackets in the United States, are matched up with people who represent the pro-racist, Dixiecrat tradition. Now, these people in the upper 20%, generally are people in suburbia, who no longer produce agricultural goods—because the farmers don’t get any money; they can’t be in that upper bracket anymore—they’re not entrepreneurs, machine-tool operators, and others; they’re not the producers of physical goods—we ship that to slave labor overseas; we don’t employ people for that any more. These are people who live on things like financial services, selling real estate, things of that sort, which we used to consider fairly useless forms of employment, years ago, but which have the highest-paid positions in the United States today.

So you have people living in suburbia, who are talking about “*my* money, *my* investments.” How do they get their money? Well, they borrow most of it. That’s why they’re so much in debt. But they also get a little bit on the basis of their income, and they’re prepared to kill, virtually, in order to secure what they think is their advantage. Over this period of time, since the inauguration of Carter in 1977, the 80% of the lower family-income brackets, which used to represent an overwhelming majority of the national income of the nation as a whole, have now dropped to *much less* than is gained by the upper 20% of family-income brackets. And most of the family-income brackets, the higher levels, are engaged in occupations, which we would have thought of, say, before 35 years ago, as pretty much useless kinds of employment: paper shufflers, who don’t produce anything, but get overpaid.

So, this is the basic problem. This is what horrifies Europe. The fact that the United States is being run by a bunch of lunatics from suburbia, and from the tradition of the Dixiecrats. People who are lunatic, but who have become very powerful, because of their domination of the parties’ electoral process.

And so, the Wall Street financiers and lawyers, who have run the country, who are called the Establishment, ever since McKinley was shot, these people have dominated the country. The

makers and shakers. The makers and shakers, through the Southern Strategy, in the Democratic as well as the Republican Party, called into being a monster, which is comparable in many of its sociological features, to the Nazi Party in Germany. This machine, these fanatics from suburbia, these fanatics about shareholder value, these fanatics, who are really racist, or something similar, of similar disposition, they have become a political machine, like the Nazi machine.

The Nazis were brought to power by bankers, and a bankers' group. Bankers in London, bankers in New York, such as Harriman, were the ones who funded Hitler's rise to power. But, by 1936, after Hitler had successfully occupied the Rhineland, the Nazi machine had gone out of control, and the bankers who had called it to power, could not get rid of it. And we ended up, beginning 1936, preparing for the war we fought, because of this Nazi phenomenon, whose echo, equivalent in the United States, is this union of the Southern Strategy crowd in both the Republican and the Democratic Parties.

So, therefore, this was the essential corruption: The party system is *morally corrupt*, because it is a creature largely controlled by these madmen, these lunatics, these fanatics, typified by Trent Lott, the Republican leader of the Senate, who have taken over the political machines. They're determined to exert their power at any cost. They're not rational. They're not in the real world. And, as they say, as you see with HMOs, with medical practice, with pensions, with the welfare conditions, with community conditions, these people are prepared to loot the people of the United States, to defend them, and to make them richer. It's a very dangerous crowd.

And that's the essential corruption.

The Worst Financial Crisis

Now, the second point of corruption, under the roots of the present crisis, is the fact that we face the worst financial crisis, worldwide, in three centuries of the history of European civilization. *And it's coming on now.* As of sometime very soon, probably half of the people in the upper 20% of family-income brackets, in the United States, will be, in effect, on the streets, bankrupt, with no prospect of employment. Correspondingly, the people of the lower-income brackets, will become increasingly destitute, as a worse depression, far worse than that of 1929–31, hits in the weeks now oncoming, onrushing. This financial crisis can not be prevented. It can be attacked, it can be cured. But it is coming, it is unstoppable. And all the news talk about "it's a soft landing," is nonsense. You're going to have the hardest landing European civilization has seen in three centuries; it's coming on fast, right now.

None of these issues were allowed to be discussed in the election campaign, by the Presidential candidates. They were addressed in passing once or twice, and the candidates ducked the issue. So, the real issues which face the American people, *and the world*, were not mentioned by people running for the highest office of the United States, presumably the most powerful nation in the world. That's corruption. Not answering the question that should be on everybody's mind.

The United States, also, is in a terrible situation strategically. Now, some of you may recall that in October of 1988, October 12th, Columbus Day, I gave an address in Berlin, in Germany. The subject of that address, which was later rebroadcast, on a national television program, in October of that year, was my forecast that, in the immediate future, we would see an economic disintegration of what had been called the Soviet system, starting in Eastern Europe. And that we would foresee for the immediate future, the reunification of Germany, with the reestablishment, at some early future time, of Berlin as the capital of the reunited Germany.

At that time, I indicated the policies which should have been followed. Now, those policies were not followed. The only good thing that happened, is, Vernon Walters, who was the Ambassador of the United States to Germany at the time, managed to persuade George Bush not to go along fully, with Mad Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of England. So, things were not as bad as they could have become, because of Vernon Walters' warning to President Bush. But, otherwise, Bush did everything wrong.

Now, what happened as a result, was that the United Kingdom, then represented by Thatcher, and the United States, represented by Bush, set into motion an attempt to set up an Anglo-American world empire. That is, as a result of these developments of 1989 through 1992, every nation in the world which had been a part of NATO, or otherwise an ally of the United States, was degraded into second-class world citizenship. As we saw in the case of Desert Storm, as we saw in the recent Balkan developments, and we see now, that important allies, like Japan, Germany, France, and so forth, were degraded to mere satrapies, mere errand boys, who would do as the Americans told them.

The same thing was done in South and Central America. A horrible genocide was unleashed in Africa, under the backing of the British and other legacies of the Bush Administration. Similar things were done to nations in Asia. Al Gore was part of that problem, at a later point.

So, the United States has been living as an oppressive empire in the eyes of the world, on the backs of not only the nations of Central and South America, and Africa, and Asia, but also

on our closest former allies in Europe. There's a deep resentment, and even growing hatred, against Washington, around the world, because of this policy.

We face the point, that in the very near future, the American dollar will probably collapse by as much as 40%, in a fairly rapid order, as this crisis takes over. We now have a current account deficit, running probably at about \$600 billion a year. We're keeping the U.S. markets afloat, by stealing over \$3 trillion a year, sucked into the United States to support Wall Street. When the U.S. dollar collapses, the effect of the current account deficit, and the effects of the withdrawal of those financial supports from abroad, will collapse the U.S. The U.S. will then be in a situation, where we desperately need partners and friends abroad, to work with us to put the United States, as well as other nations, back together in this same way.

We are in a situation which is described by the great English poet, Shelley, in his poem *Ozymandias*. The United States, the world's greatest superpower, at the apparent peak of its power, is about to collapse into the desert sand, its parts strewn upon the desert, and a sign, "Behold all you, my wonder, the wonder of my power." That's where we're at.

To fail to recognize this is the situation, is a form of corruption.

At the same time, in the United States generally, the lower 80% of family-income brackets have been suffering increasingly over the past nearly quarter-century, as you see in the clear figures. The conditions of life, of senior citizens, of the so-called minority groups, and others, the conditions of labor, the conditions of farmers, the conditions of lower-income communities, everything is getting worse, and rapidly. Life itself is becoming precarious, and *nobody behind the Presidential candidacies, cared*. No one addressed that problem, and proposed measures to solve it. They proposed to give a few handouts, maybe, to the slaves at the back door of the white-painted mansion, *nothing else*. That is corruption.

Now, we have some lessons we can learn from the past, which are relevant to the future. I shall deal with two types. First of all, certain lessons from past experience.

