

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

June 27, 2014 Vol. 41 No. 26

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Sergei Glazyev 'On Eurofascism'

Will Argentina Be First To Bolt from Bankrupt System?

Iran Amb: ISIS Represents Neither Sunnis nor Islam

Rogers Issues the Call: Dump Obama & Wall Street



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William
Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Graphics Editor: Alan Yue

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almaria

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Gerardo Castilleja Chávez

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maitra

Paris: Christine Bierre

Stockholm: Ulf Sandmark

United Nations, N.Y.C.: Leni Rubinstein

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.executiveintelligencereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: John Sigerson

Assistant Webmaster: George Hollis

Editor, Arabic-language edition: Hussein Askary

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly
(50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc.,
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,
basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.
Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:
eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Calz de los Gallos 39 interior 2,
Col Plutarco E Calles,
Del. Miguel Hidalgo, CP 11350,
Mexico, DF. Tel 5318-2301, 6306-8363, 6306-8361

Copyright: ©2014 EIR News Service. All rights
reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement
#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O.
Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Editors

Fast-paced dramatic developments, from Argentina to Iraq, to London and Ukraine, can produce a dizzying, even terrifying, effect, if not looked at from a top-down, long-term strategic approach. Lyndon LaRouche has specialized in that approach for decades, and it was his method which was applied in the recent Schiller Institute 30th anniversary conference in New York, which comprises our feature in this issue (*Conference*).

Former Senatorial candidate Kesha Rogers keynoted the afternoon panel of that conference, with a call to restore the real American tradition, which restoration requires dumping Obama and Wall Street. We provide transcripts of all the presentations which followed, both in person and by video. All together, they represent a strong goad to action to save the Republic. The additional speeches from the first panel, which touched crucial subjects such as uncovering the Saudi role in 9/11, and the police-state measures of the FBI and NSA, are included. We conclude with Helga Zepp-LaRouche's moving address on the need for Classical culture to achieve the task.

Our coverage of breaking developments is equally important. First, the Argentine debt crisis, and what's at stake, is analyzed by Ibero-American editor Dennis Small, applying LaRouche's approach to what is a bail-in move that could sink the financial system (*Economics*). Second, we present the view of Russian Presidential Advisor Sergei Glazyev on the global crisis, in an article he wrote entitled "On Eurofascism"—a viewpoint no one interested in surviving the current crisis should ignore (*Current History*).

Then, there is the stunning development in London, of the launching of impeachment proceedings against Tony Blair—a move that has everything to do with the imminent fate of that other royal puppet, Barack Obama, who is facing increasing resistance to his drive toward thermonuclear war here at home (*International*).

Finally, we turn to Southwest Asia, where the Blair-Cheney instigated Iraq crisis is raging. Our Danish correspondent Tom Gillesberg sends us an in-depth interview with the Iranian ambassador to that nation, which provides useful insight into ongoing developments. And we present Part II of our series on the Saudi role in this horror, a role taken in tandem with the British Pest herself.

EIR will take its annual July 4 Independence Day skip next week. Watch www.larouchepub.com for crucial developments until our next issue, which will be dated July 11.

Cover This Week

Kesha Rogers, at the June 15 Schiller Conference, called for Americans to return to their true, anti-imperial identity.



Schiller Institute

4 Will Argentina Be First To Bolt from Bankrupt System?

The Supreme Court's corrupt decision siding with the predatory vulture funds against the sovereign nation of Argentina makes clear that Scalia's court is acting on behalf of the British Empire's drive to destroy the nation-state and radically reduce the population. But Argentine President Fernández isn't about to roll over and play dead. *EIR* Ibero-American intelligence editor Dennis Small reports.

6 LaRouche to Argentina: 'Drop the Debt Bomb'

10 LaRouche Answers Question on South American Union

11 Economics in Brief

Current History

12 Guest Commentary: On Eurofascism

By Sergei Glazyev, an Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and Advisor to the President of the Russian Federation. Glazyev made this article available for publication in the USA and Europe, before the June 7, 2014 inauguration of Petro Poroshenko as President of Ukraine.

International

20 Blair Up for Impeachment: Can Obama Be Far Behind?

The crimes of the Queen's poodle Tony Blair in lying to detonate the 2003 Iraq War began to catch up with him last week, as cries for his impeachment arise from Parliament and the British press.

23 LaRouche Issues Call: Evacuate All Americans from Iraq Immediately

24 Interview: Ambassador Hamid Bayat: ISIS Represents Neither Sunnis nor Islam

His Excellency Hamid Bayat is the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Kingdom of Denmark. He was interviewed in Copenhagen on June 19, by Tom Gillesberg, *EIR* Copenhagen Bureau Chief, and chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark.

30 King Faisal and the Forging of the Anglo-Saudi Terror Alliance

The second part of a series. This installment details the role of the late King Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud in forging the Anglo-Saudi alliance and transforming Saudi Arabia into a leading force behind the global "Jihad Without Borders."

33 What Is Wahhabism?

34 International Intelligence

Conference

35 Schiller Conference II: Bringing the Real America into a World Without War

The second and final report from the Schiller Institute's 30th anniversary conference in New York City June 15. This week we cover those presentations that were focused on defining the requirements for freeing Americans to be able to act once again in their true Constitutional tradition, and for bringing the United States into collaboration with the nations of Eurasia, notably Russia and China.

36 Kesha Rogers: Fighting for the Real American Tradition

40 Mike Billington: Schiller Institute's Land-Bridge Policy Will Change the World

46 Andrea Boland: Winning the Fight for Glass-Steagall

48 Anthony Morss: Why We Need Classical Culture

50 Wayne Madsen: The NSA Collects It All; Shut It Down!

53 Eric Larsen: 'Art Emotion' versus Political Correctness

55 Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Remarks on the Poem Nänie by Schiller

58 Terry Strada: The Truth About 9/11 Must Be Told Now

60 Nomi Prins: Glass-Steagall Is an Idea Whose Time Has Come Again

64 Neil Gallagher: The Lantern of the Prophet Still Shines

66 Richard Black: Syria: Illegal U.S. Regime-Change Policy

Editorial

72 LaRouche: Hillary Clinton's Benghazi Revelations Mean Obama Must Be Impeached Immediately!

Will Argentina Be First To Bolt from Bankrupt System?

by Dennis Small

June 23—In a decision written by Aristotelian idiot Justice Antonin Scalia, the United States Supreme Court on June 16 sided with the bloodiest of vulture funds, NML Capital and Aurelius Capital Management, in their effort to use American courts to gain discovery of all Argentine financial movements worldwide, in order to seize that country's assets in payment for defaulted bonds. The Supreme Court simultaneously upheld a lower court ruling by Federal Judge Thomas Griesa, that Argentina had to immediately pay \$1.5 billion to NML Capital and other "holdouts" against Argentina's 2005 sovereign debt restructuring, and that Argentine assets anywhere in the world could be seized to execute that payment—including the \$900 million that Argentina must pay on June 30 to its other creditors who renegotiated in good faith.

Argentina has repeatedly warned that such a ruling could lead to an overall default on its debt. In point of fact, the ruling threatens to bring down the entire trans-Atlantic financial system in an orgy of predatory looting of nations, their populations and their resources—precisely the deadly "bail-in" policy loudly trumpeted by the British Empire as its "final solution" to the bankruptcy that is sinking their system.