Three Lessons from History: Revive the FDR Precedent

The United States was ruined, as a result of the election of Teddy Roosevelt. Teddy Roosevelt and Wilson were Southern-born boys, with Southern pro-racist legacies. As a matter of fact, Wilson himself was a supporter of the Ku Klux Klan. And while he was President in the White House, he launched the second revival of the Ku Klux Klan, which was bigger than the first one. The Ku Klux Klan of the 1920s and the early 1930s, was the

Woodrow Wilson Klan, which he launched officially and publicly from the White House. So, they weren't too good.

Coolidge was no better. Andrew Mellon, who was the thing that is being imitated by poor Alan Greenspan, was evil and powerful.

Under these Presidents and their policies, over the period 1901 until 1931, the United States was ruined, step by step, ending up in the Great Depression of 1921–1931. Along came a candidate, Franklin Roosevelt, a cousin of, but absolutely different from his cousin Teddy, who turned the thing around.

Roosevelt addressed the common man. Roosevelt addressed the needs of the "Forgotten Man." Roosevelt revived the policies on which the United States was founded, which you can read in the first three paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence, and in the Preamble of the Constitution: the concept of the general welfare. That is, the only legitimate basis for government is the efficient commitment of government, to promote the general welfare of each and all of the people and their posterity. That's what Roosevelt insisted upon. That the United States government must use its legitimate authority, as the promoter and protector of the general welfare, as well as of the national defense, in order to attack the problems represented by the Depression, and to reverse the rot, which had been created by Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, and Andrew Mellon.

We face a similar problem today. We came out of World War II. Roosevelt died, unfortunately. So, the things that he planned to do, were not fully done. But some good things were done, especially in the relations between the United States and Europe, from about 1945 through 1965. As a result of that cooperation with Europe and the United States, the United States prospered from its relations with Europe, and Europe prospered from the cooperation of the United States. We did well. Our conditions of life in the United States improved. The general welfare improved. The standard of living improved, despite all the bad things that did happen. But in net effect, we progressed.

Then, in 1966, we began to go downhill. Not fast at first, but we went downhill. We've been going downhill ever since, under the influence of the Southern Strategy, which has taken over the control of both the Republican and Democratic parties at the top.

So, today, we've come to the same kind of situation, in which the United States, which had been successful, was ruined, by the adoption of bad policies, under bad leaders. Just as we had Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Coolidge earlier, we've had Nixon, Carter, George Bush, since. These Presidents have ruined us now, as the Presidencies earlier before Roosevelt ruined us then. So the obvious answer, is to learn from the lessons of history, and

recognize that it was a great mistake ever to depart from those principles which Franklin Roosevelt used to lift the United States out of a Great Depression, to defend it in war, and to lift it to the prosperity we came to enjoy, increasingly, over the 20 years immediately following the war.

What is needed is a return to those policies, and *to overturn*, repudiate, scrap, junk, eliminate, those policies of Dixiecrats and Carpetbaggers, the policies of slaveholder and shareholder values.

In the postwar period, we had problems in reconstruction. Roosevelt was for eliminating all colonies, specifically the Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French colonies, and to establish these areas which had been colonized, as independent nations, with cooperation from the United States of the type we gave to Europe in the postwar period. For the development of these newly independent nations, into truly prospering republics. We didn't do that, because Churchill opposed it. When Roosevelt died, Truman, under Churchill's pressure, immediately used various military force, to restore colonial power on nations which had freed themselves temporarily, from colonialism during the war.

We have that policy today. We treat South America, Africa, and parts of Asia as colonies. They are being neo-colonized in a way typified by the genocide which the United States and British are conducting with U.S. military and other means *in Africa, and the genocide in Africa is one of the most horrible spectacles in this planet today.*

The problem we faced during the war, was a result of the same kind of situation. Montagu Norman, who was for a period of time the head of the Bank of England, who was a controller of the Averell Harriman interests in the United States, was the man behind Hitler. It was Montagu Norman who brought Hitler to power in Germany, with the support of Averell Harriman, of the Harriman clan. That's the clan of George Bush and some other people. That was done.... The way in which it was done, is important to recall today.

At the end of 1932, people in Germany had already adopted a policy for dealing with the Great Depression. This policy was formulated by an organization called the Friedrich List Society, or, in German, Friedrich-List-Gesellschaft. This group had made a policy called the Lautenbach Plan, for doing the same thing, in effect, that Roosevelt did for the recovery in the United States. That is, to use the public credit, to create mass employment, to create an economic revival, in infrastructure and other means.

Hitler was on the downslide at the end of 1932, because of various reasons. But, in this period, the Germans brought to power a man, Kurt von Schleicher, who was for a time the Chancellor of Germany. And if he had remained in power, until Roosevelt, who had just

been elected in the United States, became President in March of 1933, there would have been no World War II. Because if von Schleicher had remained in power, Germany would have been a partner of the United States, in a worldwide recovery. The Nazi Party would have vanished, and no war. No great penalty.

But that didn't happen. Montagu Norman, with the backing of Averell Harriman and his friends in New York, including the father of George Bush, the later President, the grandfather of Gov. George Bush. Now I don't know if Gov. George Bush knows what a grandfather is—but, in any case, nonetheless, he is the grandson of the person who worked with Averell Harriman, to bring Adolf Hitler to power in Germany under the leadership of Montagu Norman.

So, you don't have much confidence, naturally, in a Bush candidacy, a Bush Presidency, do you?

But in any case, the lesson to be learned is, that you must act always, when you see something coming, like the Nazis in Germany, or like the takeover of the United States in the form expressed by this election scandal, this election crisis, by the Bush-Gore duo, Tweedle-dum and Tweedle-dee (and George Bush obviously is Tweedle-dum); when you see that, you say, "Stop it now, before it's too late. Learn the lesson of Hitler." If we had stopped Hitler when we could have, by supporting von Schleicher, and preventing the Harriman clan from pushing Hitler into power in Germany in January of 1933, we would have never had World War II, and the horrors of the Nazi show. *Stop it now before it's too late.* And stop it with the kind of policies which—FDR may not have been perfect, but he typifies still today, the state of mind, the attitude, that a President must have, to lead this nation out of this kind of crisis. And we can do it again.

A Strategic Model: How Russia Defeated Napoleon

Let me give you one example from history. A page from history, from strategic history, which typifies what is required of us today.

In the beginning of the 19th Century, a Napoleon Bonaparte, who was in a sense—he was the first modern fascist, Napoleon Bonaparte. Of course, he had better military qualifications than Benito Mussolini, but otherwise he was very much of the same mind, of the same policy. Napoleon became very quickly, as Emperor, a tyrant, subjecting all Europe to an empire modelled upon that of the Caesars, even introducing old Roman law as the Code Napoléon to France. This tyranny of Napoleon, looting France of its own bodies, looting the neighboring countries, became a tyrant as bad as Hitler was in our time.

And the time came, in 1812, when Napoleon decided to teach Russia a lesson, and to break its will, as he had most of the other nations of Europe.

At that point, some Germans, including those very close to Friedrich Schiller, volunteered, with the blessing of Gerhard Scharnhorst, the leader of the German military, to volunteer for Russian military service, to assist the Tsar, and Russia, in defeating Napoleon.

Now, for that purpose, the German advisers, including a fellow called von Wolzogen, who was an in-law of Friedrich Schiller, devised a policy, which was later revived after the beginning of World War II, by the Soviets in defending the Soviet Union against the Nazi invasion, the same policy. And that was to take a daring strategic effort to draw—don't fight Napoleon at the borders of Russia; draw him, step by step, back into the depths of Russia. Lure him to Moscow. Let him go into Moscow, a city which had already been mined, to destroy the city and burn it down around Napoleon's ears. Do this in the wintertime. Catch Napoleon without resources. Force him to retreat. And then take the Russian army, which you had refused to spend on taking him on earlier, follow his rear and crush him!

This tactic succeeded. And it led to a great battle at Leipzig, called the Battle of the Nations, at which the power of Napoleon was broken almost permanently. And the follow-on battles eliminated Napoleon's power in Europe forever. That was the first war against fascism. It was fought against Napoleon, and successfully.

But what I want to point out to you about this strategy, is that to conduct that kind of strategy—and the Tsar of Russia was very frightened by what was proposed to him, by von Wolzogen and others—it took nerve, to have the courage to retreat. It took nerve, to give up territory to Napoleon's army. It took nerve, to mine the city of Moscow and burn it down around Napoleon's ears. It took nerve not to fight a battle too soon, or not to fight a decisive battle too soon. It required a clear head, clear ideas, correct ideas, and *a steady nerve*.

'Partners of America': A 25-Year Perspective

Now we're coming into the worst financial crisis in all modern European experience. It's coming on fast now. There are clear solutions. It is not a desperate or impossible situation, itself. The only impossible thing about this situation is the fact that we have the two worst dummies in the world contending for the position of President of the United States. And the desperate thing is, we must somehow get the United States into cooperation, not only with the nations of western Europe, but also Russia, with China, Japan, Korea, other nations of the ASEAN Plus Three group, and nations who are south of our borders, to end the adverse relationships among us, to bring us together for a common cause. To take the old rotten, stinking IMF, and the bankrupt banking systems, and to pull together by agreement, to put

these things in order, to create a new international monetary order, of cooperation among all these partner-nations, and to set forth, to stabilize the situation, and to launch the kind of growth which Franklin Roosevelt had *intended* to be U.S. policy, had he not died prematurely at the end of the war. We must have this kind of partnership.

What is needed is a policy which I might call Partners of America, in which this nation corrects its great error, the error typified by the very existence of the Southern Strategy's control over our two political parties. Let us take the fact of the crisis, the fact of the crash, the fact of the financial disaster, to recognize that this disaster proves, that we have been swindled by party leaderships, by organizations, and by a press which has lied to us, and that this financial crash *proves that everything they've been saying is wrong*: that shareholder value is wrong. That slaveholder value is wrong. That Dixiecrats and Carpetbaggers are wrong, old-style or new-style. To reassert, as Roosevelt reasserted the American principle, in the conditions of depression then, in the financial crisis now, respond to the crisis by mobilizing, to pull this nation together, to give it a President and a Congress which functions. Maybe we could intimidate some of these Congressmen into becoming good—sometimes it's the best way to educate them.

And to enter into *partnership*, rather than adversity, with our friends in Europe, and Japan, Africa, Asia, South America, Central America. To cooperate, to build up trade, to stop this stealing. And to establish as a principle, like a beacon that everybody in the world can know, that we nations agree, as the foundation of our new global partnership, we agree that the only efficient authority, the only moral authority, of government, of sovereign government, is its efficient commitment to promote the general welfare of *all* of its people, and their posterity. And to engage with one another, as nations, in promoting the common welfare of us all.

On that basis, if we take along view, of the great financial mess around us, we're going to have to put things into bankruptcy reorganization. We're going to have to wipe out this and that; we're going to have to manage to make sure people don't go hungry. We're going to have to keep firms going, communities functioning, all of those kinds of things you do in a crisis like this. And it's going to take us 25 years, of long-term, steady investment in infrastructure, in new industries, in improved technologies, and in trade, to build up the kind of world which we want to build. A world we bequeath to those children who will come to adulthood 25 years from now. And we as grandparents, or great-grandparents, can take satisfaction, that what we're doing today, is for that purpose. And we can look forward into the future, and see the happy faces of those who will bless us for what we've done.

We will live, we will survive. It'll be tough times, but we'll make it. And take that attitude.

The Constitutional Questions

Now, what I want to read to you just briefly is this prepared statement, on the constitutional question. And I've written it in this form, to be precise, so that this can be properly placed before relevant institutions, particularly in the United States. It's as follows:

Two constitutional questions are posed to us at this juncture. Considering the present circumstances, in which this election-crisis has erupted, does the U.S. have both the right, and the obligation, to pause now for calm, sane, and sober reflection, during these weeks the Electoral College is being prepared: to consider the implications of that present danger both to the very existence of our constitutional republic and the welfare of the world at large? Have we the national will, as well as the constitutional right, to consider thus the causes of that vast corruption which permeated the process leading into the Presidential election-crisis of November 7th?

My reading of the intent of the framers of the U.S. Constitution, my reading of the circumstances of the choice of Thomas Jefferson over Aaron Burr, the selection of President John Quincy Adams, and the Tilden-Hayes crisis, indicates that we have not only precisely that right, and also that solemn obligation, to the founders of our republic, to our Constitution, and to our posterity, and to the world within which we have exerted great power, to use the means which our Constitution has prepared for like contingencies, to ensure the continued existence of our republic according to that solemn, constitutional intent to promote the general welfare, that commitment to the common good, upon which the very existence of our republic was premised.

Thank you.

Questions & Answers

LaRouche's seminar was attended by some 115 people, including diplomatic representatives, trade unionists, religious leaders, and the media. Questions were asked by many of those present, as well as by people calling in from cities around the world. The following is a selection of the discussion.

The American Electoral Crisis

Adviser to the Ukrainian Parliament: Mr. LaRouche, in a recently broadcast television show called Tishden, "The Week," one of the best-known Ukrainian political observers said that the American democracy, which has been proven valid repeatedly in history, and which is an eternal example for the rest of the world, now finds itself in a dead-end street, because of the ongoing electoral crisis. Do you agree with this? Could you please comment?

LaRouche: Yes, I'll just refer to what I said briefly before, as the best way of getting at it.

Leading people in Europe, who frequently travel to high-level places in Washington or New York, know this very well, and it frightens them because they know it. They know, that the fascist mob, based on the Southern Strategy, this alliance I referred to of Dixiecrats and Carpetbaggers, has taken over the United States, and is extremely dangerous. They also know that the people who called this monster into being, just like Montagu Norman called Hitler into being in Germany, that those people are no longer in control of this mob which they created. It's like the famous story of the Rabbi of Prague, whose wife, when the Rabbi went on a trip, his wife tried to do magic tricks, and created a Golem. And this Golem was going to help her do the housework, and he destroyed the house. And the Rabbi came back and turned the whole thing off.

And what we have in Wall Street, is a bunch of dumb people, who, like the wife of the Rabbi of Prague, created a Golem. This Golem is called the Southern Strategy, the alliance of suburbanites and fascists and whatnot, and racists, and this crowd is out of control. And because Wall Street has not got a competent hand on the world economy, and because this mob has taken over, our system of government is corrupted, top to bottom, by the presence of this monster. And Europeans are *terrified*, of the idea that the United States, as a superpower, should be taken over by this Golem, this bunch of hooligans, typified by a guy who is, at very best, a Ku Klux Klan freak, fellow-traveller, Trent Lott, the Republican head of the Senate. Who is a part of this package of Ku Klux Klanners, who met with Nixon back in 1966, and so forth, in Mississippi, who followed the Southern Strategy. When you realize that you're talking about right-wingers, and you've got genuine fascists of this type, in the United States, in both the Republican and Democratic party, and that the Bush candidacy, and the Gore candidacy, are both based on the control of the party system by these types, then you realize what the problem of democracy is in the United States.

And thus, I would ask our friends abroad, to have some compassionate insight to the mess we have to clean up here. And that when they find that the United States does bad things, maybe they should take that into account, and not hold us all to account for it, because we're suffering from it, too. Maybe we should just get together, and combine forces, to get rid of that monster.