Lyndon LaRouche stressed this point in his opening remarks to the June 23 LaRouchePAC Policy Committee weekly discussion. "The bailout/bail-in policy is in full play now, and this attack on Argentina set this into motion." Wall Street is about to go bankrupt, LaRouche

said, and the situation is ripe to "explode or implode immediately. So what we're headed for is a world war." In this life or death battle, LaRouche said, Argentina "cannot capitulate, it cannot possibly. Uruguay has joined them—they're going to block. We probably will have, throughout the entirety of South America, more or less the totality is going to block. This is going to be an international block," LaRouche stated.

"Because Argentina *cannot* submit: it would become extinct," LaRouche stressed. "Most of South America realizes that. They must support Argentina. Not for the sake of Argentina, but for the sake of the entire continent. . . . Russia is not going to capitulate. Eurasia is not going to capitulate! So, in one sense, you're headed toward a *very early* thermonuclear war, globally!

"The only solution is, throw Obama out of office now; let Wall Street go bankrupt, which is what it really is in principle. And we can proceed, immediately, in the United States, to set forth a new program, a new set of relations, and the whole mess will be under control."

Sovereignty at Stake

Two additional court actions over the last 72 hours, on top of the Supreme Court atrocity of June 16, point to the scope of what is actually at stake.

- On June 17, Economy Minister Axel Kicillof had announced that the Argentine government was considering a bond swap for existing bondholders, to allow them to be paid on identical terms, only in Argentina



UN/Paulo Filgueiras

Argentine President Cristina Fernández has made it clear that she has no intention of accepting the imperial Supreme Court decision: The Court, she said, is defending “a form of global domination of financial derivatives intended to bring nations to their knees.”

and under Argentine jurisdiction, and not in New York, thereby avoiding the danger of seizure of assets. Kicil-off explained that this option had been “studied in depth” by the government since August 2013, adding: “If a ruling asks us to commit suicide, we’re not going to commit suicide.”

Judge Griesa promptly issued a court order on June 20 stating that “the Republic of Argentina is prohibited from carrying out the proposal of the Economy Minister.” That ruling of Griesa’s is an attempt to wipe out the very existence of “sovereign debt” as a category, in fact eliminating the sovereign nation-state as such, and replacing it with supranational jurisdiction over all financial flows. This would spell the end of the Westphalian system of sovereign nation-states altogether—a long-standing policy objective of the British Empire that stands behind both Griesa and the U.S. Supreme Court.

- Also on June 17, NML Capital, which is owned by Republican Party billionaire Paul Singer, went before

California’s District 9 Appeals Court to demand that international business partners of Argentina’s YPF oil company—including Chevron Corp. Exxon Mobil, Dow Chemical, and Apache Corp.—provide information about where YPF’s assets may be located.

Argentine Cabinet Chief of Staff Jorge Capitanich responded on June 22 that, behind the legal battles and the vulture funds, there are “dark interests whose perspective is to seize real and financial assets of the Argentine Republic.” Two days earlier, an outraged President José Mujica of neighboring Uruguay, had told an audience at Argentina’s La Plata National University that the vulture funds are going to come after Argentina’s oil, particularly the Vaca Muerta shale oil and gas deposits in the Patagonia region, one of the largest such reserves in the world, for whose exploitation Argentina’s YPF oil firm has signed a \$1.25 billion partnership with Chevron Corp. “They will want to swallow Argentina’s oil for nothing,” Mujica said, “and they’ll end up proposing that the debt be paid with natural resources.”

Argentina and the BRICS

One of the British Empire’s problems in ramming through such a bail-in Brave New World of asset seizure and pillage, is that the Argentine government of Cristina Fernández de Kirchner has no intention of rolling over and playing dead. Moreover, she has given indications that she is aware of what is at issue strategically, and that Argentina has other options available to it, including alliances with the surging Asia-Pacific nations of Russia and China, and with the broader BRICS grouping that also includes India, South Africa, and Brazil. In fact, Russian President Vladimir Putin, no stranger to threats of financial warfare against his country, has invited President Fernández to attend the upcoming BRICS summit in Fortaleza, Brazil on July 15, where he will also hold a bilateral meeting with the Argentine head of state. Will their agenda include establishing the basis for Argentina to become the first nation in the bankrupt trans-Atlantic sector to abandon that sinking Titanic?

Argentina is well-suited for such a role, being singularly focused, among the nations of South America, on the role of science and advanced technology in fostering economic development, especially in the fields of nuclear energy, space exploration, etc.—a perfect match with the strategic policies now emerging from the Asia-Pacific region. The Fernández government has repeatedly stressed that the success of the country's 2005 debt restructuring was based on its rejection of IMF austerity conditionalities, and adoption of its *own* policies of growth. As the Argentine Presidency stated in a full-page advertisement placed in the Sunday, June

22 editions of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*: “The fundamental principle of all negotiations conducted with creditors was always the same: in order to be able to pay, Argentina must first grow, so as to generate the resources that will enable it to honor its commitments.”

Not only will President Fernández be discussing these matters with Russian President Putin at the upcoming BRICS summit. Chinese President Xi Jinping will also take advantage of the BRICS summit to hold a state visit with Brazil, followed by state visits to Argentina, Venezuela, and Nicaragua.

LaRouche to Argentina: ‘Drop the Debt Bomb’

In remarks during the June 20, 2014 LaRouchePAC weekly web-cast, Dennis Small discussed the difference between strategic and tactical thinking in times of crisis.

I'll give an example of this from 30-odd years ago, but I think people can draw their own conclusions about the current situation. Back in 1982, when the British laid a typical British trap for Argentina around the Malvinas War, Mr. LaRouche was the only political figure in the United States who sided with Argentina on the issue of their sovereignty over the Malvinas, in terms of the Monroe Doctrine and its author John Quincy Adams.

The Argentines at the time consulted Mr. LaRouche, and said, “What do we do? How can we win this war? We have Exocet missiles and so on; but how do you recommend we proceed?” And Mr. LaRouche's response was, “Well, one often does have to take such measures, but you are in possession of a super-weapon, a weapon so powerful *that it can bring down the entire British Empire*. And that weapon,” he said, “is the debt bomb.”



LaRouche said, “The British Empire is totally dependent, as are their Wall Street allies, on the existing financial system. The purpose of the Malvinas operation was to establish out-of-area NATO deployments for debt collection. You want to defeat the British Empire? Sink their financial system, and get

allies to help you. Drop the debt bomb!”

So the concept of the “debt bomb” originated with Mr. LaRouche in that way. But it was picked up almost a year later, on the cover of *Time* magazine in January of 1983.

So, whenever people tell you: “Oh, you can't do that! Oh, that's not possible; there's only a pragmatic solution to this crisis. We can't do anything so dramatic as impeach Obama! Oh, no, no! We can't actually drop the debt bomb. Oh, we can't go with LaRouche's four point program; that's not practical!”—that is the sign of someone who has already capitulated to the British. They *say* they haven't, they may even feel that they haven't; but they have! Because the most powerful weapon that the British Empire has, is to get their intended victims to *think* like the British! That is to say, to think like Aristotelians. To think in terms of tactics, not strategy. To think like *beasts*, as opposed to thinking the way Vernadsky points out human beings are uniquely qualified to think, which is, creatively.

If the British Empire, their assets in the U.S. judicial system, and the vulture funds go too far—which they may already have done—they may indeed produce their own worst nightmare.