Voting Rights Violations Before Election Day

Debra Freeman: We also have a question, Lyn, from the staff of the United States Congressional Black Caucus. They actually have two questions. One is directly on the election, the other is on the question of the global financial system. On the election, the question is: "There are allegations of serious violations of the Voting Rights Act committed

prior to last Tuesday's election. Is there any way that this can be addressed now? It does not seem that the Electoral College procedure provides for this. Is it conceivable that the President form a high-level bipartisan commission, to investigate the very question of the legitimacy of what occurred *prior to* last Tuesday?"

LaRouche: It may be necessary to do, in the form of just that. Let me take this first, and then get the second question. It may be necessary to do just that. Remember, that was done in the Tilden-Hayes case, back in the 1870s, in which the President supported the formation of a commission to investigate the questions of vote fraud and vote irregularities in that national Presidential election. Something of that sort is needed.

Now, we should not think of the Electoral College as a rubber stamp for the candidates; it is not. In half the states, it is supposedly semi-controlled by the candidates, in commitment, but in the other half of the states, it is *not*. So, if the Electoral College is aware, or made aware, of the fact that the hoax is not a question of cheating by somebody in some election—the cheating on both sides is enormous.

For example, in the case of my campaign in the state of Arkansas, for the Presidential nomination, 23% of the vote was *openly* stolen from me, *openly!* After counted and cast, by Al Gore. And similar things happened elsewhere. When you see that kind of operation in the primary process, and in the general election, you don't say you're going to take a case to court and prove the election went one way or the other. If you wanted to conduct an inquiry into this election, I don't think it would take less than *years* to get to the bottom of the level of the corruption run by the two contending corrupt people, and their machines. The corruption in this election was beyond belief. I don't think there's one or two, or five or ten, little cases of investigation of this county or that county, that's going to get to the bottom of the mess.

However, if the Electoral College is persuaded that it is the victim of a hoax, not on the basis of who chose the members of the Electoral College, but if it is convinced, in its conscience, that the American people and the Electoral College system are the victim of an electoral *hoax*, involving the partisans of both candidates, and the hoax is so dirty and so messy nobody can clean it up in fair time, by January 20th, then it is the duty of the Electoral College to make its own independent decision about who the next President should be! That would mean, in my view, that the Electoral College can select a candidate as President, who is *neither* Al Gore nor George Bush. And if that is not the case in the Electoral College, it is true in the Congress. If the mess goes into the Congress without a clear Electoral College decision, then the mess goes into the Congress, and the Congress has much broader explicit ability to select a President.

So, we have not yet determined, by vote or anything else, who the next President will be. Counting the votes will not tell you who the next President is going to be! You have to take into account the corruption, the mass of the corruption.

What if you know the whole election is so corrupt, you can't *do* anything with it in time to select a President? Then you have to do something else. Because you must preserve the Constitution and representative government. If you *don't* do that—. Imagine if you elect either of these bums. What happens? Nobody in the world will have any respect for a United States who's elected as a President, somebody who qualifies, in the opinion of the leading European press, of being a petty comic-opera dictator of a banana republic! And that's the way that a Bush or Gore Administration will be viewed by the world as a whole.

Do you want the United States prisoner to that kind of a reputation for a sitting President? For four years, until you can impeach him? So, therefore, is it now the responsibility, as our Constitution provides, that we set reflective stages of the process, which is a process of review, by responsible agencies, of any error that was made in the proceeding step. Who must, with due process, and due haste, as well, proceed to find a solution. I say—insist—back up, organize. The decision must not be made in the courts by all these squabbles about this vote, or that vote. You'll never get to the bottom of it that quickly. Instead, insist that the Electoral College do a good job. And if it can't handle the job, pass it to the Congress, as the law prescribes. And work on the Congress, and the Electoral College, to ensure that they take into account everything they should.

Now, obviously, all the evidence, like the fraud against me, the open vote-stealing by Al Gore—openly, shamelessly—and all these other things show, that the moral turpitude which pervades both candidacies—, you want to impeach a President on charges of moral turpitude? Why not get rid of him before you put him in there, if you've got the evidence? And that's the first question. I think that's the way to go.

Toward a New, Just Financial System

Freeman: Their second question, Lyn: “Mr. LaRouche, you've repeatedly called on President Clinton to take steps to initiate the formation of a new, more just financial system. My question to you is in two parts: If President Clinton should fail to take such action, during the remainder of his term, can Congress initiate such a process? And on the other side, in the event that President Clinton does move in the direction, could a Republican Congress block him, or is it in his power to do it without them?”

LaRouche: What I'm doing today, and why this is an international press conference, in effect, is because, at this point, largely because of the onrushing financial crisis, and because

the world is horrified by the spectacle of what happened in the election on November 7, and before, that none of the above candidates have any credibility as President of the United States. To put them in charge of the United States, is to drag the United States down into the pit, simply by doing so. You have Presidents who command no respect in the nation. Remember, people voted for them—not *for* them; they voted *against* the other guy. They voted for the lesser evil, and they got evil. They can now reconsider that.

The reason I'm doing this, is, in this process, I've acquired a considerable amount of intellectual influence and credit, in high-level circles, as well as others, throughout the world. Many people will tend to agree with many of the things I say, but none of them so far, have put forward what I've outlined to you today: the indications of general solution, which is feasible, and practical, and based upon precedent, by which we ought to address this general problem of international crisis, and related things.

It is my hope that by my doing this—and I see nobody else who is presently situated to do what I'm doing right now—that my doing this will cause people to begin to move. I think that most of the serious politicians in the Congress and elsewhere in the United States, will not really privately disagree with much of what I've had to say. They know it's true. Everybody in top circles in the United States, knows what I've said about the Southern Strategy, is absolutely true, that is, in both parties. That the Presidents and Wall Street and everything else, are now political prisoners of the Southern Strategy, a fascist, Nazi-like movement. And they would like to get rid of it.

So, I'm doing what I can to inspire that action, and I'm taking the spear on this. You know, what I've said tonight, has put my life in the cross-hairs. But I'm 78 years old; I'm probably ten years younger in terms of biological condition and so forth, but it's kind of risky. But, since that's the kind of business I'm in, I take those kinds of risks; that goes with the job, as they say.

So, I think that what we have to do is realize, that you can not get a real satisfactory solution to this crisis, unless you engage the United States with Europe, and if you can do that, to engage the United States in cooperation with groups like the ASEAN-Plus-3, Russia, and people in Africa, people in Central and South America: In that case, we can do the job.

To do the job without enlisting the office of the President of the United States, is extremely difficult. As far as Bill Clinton is concerned, between now and January 20th, if you could get a movement among some Congressmen, which were capable of pushing such an initiative, I think Bill Clinton would join it. And you wouldn't have a problem.

Bill Clinton, you remember, in September of 1998, made a speech in New York City, in which he indicated his readiness to consider reforms of the international financial system. I think that *personally*, he's not averse to such things, if he thinks he's got the backing. He's a very political guy, as some of you may have observed. And with the signs of adequate backing, and if he didn't think they were going to shoot him on the following morning, I think he might do it.

And therefore, I would say, don't ignore the Congress. But don't count on the Congress as an institution to do the job. You can count on people in the Congress to set a fire under the President, a supporting fire, as they say, under the President—like supporting fire under a mule you want to get off his butt. That might work. And that's very good idea. And I think the possibilities are considerable, especially as this crisis gets worse. It's not going to get any better. People who are still clamoring, "Well, my man should get elected, don't want Bush elected, I don't want Gore elected;" that kind of thing is going to die out. And people are going to get the idea, fighting for either candidate's cause, is not a worthy, profitable cause. We've got to take other courses of action. And I think putting pressure on institutions, in the Congress and elsewhere, to set a fire under the President, under President Clinton, to do what he can do in this direction—and if we could get echoes of this from people in Asia, South and Central America, but particularly Asia, Russia, and western Europe, I think we could pull it off.

Now, the President is going to be meeting at about this time, with the President of Russia. There's an agreement that has been reached, initiated through Germany and Russia, between the Chancellor of Germany, Gerhard Schröder, and Putin, Vladimir Putin, the President of Russia. This agreement provides for a 20-year cooperation of oil-for-technology exchanges between Russia and western Europe. This agreement has been extended under the auspices of the President of the European Commission, Prodi, to include other European nations. This can follow very quickly the type of agreement that was made by some signators in the 1920s, called the Rapallo Pact, in which certain Europeans had entered into an agreement with the minister of Russia, Chicherin, to this kind of cooperation: technology for Russian exports.

This is a very sound project from the standpoint of Russia's interests at this time, and from the standpoint of western Europe in particular. It is important to the United States that such agreement is being reached, because the United States' trade relations with Europe are crucial for the United States itself. A healthy Europe is essential to the United States.

Under those conditions, Japan, Korea, China, the ASEAN-Plus-3 group, in general, would be in a position to cooperate. So we might, by this route, and by pressure and thinking in those directions, we might bring into being, quite feasibly, the circumstances by which we

can pull this off. And I think we should watch very closely what the discussion between the two Presidents, Putin and Clinton, is, in this immediate time frame. A good discussion between them, on this kind of issue—economic cooperation—could be a very important added factor, in light of the existing discussions among Russia, China, Japan, Korea, and so forth in that area, and India, and so forth.

So, I think the possibilities are great. The idea of a 25-year global long-term credit agreement, among a group of nations, of swaps for technology, and raw materials and so forth, around the world, this kind of agreement is a very viable agreement; it's the one thing that can work to get the world out of the present financial crisis.

The U.S. Role in Africa

African diplomat: Good afternoon. Dr. LaRouche, thank you very much, indeed, for the lecture. It's quite obvious that the American election has somewhat altered the scenario, not only immediately, but in the near future. I'm very much interested to know, how you see the world political and economic system, and the role that the United States can play, in the next two years, following these elections, with particular reference to Africa, in terms of debt and AIDS, and democratization, and also with particular reference to the Middle East. Thank you.

LaRouche: I think—as you're experienced, you know something about these things—that sometimes you take a principle, and you try to find the practical road of least resistance to get the thing in operation. Now, in this case, in the case of Africa in particular, from my own experience in doing studies, and plans, and proposals for development of Africa, and looking back to it, I see that what President Franklin Roosevelt threatened Churchill with, on African development, in his meeting with Churchill at Casablanca, is a place at which to start. Why? First of all, this is the policy of a President of the United States, who is one of its authentic heroes, President Franklin Roosevelt. Secondly, the time has come when the anti-Roosevelt slanders—Roosevelt-haters are about to get a big slap in the face from reality, and therefore, a U.S. population, particularly the lower 80%, who are suffering as much as they are, will encourage a return to the policies of Franklin Roosevelt, saying, "He got us out of the Depression. These guys put us back in one. We're going back to his policies." And therefore, in that light, the American people, in that condition, will tend to have confidence in the kind of policies for which we can cite a precedent from the policies of the United States, the Roosevelt Presidency.

And therefore, what I would do, is, I would simply say, what the United States should think of, in cooperation with its partners, in various parts of the world—Africa's major problem, as we discussed this, the major problem is the lack of basic economic infrastructure. That is, we

need, for example, as I said many years ago: From Dakar to Djibouti and Port Sudan, we need a corridor, an East-West corridor of modern transportation, water management; that such a route would be crucial along the Sahel region area, for bringing back that whole section of Africa, into the conditions for very significant rates of the development of agriculture and other things. We need similar things from North-South, and so forth. I think that these questions of power, of large-scale power systems, large-scale transportation systems, large-scale water-management systems, and so forth, that these things— And remember also, that we had another problem, which relates to this right now; it's an added problem, the problem of epidemic disease: As a result of the conditions, which the past years' U.S. and other policy, IMF policy, has imposed on Africa, we have turned Africa into the breeding place, for the spread of new types, as well as old types, of pandemics and epidemics. The entire planet, as the recent CIA and National Security Council reports indicate, the United States itself is now threatened by a major strategic threat from the spread of pandemic and epidemic disease. The greatest concentration of this disease, is, naturally, in the poorest area, especially in the tropical disease belt of Africa, in the wake of wars and devastation of other kinds, and poverty. And therefore, we have to realize, that not only are we going in to help Africa, by helping with support with grants and other ways, to support Africa, so that Africa is able to undertake these large-scale infrastructure projects, which it desperately needs, as a precondition for any successful economic development, as Roosevelt indicated in the Casablanca address. But we must also recognize, that the frontier, the world frontier for fighting against the spread of a deadly—strategically deadly—spread of epidemic and pandemic disease, is in Africa.

If we understand our own best self-interest, *right here in the United States and Europe, we are going to get on those fighting lines, mobilize the forces to fight the disease where it comes from.* That's, I think, the way to approach it.

How To Revive the Mideast Peace Process

Freeman: Lyn, the next question is from *Esam Elborei Albayan* newspaper, in the United Arab Emirates.

Q: Hello, Mr. LaRouche. The current crisis, obviously, will be reflected on the credibility of the next President, whoever he is. There's an idea circulating that Bill Clinton probably will continue his intermediation in the Middle East, even under a new administration. A new President will be susceptible to blackmail from pressure groups in the United States, because he will start with a situation, that is, that reflects a lack of credibility. How do you think the situation in the Middle East will evolve under such a vacuum of the influence of the United States?

LaRouche: Well, let's say that President Clinton made a great mistake in handling the Camp David discussions with Ehud Barak and Chairman Arafat: that he did the one thing, he make the one mistake, which spoiled everything else. There had been progress in the discussions, along the lines of the Oslo Accord. There was a sentiment among many of us, that the murder of Rabin should not be rewarded, by giving in to the policies for which Rabin's murderers had fought. We could not let Rabin's murderers dictate the policy of the world, and the United States in particular.

Now, it's true that Prime Minister Barak had gotten himself into a difficult situation, in which he himself was under death threat from the same people that had killed Rabin, many of whom are based in the United States, and are found among those associated with the influence of Edgar Bronfman, the man who backed [East German dictator Erich] Honecker in the last years of Honecker's career—a failed effort.

But, the point is, despite the fact that Barak may have excuses, in the fact that he was acting as he did under *death threat* from the forces associated with Sharon, but also from the forces associated with the hard core of the Dixiecrats in the United States. The basic problem with the so-called Temple Mount phenomenon, the attempt to take back the holy places in Jerusalem, and give them over to these fanatics: This does not come from Jews! There may be Jewish factions—nominally Jewish factions—who tend to be rallied into this, but the threat comes from certain American fundamentalist Protestants, who are organized around this idea of an Armageddon. They want to have the Battle of Armageddon now, so they don't have to pay their rent next month, or something. These kinds of fanatics, these dangerous fanatics are typical of the racist element in the United States, the Southern Strategy types, the Dixiecrat types. We know them: the Falwells, the Robertsons, these loose-geese fanatics all over the place, are dangerous.

Thus, the problem here, is, the United States can not act as an "honest broker" in the Middle East. The United States, and the President of the United States, must never become an honest broker. The President must be President of the United States, and represent the fundamental interests of the United States in any negotiation in which he deals.