Fernández Defines the Issue

The same day that the U.S. Supreme Court announced its ruling, President Fernández delivered a nationally televised speech in which she stated:

“I wasn’t surprised by this ruling. I expected it . . . because this isn’t an economic or financial problem, or even a legal one.” The U.S. Supreme Court has defended “a form of global domination of financial derivatives intended to bring nations to their knees,” Fernández explained. Should this global economic model continue to operate unhindered, it will “produce unimaginable tragedies,” as it is fed by the “blood, hunger, and exclusion of millions of youth worldwide who are jobless, with no access to education.”

In a speech delivered one day earlier at the closing session of the G77 summit in Bolivia, just before the Supreme Court ruling, Fernández had explained what the actual issue is with the vulture funds:

“In this kind of anarcho-capitalism, where a small group of financiers runs the rest of humanity, a group known as ‘vulture funds,’ obtained debt instruments at absurdly low prices—if the value was 100, they paid 5 pesos, or perhaps less—financiers who don’t even pay taxes because their official headquarters are in tax havens, and which only represent 1 or 2% of Argentina’s total debt.” Fernández continued that these funds threaten to cut off Argentina’s access to capital markets, but “for us, to go to the capital market with interest rates of 14 or 15% is frankly usurious and prohibitive.

“And yet this small group of vulture funds is endangering not only Argentina—because if it were only Argentina it might not matter much to the world, a country lost at the bottom of the South American continent wouldn’t matter much to them. But in reality what is at stake is the international financial system, and the international economic system more than the financial system. . . . [This is] financial capitalism and the appearance of what is called financial derivatives, which began to generate, or at least make the world believe that they were generating, money without going through the cycle of the production of goods and services, which is impossible and obviously generate as-



Creative Commons/Tomaz Silva/ABR

Pope Francis has also spoken out strongly against the current global financial system. He termed it “an atrocity” that “we are discarding an entire generation to maintain an economic system that can’t hold up anymore, a system that, to survive, must make war, as the great empires have always done.”

tronomically high profits, but also the existence of fictitious money.”

Bail-in on the Ropes?

The Argentina government has explained the specific implications of the Griesa/Supreme Court rulings very clearly, in the June 22 full-page ad: “7% of bondholders did not accept the restructuring. The vulture funds that secured a ruling in their favour are not original lenders to Argentina. They purchased bonds in default at obscenely low prices for the sole purposes of engaging in litigation against Argentina and making an enormous profit. Paul Singer’s NML fund, for example, in 2008 paid only 48.7 million US dollars for bonds in default. Judge Griesa’s ruling now orders that it be paid an amount of 832 million U.S. dollars, i.e., a gain of 1,608% in only six years.

“Argentina has appealed against New York District Court Thomas Griesa’s ruling, which orders payment of 1.5 billion dollars to be made on June 30, which is the due date of the next payment related to the restructured debt. However, it is estimated that the total bonds in default that did not enter the restructuring processes amount to 15 billion US dollars, i.e., over 50% of Argentina’s foreign currency reserves. Judge Griesa’s ruling would push the country to a new default. This is so because if Argentina does pay the 1.5 billion, it will have to pay 15 billion in the immediate future. To make matters worse, under the laws of Argentina and the clauses governing the restructured instruments (RUFO), if the vulture funds were to be paid, all other bondholders would demand equal treatment, involving an estimated cost of over 120 billion US dollars. If, on the other hand, Argentina does not pay the vulture funds, Judge Griesa’s ruling forbids Argentina to make payments to 92.4% of the bondholders who did accept the restructuring, as the judge has issued orders to the Bank of New York and to the settlement agencies for them not to pay.

“In other words: paying the vulture funds is a path leading to default, and if they are not paid, Judge Griesa’s order entails jeopardizing the right of the bondholders to collect their debt restructured in 2005 and 2010.”

But there are further-reaching consequences of the Griesa/Supreme Court rulings. The International Monetary Fund, for example, is deeply concerned that this will set a precedent for all future bond renegotiations, that will de facto make the British Empire’s intended bail-in operations impossible. The bail-in, or Single Resolution Mechanism, entails drastic reorganization of insolvent financial institutions by forcibly seizing the assets of “unsecured creditors,” including depositors and certain categories of bondholders. The latter would be forced to swallow major write-downs on their holdings, and/or conversion of bonds into worthless stocks in the bankrupt bank. If a small minority of such bondholders is able to file suit and can maintain the face value of their bonds, a precedent just upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, then any and all such renegotiations will be scuttled.

In a statement issued June 16, right after the Supreme Court decision, the IMF stated: “The Fund is considering very carefully this decision,” because it could undermine sovereign debt restructurings around the globe. The IMF said it is “reassessing” how it handles debt crises internationally. And then again on June

20 the IMF issued a report protesting that the Supreme Court decision “will give holdout creditors greater leverage and make the debt restructuring process more complicated,” and that the IMF is therefore studying “a more robust form of collective action perspective than those currently in existence.”

Mobilize to Defend Argentina

Argentina is indeed facing an existential crisis. In her June 16 address, President Fernández stated that the U.S. Court decisions, if implemented, would mean that Argentina’s successful 2005 debt restructuring would “collapse like a house of cards, and along with it, obviously, the Argentine Republic.” She warned: “No president of a sovereign nation can subject their nation and people to extortion.”

Argentina has quickly found support among its sister republics of South America. Uruguayan President Mujica has been most explicit:

“From the countries of the region, we have to come up with something to lend Argentina a hand, allowing it to launch a counter coup, so that the confrontation becomes a global one, not just one involving Argentina.” Pointing to Judge Griesa’s original ruling favoring the vulture funds, he warned “today they come for you, but tomorrow they’ll come for me!”

Already Argentina has received statements of solidarity from the Common Market of the South (Mercosur), the Community of Latin American and Caribbean Nations (CELAC), other regional bodies, and even the broader G77, which pronounced on June 14: “We reiterate that the vulture funds cannot be allowed to paralyze the restructuring activities of developing nations or deprive the State from protecting its people in accordance with international law.”

Another critical strategic force that the British Empire has to reckon with, is Pope Francis, who is not only Argentine himself and a regular interlocutor of President Fernández, but has also given strong voice to rejection of the current global financial system in terms not unlike those employed by President Fernández. In a mid-June interview with the Spanish newspaper *La Vanguardia*, Pope Francis stated: “75 million young Europeans under 25 years of age are unemployed. That is an atrocity. But we are discarding an entire generation to maintain an economic system that can’t hold up anymore, a system that, to survive, must make war, as the great empires have always done.”

Within the United Kingdom itself, a group of 106

British Parliamentarians, organized by the Vatican-linked Jubilee Network, issued a statement in early June warning that the vulture funds were trying to drive Argentina into default, and calling on the British government to put forward a bill that would “prevent the vulture funds from ignoring the restructuring of the Argentine and Greek debt.”

The reference to Greece is telling. Among that country’s principal creditors, for which the country and its population is being torn limb-from-limb by savage Troika-imposed austerity policies, are the same vulture funds involved in the Argentine assault. Among them are Singer’s Elliott Associates, and the infamous Dart Management, whose owner Kenneth Dart gave up his U.S. citizenship to take up residence in the British overseas territory of the Cayman Islands to more easily direct his predatory activities.