Now it happens that the fundamental interest of the United States, in the Middle East, is peace. And the fundamental interest of the United States in peace in the Middle East, is development. Because, look, for example, in the Palestine area now: You have less water available in the aquifers than there are people existing. How the devil can you divide the land? It's the water that's the problem. There's not enough water! People are moving in from Brooklyn, and elsewhere, into new settlements. The Palestinians wish to return to their

homeland. Where's the water? *Where's the water?* The Middle East has lots of land. But look at it. Fly in a plane over it, as you know it well. Desert, desert, desert! Where's the water?

We have the ability to make the water. We have the technologies to produce masses of water, to turn the desert into—to make it bloom. If we create that kind of optimism, then we can have peace, or a basis for peace.

The interest of the United States, is to say: We've had—from the time of the Grand Mufti, who was a British agent, with Nazi clothes—we've had a state of warfare which did not previously exist among Jews and Arabs in the Middle East. It didn't exist. This state of warfare, has gone on, for how many years? It's gone on since World War II, as an active state of warfare. It has never really stopped. We've had interruptions, but it's gotten worse now than it ever was before, because of these fanatics, who are loose, the fanatics who killed Rabin, and who have threatened to kill Barak, if he didn't do what Sharon wanted.

What we need is peace. We need peace, as we needed peace in Europe during the period of the Thirty Years' War.

The interests of the United States, is to force peace, in a situation dominated by what is recognizably *religious warfare*. In the case of religious warfare, the one mistake you never make, is, you never make the possession of holy places, a matter of political negotiation. The holy places must be left *intact. Untouched*. Untouched by political power. The only thing the politicians must do, is, they must work to ensure access to the holy places. They must never touch them. They must never claim to *own them*, or *manage them*. As long as you insist that the holy places must be part of the negotiation in a Middle East agreement, *you are fomenting war*.

And that's exactly what happened.

When President Clinton made the mistake of trying to act as an honest broker, instead of President of the United States, and took an otherwise workable agreement, as an interim agreement, negotiated that, then *added to that, the insanity, of bringing a political negotiation over the holy places into the discussion, the whole thing blew up*. And we now have a full-blown, potential religious war developing in the Middle East.

The solution to that, is not, how do you force a peace on the Middle East? The solution in this, is for the United States to act as a sovereign nation. And what Clinton is—he represents a sovereign nation; what's out there in the wings trying to get in, does not necessarily represent that. But, what Clinton should do, if he wants to bring peace, as a first step—you can't guarantee you're going to get peace by any action, but you have to take the position,

which the United States itself should take, which is the first step toward bringing peace. And that is, President Clinton should say, he made a big mistake, by opening his big, fat mouth about the holy places, and for blaming Arafat for breaking up the negotiations, because Arafat did what he had to do. *Arafat could not live ten minutes*, if he had agreed to that condition, demanded by Barak, and supported by Clinton. Religious war would have been inevitable, as the immediate outcome of it. Worse than what we have now. By Arafat rejecting that demand, he may have postponed the full-scale outbreak of religious war.

We, of the United States, must take the position, that the precedent by which we overcame religious war, which was tearing us apart for a century and a half in Europe, including the Thirty Years' War, that we must use the lesson of the way we stopped religious war in Europe, and say that is in the interest of the Arabs and the Israelis, as it was of the Europeans in 1648. We must recognize, that from the standpoint of modern international law, that the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, is the standard of international law, which is in the vital interests of the United States. And the United States President, despite Henry Kissinger's objections, *must* say that the Treaty of Westphalia is the terms. We want peace. We want each to walk away from the negotiations, equally as sure of the sovereignty of their people, and the right to prosperity. No recriminations. No retributions. No compensation. We just do the right thing, to give each people a way to live to the future, so that their children will not be living still, with the hatreds of the past. And that was the rule of the Treaty of Westphalia.

The United States should use its good offices, and can obtain the support of Europeans and others, in that thing, to offer to the parties in the Middle East, an offer they can not refuse, an offer based on *our commitment* to the same principles of the Treaty of Westphalia, which brought to an end, the horror of nearly a century and a half of religious warfare in modern Europe.

That's the only approach that I think can be taken as a policy. Of course, there's much more to discuss. We can discuss many things, but I think that's the core of the answer.

The Role of the Electoral College

Q: My question, Mr. LaRouche, is, if indeed the Electoral College has been appointed by people we don't know, and we consider it a hoax, why would you advocate holding on to the Electoral College?

LaRouche: Because the Constitution provides for it. If you try to reinvent the Constitution impromptu, on the basis of a specific issue at a specific time, you're going to unleash a pack of cats and dogs, which you can't get back out of the picture.

Now, I know that some people are desperately saying, "We don't want George Bush for President; therefore, we've got to support this idea of "the majority must rule." "We don't know who the majority is! The corruption of this election campaign was so filthy, nobody knows who won anything. The popular vote doesn't count, the electoral vote doesn't count, etc. So what you have to do, is, try to get the Electoral College—which is created for this purpose, under the Constitution—get it induced to make an honest decision, based on the conscience of the members, or the majority of the members.

If the Electoral College can not make that decision, then the Congress has to make it.

Now, if you try to get out of that track, and go to some crooked court, and try to get a crooked judge to give you a crooked decision in your favor, what are you going to get? You're going to say, "Where is the law? Where is the Constitution?" When you go, and try to get Justice Scalia to recognize the Constitution, you already have an almost-impossible chore on your hands. This guy is against human beings, he's for shareholder value. His decisions don't make any sense, but he makes them, and they cause a lot of trouble. Rehnquist doesn't understand what Scalia's decisions are, so what are you going to do talking to him for? He's too dumb.

So, the point is, we do not want to start gambling, opening a gambling hall, with the U.S. Constitution. What we must do is make the Constitution work. *Make it work*. Because, if you go the other route, then you turn around tomorrow, and when you try to get a constitutional defense, and uphold constitutional law, you haven't got a chance in the world. And once you begin to get that kind of fight, and once someone says the whole thing was illegal to begin with—. What if, for example, you get Gore nominated, designated by the Electoral College, and Gore goes up to be sworn in; and Chief Justice Rehnquist is standing there, and refuses to swear him in, because the whole election was a fraud? And can prove that the selection of Gore was done by a method which violates the Constitution? What are you going to do?

So the problem in this case, is, don't go for what you think the cheap-shot debaters' tricks are. And that's the tendency of the American people, when they say, "vote for the lesser evil," and they get the evil, every time, either way the vote goes, as they got in this election: They got evil. And Gore is a racist, even if he pretends not to be, but I know better. Why did he vote for repudiating the Voting Rights Act of 1965? But he did it. He got the court to go along with it—a Bush court, Sentelle—to go along with doing that, on his initiative. The man's a racist.

So what's the difference between him and George Bush? Gore's intelligent enough to know that he is a racist. Bush is too dumb to know it. What's the difference?

So, I say: What we have to do is, we've got to stop being beggars at the back door of the White House, like slaves. We've got to go in the front door, and say, "We are in charge of the joint; we are the citizens." And you're going to find that, as the financial crisis hits, we're going to find a lot more who'll go with us. The problem, is that this country needs leadership; people who say, "I'm tired of the lesser evil."

Remember the whole thing about [Socialist Party Presidential candidate Eugene] Debs? Now, I've got a lot of things to say against Debs. But Debs, when he ran for President in the 1890s, said, "It is better to vote for what you want, and lose, than to vote for what you don't want, and win." And we, the American people, have got to get off our butts, and stop being the lower 80%; stop being the field-hands, begging for favors from the back door of the slavemaster!

We've got to assert our rights. Look who voted for Gore: African-Americans, labor people, and so forth—not one of them likes anything that Gore represents. They just thought Bush was the greater evil. And if these same people had not made the mistake, of selling themselves to—. Of course, the Justice Department blackmail helped a good deal, otherwise they wouldn't have gone for Gore in the first place. But, if we'd gotten together, and defended our interests, instead of trying to find the lesser evil, the power that we represent—just those two constituencies, labor and African-Americans, represent a core of political power among the lower 80% of the population, which has the power to mobilize the nation, and determine its policies. And we've got to give up this idea of field-hands, slaves, going begging at the back door of the slavemaster's plantation, and trying to find out which door opens to the lesser evil. Instead, we've got to find someone who represents *us*. And then we'll win.

And when the people get the idea that we're out to win, and we get the majority together to do it, at least a reasonable sample of that majority, we're going to start winning. Every crisis is the golden opportunity to seize, to make that fundamental change, when people no longer believe in corrupt institutions, and they're ready to consider looking for something else instead.

This is our great opportunity!

And those people who are on the state level, whether as elected political officials, or as influentials on the state level, who represent the grassroots leaders of the nation: These are the people to whom I would appeal and I have confidence in. We can do it, if you guys will stop playing lesser-evil games, and start fighting for what we want, instead of the lesser evil. Then we won't get evil! We'll get something else, instead. We may lose, but at least, we'll set a precedent, a precedent of courage and honor, through which someone who will come after us, will redeem the nation.

The Coming Collapse of the Dollar

Egyptian journalist: Will the coming collapse of the dollar be beneficial to other currencies like the euro, or will it lead to the collapse of all currencies? What will the effect of the dollar crash be, on the economies of the Third World? And what's your advice to Third World countries, as they face this crisis?

LaRouche: First of all, the collapse of the dollar will be a catastrophe for everyone. It should have been prevented, but it's coming, and it's now here. My estimate is, that no one can know how far the collapse will go, because there is a certain element of pure fantasy in this whole business, anyway. But, to talk about a 40% collapse of the U.S. dollar over a fairly short period of time, some time in the very near future—could be next week, could be this week, that sort of thing could start, at any moment; you're already getting signs of it right now. The turbulences on the financial markets right now portend the preconditions for a very rapid, sudden collapse of the dollar.

When it goes down, it will go down big; it will flop; it will crash. And a 40% relative devaluation of the dollar is a very likely prospect to think about. No one can predict how far it will go, but you've got to think in those terms, to make a policy for dealing with it.

The collapse of the dollar will immediately—. See, people think that everything is trade relations, and trade has very little to do with anything these days. Everything is financial speculation.

What will happen with the collapse of the dollar will be a number of things. First of all, not only is every leading bank in Europe, in particular, and Japan, the United States, bankrupt. But the central banking systems, including the Federal Reserve System of the United States, the central reserve systems of Europe, Japan, and other nations, are bankrupt.

You face a situation, in which the only way to prevent chaos, is for the U.S. government—in the case of the Federal Reserve System—to take the Federal Reserve System, which is a government-chartered private organization of merchant bankers, and take it into receivership, into bankruptcy receivership. In other words, the United States government has to direct—and the President, the Executive Branch, and the Congress together have to collaborate in taking over the Federal Reserve System; putting it through bankruptcy reorganization, for the purpose of defending the U.S. economy, its functioning, lines of credit to communities and other things like that; and to protect the U.S. dollar itself. Which means that things like the derivatives—which they say is \$100 trillion, but which is maybe closer, in total globally, with the off-the-counter stuff, to \$400 trillion in soft paper around the world: Most of that should be wiped off the books immediately!

You see, as a famous man said of the 1929 crash: What collapsed was only paper. The essence of this crisis is, that what is collapsing is paper! You could burn the paper. You could write it off. You can declare it worthless. But that is not the economy. The economy is people. The economy is infrastructure. The economy is production. The economy is essential services. The economy is the functions of government. Our concern, is to save the economy, which is not money—we have to have a stable currency—but to save the institutions which are *real* economy: people, families, schools, farms, factories, modes of transportation, health services, essential services. We must keep those functioning. That's the real economy.

What happens if a corporation continues to produce what it produced yesterday, but its stock value has collapsed to 10% of what it was the day before yesterday? Is that a catastrophe? It's a financial catastrophe for those who are stockholders; but it's not a catastrophe for the economy. The economy is the *real things* on which life depends, and the maintenance of life depends. The economy is not money. The economy is not paper. It is not shareholder values. It is the things which are needed to sustain life and sustain the economy, and the civil order, and the development of the population.

Therefore, under the rule of the general welfare, which very few people today understand as a principle of natural and international law, the function of the government in the bankruptcy of the Federal Reserve System—which is now, presently bankrupt, I can assure you; it's more bankrupt than you can imagine—under those conditions (and Alan Greenspan, essentially, might be called the Cowardly Lion of Wall Street), under those conditions, you freeze everything that is not essential. You keep families functioning; you keep the local stores functioning; you keep the local police chief, the local fire chief, and all these people, functioning. You keep people employed, as much as possible. And you set out to create expanded employment in useful things.

And that's what we're going to have to do.

So, the question then comes: The collapse of financial values is meaningless, in this period. A vast collapse. Look, we have over \$400 trillion of debt out there, against about \$42 trillion of total GDP of the world, as a whole! *You can't collect!* What you can't collect, you've got to write off. And you write off the things that are least important, and that means derivatives; that means short-term financial speculation; that means a lot of so-called shareholder value, get written off, because we must save the people, the economy and the nation.

If we agree on that, and if the nations in Europe, the United States, the ASEAN-Plus-3 nations and so forth, agree on that, then we shall survive, and we shall prosper! Because by getting *rid* of the cancer, the rest of us can grow. The question here is not a financial or economic question as such; it's a *political* question. It's a moral question. If the government

decides that we're going to save the people, rather than the shareholders, we'll save the people. If they decide to save the shareholders rather than the people, which is what Gore and Bush are both *sworn* to do—to save the shareholders, not the people—then the people are going to suffer. The economy will collapse. Chaos will exist.

So, that's the big question.

So, if as nations, as in the case of Egypt, if we can get a regional agreement within the Arab world, for example, on development, if that agreement touches into Africa, if we can bring that agreement into congruence with agreements with the ASEAN-Plus-3 with India, with Europe, with Russia, Japan, the United States as such, then we shall all do very well. Simply because we decided to cooperate, on the basis of protecting the people and the economies, and the integrity of the nations and development, rather than protecting the shareholders.

But, whatever happens, whether they try to defend the shareholders or not, the shareholders are doomed. There's nothing you can do for the shareholders. They'll just have to eat their losses, and live like the rest of us, and normal people.

Who Is Destroying Democracy?

Patricio Ricketts, Peruvian journalist: All right, Mr. LaRouche. Months ago, the Peruvian elections were seriously disturbed, as you recall, and finally objected to by the Organization of American States, as well as the American Embassy, supported by Canada and the European Community, the so-called "U.S. Protectorate," to quote Raymond Aron. To be sure, the show of Washington finance, non-governmental organizations, did their job. One of them, Transparencia, got a million dollars to model the election, with the excuse of observing it. The Carter Center and the Democrats made a similar effort. Finally, the American government and its orchestra came to the conclusion: The Peruvian elections were below the minimal world standards.

Now that we can observe with amusement the American elections, we Peruvians ask ourselves, if the United States will be able to reach at least our poor mark, below those famous standards, provided someone is able to find them anywhere in the world.

In this country, 80% of the citizens entitled to vote, that means absolutely everybody above 18, did vote. What was the American electoral participation, and therefore, is now the Presidential democratic representation? In this country, votes were immediately counted by the citizens elected at random to manage the electoral sites. Their results were registered in acts in front of party representatives; and then went into an Internet page, all the 90,000 documents, so that every citizen could check the official counting of the electoral documents.