In fact, all of Europe is ripe for bolting from the bankrupt trans-Atlantic financial system. The Auschwitz-like conditions that submission to the European Union and the Troika has created, have led to the political earthquake expressed in the recent European Parliament elections, in which anti-euro parties achieved dramatic gains against the agents of the British Empire,

such as the French Socialist Party of François Hollande. Many of those newly victorious forces will recall that in June 2012, *EIR* published a study commissioned by Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche, entitled “There Is Life After the Euro! Program for an Economic Miracle In Southern Europe, The Mediterranean Region, And Africa,” which contained a chapter called “What Europe Can Learn from Argentina.”

Two years later, that issue is now back on the table with renewed urgency.

But what Europe, the BRICS nations, and others must register, is that well-meaning solidarity will not suffice to defeat an enemy as evil and entrenched as the British Empire. In a response to a question sent to him about whether or not “the countries of South America have the ability to unite into a union, which maybe might work within a BRICS alliance, to begin development,” LaRouche responded: “Yes, but only under appropriate new conditions among those respectively sovereign nation-states. . . . There can not be any alien imperialist intrusion among the members. In other words, the individual partners must not be subject to a monetarist tyranny of economic relations among those nations which intended themselves to be



There Is Life After the Euro!
Program for an Economic Miracle in Southern Europe, the Mediterranean Region, and Africa
 AN **EIR** SPECIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

- Introduction by Helga Zepp-LaRouche
- Greece, and a Marshall Plan for the Mediterranean Basin
- Spain: Bridge to African Development
- The Rebirth of Italy’s Mezzogiorno
- Africa Pass
- The Transaqua Project
- North Africa: The Blue Revolution
- What Europe Can Learn from Argentina
- A German Economic Miracle for Europe

http://www.larouchepub.com/special_report/2012/spec_rpt_program_medit.pdf

sovereign, such as the virtually globalist British imperial tyranny which presently dominates the planet as a whole, or nearly so” (see below for LaRouche’s full response).

LaRouche Answers Question On South American Union

In response to a question on whether a South American Union could be formed, within a BRICS alliance, to strengthen their economies, with connections of high-speed trains, Lyndon LaRouche gave the following reply.

Yes, but only under appropriate new conditions among those respectively sovereign nation-states. That means that the economies composing the union, for that purpose must not be subject to an agency outside that set of respectively sovereign nation-states composing the origins.

The threat to any such cooperative undertakings would be subordination to powers and agencies outside the set of relevant, associated, respectively sovereign nation-state republics composing the agreement among what are essentially the participants in a 1648 Westphalian principle agreement. Heretofore, such agreements among member-states of the Americas have been prevented, chiefly, by the British Empire’s dominant position among the trans-Atlantic community. There can not be any alien imperialist intrusion among the members. In other words, the individual partners must not be subject to a monetarist tyranny of economic relations among those nations which intended themselves to be sovereign, such as the virtually globalist British imperial tyranny which presently dominates the planet as a whole, or nearly so.

The model for medieval and modern imperial tyrannies have been, chiefly, the ancient Roman and modern Dutch-British Empires, otherwise to be known as the modern British empires echoing the tyranny of the Satanic Zeus. These are the forces of evil which dominate, among other governments, the imperialist political-economic systems which dominate all of the Americas presently, including that of the USA.

The typical modality employed for imperialist operations is based essentially on what are to be recognized as monetarist systems, under an arrangement in which monetary authority reduces economies of nations to puppets of monetarist imperialisms.

For example: The process of corruption which has led, repeatedly, to the foreign subjugation of the U.S. economy began with the follies of U.S. Presidents such as Presidents John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison. That corruption of our USA Federal Constitution, had been turned back under reforms introduced by Presidents Monroe and John Quincy Adams. The subversion of the U.S. Federal Constitution, has been customarily established, repeatedly through the hoax named “states rights.”

In fact, the origins of chronic returns to the treasonous implications of U.S. submission to the states’ rights cult in the Americas, began with the assassination of U.S. Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, by the British professional assassin, Aaron Burr, a Burr who was tolerated by the complicity in the “states rights” practices which turned the United States itself, repeatedly, into a British imperial puppet: up through the present moment of this report. Just so, President Abraham Lincoln was assassinated on behalf of the British Empire, like President William McKinley, who was murdered for benefit of the treasonous Theodore Roosevelt, and like both President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, as with the similarly motivated, and intended assassination-attack against President Ronald Reagan.

The immediately evident evil of all monetarist policy, is that it tends, inherently, to the international reign of imperialist rule among even nominally sovereign nation-states. Those institutions which are nominally independent nation-states, including most apparently sovereign nations, are degraded into victims of international monetarist systems. All imperialist systems of modern times are based on economic control under the domination of foreign monetarist systems, for the case of the United States presently, as under, chiefly, British imperialist modes of monetarist imperialism, as such as the case of the British puppet-system known as the Wall Street which has been a British imperial “loan shark” since the very beginning of its existence.

Most assassinations of U.S. Presidents, and certain others, inside the United States, have been motivated by the relevant President’s threats to the British Empire’s puppets in the United States.

Economics in Brief

Greece

Supreme Court Puts Debt Before People

June 17—The Greek Supreme Court has issued a ruling putting the payment of government debt above “personal” lives, while an administrative court ruled that bank accounts can be seized from debtors without warning.

After deciding to accept the Ministry of Finance’s appeal in the first of these cases, the Supreme Court published the justification for its ruling, arguing that personal interests cannot override the government’s financial policy. This followed a decision by a lower court that the dismissal of the entire Finance Ministry cleaning staff was illegal. The Supreme Court claims that the abolition of the cleaning staff positions will “not cause any problems” and that the “preservation of the financial policy during a period of exceptional financial difficulties on a nationwide level” is paramount.

The Council of State, Greece’s highest administrative court, meanwhile, ruled June 16 that the state and insurance funds are within their rights to seize—without prior notification—the contents of bank accounts belonging to individuals who owe them money. This overturns an earlier judgment that the seizures are unconstitutional if account holders do not receive prior notification.

Greece’s public sector workers union, ADEDY, has announced a nationwide strike, starting June 18, to protest the government’s plans to lay off some 6,500 civil servants by the end of the year, as demanded by the country’s creditors.

Government Bonds

IMF Calls for Massive Purchases by EuroBank

June 19—In a paper “obtained” by the *Financial Times* and Reuters, which was presented June 19 at the EU Ecofin meet-

ing in Luxembourg, the IMF called on the European Central Bank to start massive purchases of government bonds.

Although never using the term “quantitative easing,” that is what it is. “If inflation remains stubbornly low, the ECB should consider a large-scale asset purchase program, primarily of sovereign assets according to the ECB’s capital key,” the statement reads. “This would boost confidence, improve corporate and household balance sheets, and stimulate bank lending.”

It remains to be seen how the German Constitutional Court will react. Its last ruling stated that such asset purchases can be allowed only in a limited time-span.

European Union

Income Declines, Poverty on the Rise

June 19—The European Union statistical agency Eurostat is reporting figures that show how the EU is destroying the living standard of its member states, especially those “rescued” by bailouts (for the banks). Eurostat’s latest figures show that the income disparity among EU nations is not only widely contrasting, but that this income is also declining as well.

For example, the EU’s greatest “success story,” Greece, has had its population’s income and purchasing power constantly shrinking, and is now 25% below the EU averages. According to the Eurostat report, the highest level of Actual Individual Consumption per capita in all 28 EU member-states is in Luxembourg and Germany, which are almost 40% and 25%, respectively, above the EU28 average. Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium, Finland, France, and the United Kingdom recorded levels of between 10% and 20% above average, with the Netherlands just under 10% above.