The State Department, the CIA, the Organization of American States in Washington, and anyone, in any possible place on Earth, could verify the results, and check the votes, act by act, for each of the 1,227 candidates for the Presidency and Congress.

So far, no one has been able—no one, *no one*—has been able to demonstrate that the official counting was incorrect. And nevertheless, the U.S. government objected to the results, decided they were substandard.

Now we ask, when are we going to see credible results of the American election? And what about the famous standards? How is it, that the country which reached the Moon, cannot count votes? Have we reached the cybernetic era in order to rely on manual counting of votes?

Let me quote, Mr. LaRouche, a sentence of Pachacutec, the wisest of the Incas. “If a fellow,” he said, “cannot count the knots of the *quipus* (their accounting system), and pretends to reach the stars, he deserves a laugh.” I would like to hear your comments, Mr. LaRouche. Thank you.

LaRouche: First of all, you have to start with two facts, two sets of facts.

One is, that in 1989–1990, the alliance of George Bush, then President, with Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom, then Prime Minister, created what they imagined to be a world empire, an English-speaking world empire, Anglo-American world empire. As I said earlier in my remarks, today, this reduced the status of France, Germany, Italy and so forth, to satrapies. So that what you have now, is a parody of not only East Germany—and you might consider Bush and Gore as the Honecker and Mielke of the United States, two characters in East Germany who were being supported heavily by Edgar Bronfman when the East German government fell apart.

What we’re dealing with is an empire, the United States, the Anglo-American empire, as defined by George Bush and Margaret Thatcher and others, at the end phase of its existence. You’re at the point at which the empire is collapsing in on itself, because the oppression by the central force upon the periphery, is causing the periphery either to crumble, and thus disintegrate as assets of the empire, or to turn upon the empire itself.

Now, in the case of Peru, these two things are to be considered: First of all, the idea that this was democratic or anything else—there was no democracy whatsoever in anything the United States did in that process. None. The whole claim there was democracy is a fraud.

But then you look a little bit closer: What is the “democracy”? Carter is an exponent, and an agent, of the Southern Strategy, the Dixiecrat-Carpetbagger alliance. The Carter Presidency

was the inauguration of the takeover of the Democratic Party by the basically racist, Carpetbagger-Dixiecrat alliance. Carter doesn't know what democracy is. Why do they call it a Carter Committee for democracy? Because he's still studying, trying to find out what it's about, and has not yet discovered. He thought it was an early-on version of George W. Bush.

Transparencia is a personal asset of the Royal Consort of the United Kingdom, Prince Philip. Prince Philip is the head of Transparency International. Now you realize that anyone that is a monarch, an absolute monarch in a sense, one hereditary monarch, is not exactly a paragon of democratic institutions. There may be some decent monarchs in history, but that institution is not necessarily one qualified to judge from experience, to explain what democracy is.

So, you look earlier at the case of Italy, 1992 on. Transparency International was represented by the yacht *Britannia*, of the Queen of England, which was parked off the coast of Italy, which gave marching orders to a bunch of Italian politicians who were agents of the British monarchy, who then collapsed the existing system of democratic government of Italy, in an operation called "Clean Hands." They washed their hands in the blood of their victims. And they slaughtered and destroyed the political system of Italy, which has not been able to regain control over its own sovereign affairs since.

Is that democracy? So, if you say, these guys call themselves democracy, but they're pirates.

You take a step back further. What is Project Democracy? Project Democracy was founded, as a project, in 1975–76, by crazy Zbigniew Brzezinski, the man who was the controller of the Carter Presidency. He was typical of the forces which took the Democratic Party over, for the Southern Strategy! Huntington, the agent of Brzezinski, wrote a paper on the "Crisis of Democracy." This paper on the crisis of democracy, which was intended to create a system under which the two Southern Strategy organizations, that is, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, would together control the political party system of the United States, through what was called Project Democracy, the National Endowment for Democracy, which runs both parties from the top.

So, what you have is essentially a fascist organization, so defined as fascist by its Mussolini-like commitment to shareholder and slaveholder traditions, imposed upon the system of government of the United States, in the party system. Agents of that party system, typified by that desperado Carter himself, go down to Peru, and say, "You do not please us in Project Democracy. You're not democrats, the way Project Democracy defines it. Well, you don't have any black slaves down there! You don't have any slaveholder tradition, to speak of, that you honor. You don't have a shareholder decision—you don't have a bunch of fascists running the country! Therefore, you're not democratic!"

When you eliminate this word-play, and say: What is the content of Project Democracy, what is the democratic system of the United States, what is this cesspool of corruption called the recent election, Presidential election? Put this all together, and what we're dealing with, which I'm sure you understand, is a question not of fact, or law, but of power. Power as a substitute for law. We watched in Ibero-America. We've watched George Bush in Panama. We watched the United States State Department backing the drug-pushing dictatorship inside Colombia. We saw what happened to the destruction of all sovereignty of Ecuador. We see what's being done, now, in adjoining countries. We see the destruction of one nation and economy after another, throughout all of Ibero-America.

This is democracy?

The question is, it's a misunderstanding about the definition of words.

Now, the question is, is how do you defeat this? Well, you don't defeat it by appealing to courts of law, because the judge is a crook. You don't complain about the lack of democracy by going to a fascist judge. You have to change the judge. You have to change the correlation of forces.

A nation like Peru understands, as a relatively small and vulnerable nation, that it depends upon some system of law among states, which is based on rational grounds, on the grounds of the general welfare, the grounds of the common good. Therefore, a country like Peru *needs* a rational system of international relations, based on clear and honest rules of law, for behavior among nations.

The United States has become a lawless dictatorship, in the tradition of the Roman Empire at its end-phase. So, you've got to eliminate the empire. We're now at the point that the empire is about to collapse, and the smart victims of the empire, at that point, always get together and say, "Let's restore the kind of system which was promised by Franklin Roosevelt, and his 'Good Neighbor' policy, which was promised by John Kennedy, before he was killed, and his policy for the Americas, and start right there." All we need is an honest President of the United States, who is not under the control, and not terrified by the bullets aimed at the nape of his neck, by the fascists, the way Bill Clinton is. If Bill Clinton did not have the gun-sights of the people behind this fascist gang, aimed at the back of his neck, he would behave as a different President than he's behaved as so far.

So, take the gun out of the hands of those people who've got the gun-sights aimed on the nape of his neck, and his child's neck, and he might behave differently.

So, the point is, those of us who have power, or don't have power, must have among ourselves, an understanding of these problems. We must have an understanding of our need to cooperate around the ideas of the kind of world, based on what John Quincy Adams called a community of principle, among perfectly sovereign nation-states. A group of nations which has agreed to defend the sovereignty of each by all. No tampering with the sovereignty of a nation. And to agree to a principle of the general welfare, otherwise called the common good, by which we each seek to govern our own internal affairs, and by which we seek to promote the common good among us.

That's all that we need, and we have to make that revolution now.

Because obviously, as you see in the case of Peru, as you saw in the case of Ecuador, as we see in the case of Colombia, which we see in the case of Panama, and so forth, we see that there is no hope, for any of the nations, of Central and South America, in even the relatively short term. There's no trick, there's no way in which any hope can be brought, *unless the power can be brought to bear, to bring back a cause for hope.*

And we who understand that, like you in your position, I in mine, we must do what we can together, to bring that *coalition of power together*, to bring this world back into some semblance of order, to establish, finally, a community of principle among self-respecting and mutually-respecting, sovereign nation-states.

That's the only solution to this mess.