In contrast, in the countries subjected to bailout, such as Ireland, Italy, Cyprus, and Spain, the levels were as much as 10% below average; Malta was between 10% and 20% below; Lithuania, Slove-

nia, Portugal, Poland, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic were between 20% and 30% below; Latvia, Estonia, Hungary, and Croatia were between 30% and 40% below; and Romania and Bulgaria were around 50% below the average.

The fact that this is not the whole story and that poverty is increasing dramatically is revealed in a new study on poverty in Great Britain by the Poverty and Social Exclusion project, which found that the number of British households living below the poverty line doubled over the past 30 years, in spite of nominal doubling of the British economy, according to the *Guardian*. This means that 33% of households, up from 14% three decades ago, endure below-par living standards—defined as going without three or more “basic necessities of life,” such as being able to adequately feed and clothe household members, and to heat and insure their homes.

Russia-China

Gas Pipeline Project Starts in August

June 19—Russia’s energy giant Gazprom said June 18 it will start welding seams of its pipeline for gas supplies to China in August. “We have a clear action plan. We have distributed all duties and we have set tough deadlines,” Gazprom said in a statement, citing CEO Alexei Miller.

“Our goal is to weld Power of Siberia’s (the unified Gazprom gas transmission system) first joint as soon as August,” the Itar-Tass news agency quoted Miller as saying.

The same day, vice-president of Gazprom Alexander Medvedev said the company and China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC) have inked a \$25 billion advance payment agreement for gas supply.

The 30-year contract for the east route pipeline will provide China with 38 billion cubic meters of natural gas annually, starting in 2018.

GUEST COMMENTARY

On Eurofascism

by Sergei Glazyev

Sergei Glazyev is an Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and Advisor to the President of the Russian Federation.

This guest commentary was written and made available to publications in the USA and Europe, before the June 7, 2014 inauguration of Petro Poroshenko as President of Ukraine. The version printed here incorporates, with the author's permission, passages from his March 21, 2014 interview with Radio Radonezh, a Russian station. Subheads have been added.

Current events in Ukraine are guided by the evil spirit of fascism and Nazism, though it seemed to have dissipated long ago, after World War II. Seventy years after the war, the genie has escaped from the bottle once again, posing a threat not merely in the form of the insignia and rhetoric of Hitler's henchmen, but also through an obsessive *Drang nach Osten* [drive toward the East—ed.] policy. The bottle has been uncorked, this time, by the Americans. Just as 76 years ago at Munich, when the British and the French gave Hitler their blessing for his eastward march, so in Kiev today, Washington, London, and Brussels are inciting Yarosh, Tyahnybok, and other Ukrainian Nazis to war with Russia. One is forced to ask, why do this in the 21st Century? And why is Europe, now united in the European Union, taking part in kindling a new war, as if suffering from a total lapse of historical memory?

Answering these questions requires, first of all, an accurate definition of what is happening. This, in turn,

must start with identifying the key components of the events, based on facts. The facts are generally known: [former Ukrainian President Viktor] Yanukovich refused to sign the Association Agreement with the EU, which Ukraine had been under pressure to accept. After that, the United States and its NATO allies physically removed him from power by organizing a violent coup d'état in Kiev, and bringing to power a government that was illegitimate, but fully obedient to them. In this article, it will be called "the junta."

The goal of this aggression was to gain acceptance of the Association Agreement, as is evidenced by the fact it was indeed, prematurely, signed by the EU leaders and the junta only a month after the latter had seized power. They reported (the document bearing their signatures has not yet been made public!) that only the political part of the agreement has been signed, the part that obligates Ukraine to follow the foreign and defense policy of the EU and to participate, under EU direction, in settling regional civil and military conflicts. With this step, adoption of the Agreement as a whole has become a mere technicality.

The 'Euro-Occupation' of Ukraine

In essence, the events in Ukraine mark the country's forcible subordination to the European Union—what may be called "Euro-occupation." The EU leaders, who insistently lecture us on obedience to the law and the principles of a law-based state, have themselves flouted the rule of law in this case, by signing an illegitimate



www.glazyev.ru

Economist and Presidential Advisor Sergei Glazyev (left) with President Vladimir Putin, are shown here at the “Ukrainian Choice” conference in Kiev, Summer 2013.

treaty with an illegitimate government. Yanukovych was ousted because he refused to sign it. This refusal, moreover, needs to be understood in terms, not only of the Agreement’s content, but also of the fact that he had no legal right to accept it, because the Association Agreement violates the Ukrainian Constitution, which makes no provision for the transfer of state sovereignty to another party.

According to the Ukrainian Constitution, an international agreement that conflicts with the Constitution may be signed only if the Constitution is amended beforehand. The U.S.- and EU-installed junta ignored this requirement. It follows that the U.S. and EU organized the overthrow of Ukraine’s legitimate government, in order to deprive the country of its political independence. The next step will be to impose their preferred economic and trade policies on Ukraine, through its accession to the economic part of the Agreement.

Furthermore, although the current Euro-occupation differs from the occupation of Ukraine in 1941, in that, so far, it has occurred without an invasion by foreign armies, its coercive nature is beyond any doubt. Just as the fascists stripped the population of occupied Ukraine of all civil rights, the modern junta and its American and European backers treat the opponents of Euro-integration as criminals, groundlessly accusing them of separatism and terrorism, imprisoning them, or even deploying Nazi guerrillas to shoot them.

As long as President Yanukovych was on track to sign the Association Agreement with the EU, he was the

recipient of all kinds of praise and coaxing from high-ranking EU officials and politicians. The minute he refused, however, American agents of influence (as well as official U.S. representatives, such as the Ambassador to Ukraine, the Assistant Secretary of State, and representatives of the intelligence agencies), together with European politicians, began to castigate him and extol his political opponents. They provided massive informational, political, and financial aid to the Euro-aidan protests, turning them into the staging ground for the coup d’état. Many of the protest actions, including criminal attacks against law enforcement personnel and government building seizures, accompanied by

murders and beatings of a large number of people, were supported, organized, and planned with the participation of the American Embassy and European officials and politicians, who not only “interfered” in Ukraine’s domestic affairs, but carried out aggression against the country via the Nazi guerrillas they had cultivated.

The use of Nazis and religious fanatics to undermine political stability in various regions of the world is a favorite method of the American intelligence agencies. It has been employed against Russia in the Caucasus, in Central Asia, and now even in Eastern Europe. The Eastern Partnership program, which the U.S. encouraged the Poles and EU officials to initiate, was aimed against Russia from the outset, with the objective of breaking the former Soviet republics’ relations with Russia. This break was supposed to be finalized by contracting legal Association Agreements between each of these countries and the EU.

The ‘European Choice’

In order to provide political grounds for these agreements, a campaign was launched to fan Russophobia and spread a myth called “the European choice.” This mythical “European choice” was then artificially counterposed to the Eurasian integration process, with Western politicians and the media falsely depicting the latter as an attempt to restore the USSR.

The Eastern Partnership program has failed in every single former Soviet republic. Belarus had already made its own choice, creating a Union State with

Russia. Kazakhstan, another key Eurasian country (though not formally an Eastern Partnership target), likewise chose its own path, forming the Customs Union with Russia and Belarus. Armenia and Kyrgyzstan have decided to join this process. The province of Gagauzia has spurned the adoption of Russophobia as a cornerstone of Moldovan policy; the Gagauz referendum, rejecting European integration in favor of the Customs Union, challenged the legitimacy of Chisinau's "European choice." Georgia, the only republic to have made a relatively legitimate decision in favor of Association with the EU, paid for its "European choice" with the loss of control over a part of its territory, where people did not want to live under Euro-occupation. The same scenario is now being imposed on Ukraine—loss of a part of its territory, where the citizens do not accept the leadership's "European choice."

The coercion of Ukraine to sign the EU Association Agreement became entangled with Russophobia, as a reaction of the Ukrainian public conscience, wounded by the decision of the people of Crimea to join the Russian Federation. Since the majority of Ukrainians still do not automatically think of themselves as divided from Russia, there has been a strong push to inculcate a perception of this episode as Russian aggression and the annexation of part of their territory. This is why Brzezinski talks about the "Finlandization" of Ukraine, as a way to anesthetize the brains of our political elite during the American operation to sever Ukraine's ties with historical Russia. While under anesthesia, we Russians are supposed to accept a feeling of guilt for our mythical oppression of the Ukrainian people, while the latter are force-fed loathing for Russia, with which they have allegedly battled for ages over Little Russia and Novorossiia (**Figure 1**).¹

Only a superficial observer, however, would see the current anti-Russian hysteria in the Ukrainian media, so

FIGURE 1
Novorossiia (New Russia), c. 1897



"We Russians are supposed to accept a feeling of guilt for our mythical oppression of the Ukrainian people," Glazyev writes, "while the latter are force-fed loathing for Russia, with which they have allegedly battled for ages over Little Russia and Novorossiia."

striking in its frenzied Russophobia, as a spontaneous reaction to the Crimean drama. In reality, it is a piece of evidence that the war being waged against Russia is now entering an overt phase. For two decades, we were fairly tolerant of the manifestations of Nazi ideology in Ukraine, not taking it too seriously, in view of the apparent absence of clear preconditions for Nazism. The lack of such preconditions, however, was completely compensated by the persistent sowing of Russophobia through support for numerous nationalist organizations. The discrepancy between their ideology and historical accuracy does not bother the *führers* of these organizations. In return for a pittance from NATO member countries, they are completely unrestrained in painting Russia as the enemy image. The result is unconvincing, because of our common history, language and culture: Kiev is the mother of all Russian cities, the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra is a major holy site of the Orthodox world, and it was at the Kiev-Mohyla Academy that the modern Russian language took shape.

We cannot forget the historical importance of Little Russia (Ukraine) for us. We have never divided Russia and Ukraine, in our minds. I myself grew up in Ukraine; we never felt differentiated by ethnic origin, not at school, or in our neighborhood, or at work. We were together as one people, speaking the same language, sharing the same faith and understanding of the meaning of

1. Malorossiia ("Little Russia" or "Lesser Russia") is a term dating back to Greek place-names for the areas populated by eastern Slavs, nearer ("Lesser Russia") and farther north ("Greater Russia") of the Black Sea. It has been used at various times to denote all of modern Ukraine or, chiefly, northeastern Ukraine or the left bank of the Dnieper River. Novorossiia ("New Russia") was introduced in the 18th Century for lands acquired by the Russian Empire under Catherine II in wars with the Ottoman Empire. These included the Black Sea littoral from the Dniester River to Crimea, the Sea of Azov littoral eastward nearly to the mouth of the Don River, and lands along the lower Dnieper.

life. And all of us—Russians, Ukrainians, Jews, and other ethnic groups living in Zaporozhye and throughout most of Ukraine, with the exception of the far western part—knew that we were one people, although we were aware there were some Nazis out there in the forests of western Ukraine, who still didn't understand that the war was over. Even in Soviet times, when I happened to visit Lviv, I was struck by people's hostility to speaking in Russian. Since I am fluent in Ukrainian, it wasn't a problem for me, but I couldn't fail to notice: As long as you spoke with them in Ukrainian, that was all right, but if you switched to Russian, the tension was palpable.

Wild lies have been employed, playing on tragic episodes in our common history, such as the Revolution and the Civil War, as well as the Holodomor famine of the 1930s, which are falsely attributed solely to Russian tyranny. Russophobia, based on Nazism, is being made the cornerstone of Ukraine's national identity.

'Ukrainian Nazism'

This article is not concerned with exposing the objective absurdity of the Ukrainian Nazis' hysterical Russophobia, but rather with establishing the reasons for its re-emergence in the 21st Century. This requires an awareness that such "Ukrainian Nazism" is an artificial construct, created by the age-old enemies of the Russian world. Ukrainian exclusionary nationalism and fascism, cultivated from abroad, has always been aimed at Moscow. At first it was promoted by Poland, which viewed Ukraine as its own borderland, and established its own vertical power structure to administer it. Then came Austria-Hungary, which invested large amounts of money over a long period of time, to encourage Ukrainian separatism.

During the German fascist occupation, these separatist tendencies were the ground in which the Bandera movement and the *Polizei* sprang up, aiding the German fascists in establishing their order in Ukraine, including



Creative Commons/tandalov.com

"Many of the protest actions, including criminal attacks against law enforcement personnel and government building seizures, accompanied by murders and beatings of a large number of people, were supported, organized, and planned with the participation of the American Embassy and European officials and politicians." Here, neo-Nazi "protestors" in the Maidan, January 2014.

though punitive operations and enslavement of the population. Their modern followers are now doing likewise: Under the guidance of their American instructors, guerrillas of the Banderite Right Sector are conducting punitive operations against the population in the Donbass, helping the U.S.-installed junta "cleanse" cities of supporters of greater integration with Russia, and assuming police functions for the establishment of a pro-American, anti-Russian order.

It is obvious that without steady American and European support, neither the coup d'état nor the existence of the Kiev junta would have been possible. Unfortunately, as the famous dictum goes, "history teaches us, that history teaches us nothing." This is a catastrophe for Europe, which has more than once had to deal with instances of the proto-fascist model of government that has now taken shape in Ukraine. It involves, essentially, a symbiotic relationship between the fascists and big capital. A symbiosis of this type gave rise to Hitler, who was supported by major German capitalists, seduced by the opportunity, under the cover of national-socialist rhetoric, to make money from government orders and the militarization of the economy. This applied not only to German capitalists, but also Europeans and Americans. There were collaborators with the

Hitler regime in practically all the European countries and the United States.

Few people realized that the torch marches would be followed by the ovens at Auschwitz, and that tens of millions of people would die in the fires of World War II. The same dynamic is playing out in Kiev now, except that the shout of “Heil Hitler!” has been replaced by “Glory to the heroes!”—heroes whose great feat was to execute defenseless Jews at Babi Yar. Moreover, the Ukrainian oligarchy—including the leaders of some Jewish organizations—is financing the anti-Semites and Nazis of Right Sector, who are the armed bulwark of the current regime in Ukraine. The Maidan sponsors have forgotten that, in the symbiotic relationship between Nazis and big capital, the Nazis always get the upper hand over the liberal businessmen. The latter are forced either to become Nazis themselves, or to leave the country. This is already happening in Ukraine: The oligarchs who remain in the country are competing with the petty führers of Right Sector in the domain of Russophobic and anti-Muscovite rhetoric, as well as in grabbing the property of those of their fellow businessmen who have fled the country.

The current rulers in Kiev count on protection from their American and European patrons, pledging to them daily that they will fight the “Russian occupation” to the last standing “Muscovite.”² They obviously underestimate how dangerous Nazis are, because Nazis truly believe they are a “superior race,” while all others, including the businessmen who sponsor them, are viewed as “sub-human” creatures, against whom violence of all sorts is permissible. That is why Nazis always prevail, within their symbiotic relationship with the bourgeoisie, who are then forced either to submit, or flee the country. There is no doubt that if the Bandera followers are not forcibly stopped, the Nazi regime in Ukraine will develop, expand, and penetrate more deeply. The only thing still in doubt will be Ukraine’s “European choice,” as the country reeks more and more of the fascism of 80 years ago.

The Eurobureaucracy

Of course, Eurofascism today is very different from its 20th-Century German, Italian, and Spanish versions. European national states have receded into the past, entering the European Union and submitting to the Eurobureaucracy. The latter has become the leading political

power in Europe, easily quashing any bids for sovereignty by individual European countries. The bureaucracy’s power is based not on an army, but on its monopoly over the issuance of currency, over the mass media, and over the regulation of trade, all of which are managed by the bureaucracy in the interests of European big capital. In every conflict with national governments during the past decade, the Eurobureaucracy has invariably prevailed, forcing European nations to accept its technocrat governments and its policies. Those policies are based on the consistent rejection of all national traditions, from Christian moral standards to how sausages are produced.

The cookie-cutter, gender-neutral, and idea-free Europoliticians little resemble the raving führers of the Third Reich. What they have in common is a maniacal confidence that they are in the right, and readiness to force people to obey. Although the Eurofascists’ forms of compulsion are far softer, it is still a harsh approach. Dissent is not tolerated, and violence is allowed, up to and including the physical extermination of those who disagree with Brussels’ policies. Of course, the thousands who have died during the drive to instill “European values” in Yugoslavia, Georgia, Moldova, and now Ukraine, do not compare with the millions of victims of the German fascist invaders during World War II. But who has tallied up the indirect human casualties from the promotion of homosexuality and drugs, the ruin of national manufacturing sectors, or the degradation of culture? Entire European nations are disappearing in the crucible of European integration.

The Italian word *fascio*, from which “fascism” derives, denotes a union, or something bound together. In its current understanding, it refers to unification without preservation of the identity of what is integrated—whether people, social groups, or countries. Today’s Eurofascists are trying to erase not only national economic and cultural differences, but also the diversity of human individuals, including differentiation by sex and age. What’s more, the aggressiveness with which the Eurofascists are fighting to expand their area of influence sometimes reminds us of the paranoia of Hitler’s supporters, who were preoccupied with the conquest of *Lebensraum* for the superior Aryan race. Suffice it to recall the hysteria of the European politicians who appeared at the Maidan and in the Ukrainian media. They justified the crimes of the proponents of Eurointegration and groundlessly denounced those who disagreed with Ukraine’s “European choice,” taking the Goebbels ap-

2. Moskal, or “Muscovite,” is a derogatory Ukrainian term for a Russian.

proach that the more monstrous a lie is, the more it resembles the truth.

Today the driver of Eurofascism is the Eurobureaucracy, which gets its directions from Washington. The United States supports the eastward expansion of the EU and NATO in every way possible, viewing these organizations as important components of its global empire. The U.S. exercises control over the EU through supranational institutions, which have crushed the nation-states that joined the EU. Deprived of economic, financial, foreign-policy and military sovereignty, they submit to the directives of the European Commission, which are adopted under intense pressure from the U.S.

In essence, the EU is a bureaucratic empire that arranges things within its economic space in the interests of European and American capital, under U.S. control. Like any empire, it strives to expand, and does so by drawing neighboring countries into Association Agreements, under which they hand their sovereignty over to the European Commission. In order to make these countries accept becoming EU colonies, fear-mongering about an external threat is employed, with the U.S.-guided media portraying Russia as aggressive and bellicose, for this purpose. Under this pretext, the EU and NATO moved quickly to occupy the countries of Eastern Europe after the Soviet Union collapsed; the war in the Balkans was organized for this purpose. The next victims of Eurofascism were the Baltic republics, which Russophobic Nazis forced to join the EU and NATO. Then Eurofascism reached Georgia, where Nazis under American guidance unleashed civil war. Today, the Eurofascists are using the Georgian model in Ukraine, in order to force it sign the Association Agreement with the EU, as a subservient territory and a bridgehead for attacking Russia.

Eurasian Integration

The U.S. sees the principal threat to its plans for putting the Eurobureaucracy in charge of the post-Soviet area, as being the Eurasian integration process, which is developing successfully around the Russia-Belarus-



Creative Commons/V.S. Biletsky

After signing the Association Agreement, "Ukraine is to become a colony of the European Union, blindly obeying its demands. These include requirements which Ukrainian industry is unable to carry out, and which will harm the Ukrainian economy." Shown: the Alchevsk Iron & Steel Works in the Donbass, 2011.

Kazakhstan Customs Union. The EU and the U.S. have invested at least \$10 billion in building up anti-Russian networks, in order to prevent Ukraine from taking part in that process. In parallel, using the support of Polish and Baltic Russophobes, as well as media under the control of American media moguls, the United States is inciting European officials against Russia, with the goal of isolating the former Soviet republics from the Eurasian integration process. The Eastern Partnership program, which they inspired, is a cover for aggression against Russia in the former Soviet area. This aggression takes the form of forcing former Soviet republics to enter EU Association Agreements, under which they transfer their sovereign economic, trade, foreign-policy and defense functions to the European Commission.

For Ukraine, the Association Agreement with the European Union means transferring to Brussels its sovereign functions of regulating trade and other foreign economic relations, technical standards, and veterinary, sanitary, and pest inspections, as well as opening its market to European goods. The agreement contains a thousand pages of EU directives that Ukraine would be required to follow. Every section mandates that Ukrainian legislation be brought into compliance with the requirements of Brussels. Moreover, Ukraine would assume the obligation to comply not only with current Brussels directives, but also future ones, in the drafting

of which Ukraine will have no part.

Plainly put, after signing the Agreement, Ukraine is to become a colony of the European Union, blindly obeying its demands. These include requirements which Ukrainian industry is unable to carry out, and which will harm the Ukrainian economy. Ukraine is to completely open its market to European goods, which will lead to a \$4 billion increase in Ukraine's imports and drive uncompetitive Ukrainian industrial products out of the market. Ukraine will be obliged to meet European standards, which would take EU150 billion of investment in economic modernization. There are no sources for such amounts of money.

According to estimates by Ukrainian and Russian economists, Ukraine, after signing the Agreement, can look forward to a deterioration of its already negative balance of trade and balance of payments, and, as a consequence, default. This year, Ukraine has a projected balance of payments deficit of approximately \$50 billion. Its currency reserves suffice for only three months—one quarter. Even if the full amounts of assistance mentioned in various talks were to materialize, they would win only one or two additional months. Thus, Ukraine under its current regime can expect to experience a drop in the standard of living not by 15 or 20 percent, but by half or two-thirds, with the residents of southeastern Ukraine, who are employed in major industrial plants, being the hardest hit.

The EU would achieve certain advantages from an Association Agreement with Ukraine, by way of an expanded market for its products and the opportunity to acquire devalued Ukrainian assets. U.S. corporations, for their part, would gain access to shale gas deposits, which they would like to supplement with pipeline infrastructure and a market for nuclear fuel elements for power plants. The main goal, however, is geopolitical: After signing the Association Agreement, Ukraine would not be able to participate in the Customs Union with Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. It is for this outcome that the U.S. and the EU resorted to aggression against Ukraine, organizing an armed seizure of power by their protégés. While they accuse Russia of annexing Crimea, they themselves have taken over Ukraine as a whole, by installing a junta under their control. The junta's mission is to strip Ukraine of its sovereignty and put it under the EU, through signing the Association Agreement.

The disaster in Ukraine may be termed aggression against Russia by the U.S. and its NATO allies. This is a contemporary version of Eurofascism, which differs from the previous face of fascism during World War II

in that it employs “soft” power with just some elements of armed action in cases of extreme necessity, as well as the use of Nazi ideology as a supplementary rather than an absolute ideology. One of the main defining elements of Eurofascism has been preserved, however, and that is the division of citizens into superior ones (those who support the “European choice”) and inferior ones, who have no right to their own opinions and toward whom all is permitted. Another feature is the readiness to use violence and commit crimes in dealing with political opponents. The final aspect that needs to be understood, is what drives the rebirth of fascism in Europe; without grasping this, it is impossible to develop a resistance plan and save the Russian world from this latest threat of Euro-occupation.

Neocons: Maniacal Misanthropes

The theory of long-term economic development recognizes an interrelationship between long waves of economic activity and long waves of military and political tension. Periodic shifts from one dominant technological mode to the next alternate with economic depressions, wherein increased government spending is used as an incentive for overcoming the crisis. The spending is concentrated in the military-industrial complex, because the liberal economic ideology allows enhancement of the role of the state only for national security objectives. Therefore, military and political tension is promoted and international conflicts provoked, to justify increased defense spending.

This is what is happening at present: The U.S. is attempting to resolve its accumulated economic, financial, and industrial imbalances at other countries' expense, by escalating international conflicts that will allow it to write off debts, appropriate assets belonging to others, and weaken its geopolitical rivals. When this was done during the Great Depression of the 1930s, the result was World War II. The American aggression against Ukraine pursues all of the above-mentioned goals. First, economic sanctions against Russia are intended to wipe out billions of dollars of U.S. debt to Russia. A second objective is to take over Ukrainian state assets, including the natural gas transport system, mineral deposits, the country's gold reserves, and valuable art and cultural objects. Third, to capture Ukrainian markets of importance to American companies, such as nuclear fuel, aircraft, energy sources, and others. Fourth, to weaken not only Russia, but also the European Union, whose economy will sustain an estimated trillion-dollar loss from economic sanctions

against Russia. Fifth, to attract capital flight from instability in Europe, to the USA.

Thus, war in Ukraine is just business for the United States. Judging by reports in the media, the U.S. has already recouped its spending on the Orange Revolution and the Maidan by carrying off treasures from the ransacked National Museum of Russian Art and National Historical Museum, taking over potential gas fields, and forcing the Ukrainian government to switch from Russian to American nuclear fuel supplies for its power plants. In addition, the Americans have moved ahead on their long-term objective of splitting Ukraine from Russia, turning what used to be “Little Russia” into a state hostile to Russia, in order to prevent it from joining the Eurasian integration process.

This analysis leaves no room for doubt about the long-term and consistent nature of the American aggression against Russia in Ukraine. If we analyze who is influencing U.S. policy, it is not difficult to see that the ones responsible for these decisions are a handful of deranged radical extremists, the so-called Neocons, who see the entire world through the lens of their war to assert world rule. This is a small group of the American oligarchy. And it is also fascism, in its own way, based not on radical nationalism, but on global hegemonism. These Neocons are real misanthropes and Satanists, who are even prepared to drop the atomic bomb!

At the same time, if we study the situation in the USA, there are plenty of sober-thinking people. American business is unenthusiastic about sanctions against Russia; I mean normal business, which seeks a return on investment through production and cooperation, rather than through financial speculation and the destruction of other countries. The majority of American citizens, as well, do not understand the point of fomenting a war in the middle of Europe. Therefore, another factor in determining the further course of events will be the extent to which sanity prevails in Washington.

What we are facing today is not America, not the American people, but the organizers of a string of wars, beginning with Iraq, then Yugoslavia, then Libya, the rest of North Africa, Syria, and on to Ukraine. This grouping of maniacal misanthropes, the Neocons, are prepared to plunge the entire world into chaos, in order to affirm their world dominance.

War Against Russia

To this end, Washington is directing its Kiev puppets to escalate the conflict, rather than the reverse. They are

also inciting the Ukrainian military against Russia, aiming to drag Russian ground forces into a war against Ukraine. They are encouraging the Nazis there to initiate new combat operations. This is a real war, organized by the United States and its NATO allies. What has occurred is not merely a coup d'état, and not merely some unexpected outbreak of anti-Russian Nazism. It is a war. It is a war we didn't notice for a long time, but it was prepared gradually, and then moved into its overt phase several months ago. It is not even a war for Ukraine, but a war against us: against Russia. Those are the goals of the forces guiding the Nazi guerrillas. And this well-prepared, paid for, and organized war represents aggression against Ukraine and against Russia by the relevant circles in the United States, Great Britain, the EU, and NATO. The goal of this war is to defeat, dismember, and annihilate Russia. Just like 75 years ago, it is being waged by Eurofascists against Russia, with the use of Ukrainian Nazis cultivated for this purpose.

We should not mince words. The people who have signed Ukraine's Association Agreement with the EU, signed it with this Nazi government that rests on its machine guns and shoots people, are Eurofascists. Unfortunately, the European Commission has become a “Eurofascist Commission.” I insist on this definition, which is historically and conceptually accurate. And it is strange and sad in the 21st Century to see our European partners descend to the level of fascists.

It is surprising, this position of the European countries that are tailing the U.S. and doing nothing to prevent a further escalation of the crisis. They should understand better than anyone, that Nazis can only be stopped with force. The sooner this is done, the fewer victims and less destruction there will be in Europe. That avalanche of wars across North Africa, the Middle East, the Balkans, and now Ukraine, incited by people in the U.S. in their own interests, threatens Europe most of all; and it was the devastation of Europe in two world wars that gave rise to the American economic miracle in the 20th Century. But the Old World will not survive a Third World War. To prevent such a war means that there must be international acknowledgement that the actions of the U.S. constitute aggression, and that the EU and U.S. officials carrying them out are war criminals. It is important to accord this aggression the legal definition of “Eurofascism” and to condemn the actions of the European politicians and officials who are party to the revival of Nazism under cover of the Eastern Partnership.

Blair Up for Impeachment: Can Obama Be Far Behind?

by Nancy Spannaus

June 23—The crimes of the Queen’s poodle Tony Blair in lying to detonate the 2003 Iraq War began to catch up with him last week, when an outcry began in the British Parliament demanding his impeachment, an action which, in Britain, could lead directly to imprisonment. The implications of this action, by leading individuals in Great Britain, have huge portent for the fate of one of his leading chums in the United States, fellow royal stooge Barack Obama.

The sequence of events was rapid. On June 17, the senior correspondent of the *Daily Mail*, Simon Heffer, issued a call for Blair’s impeachment, based on the deaths of British soldiers and others, which his lies about the threat posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein to the West. That same day former Labour Party MP George Galloway, now representing the Respect Party in Parliament, formally initiated impeachment proceedings. The next day, June 18, Sir Peter Tapsell, a Tory, and the longest-serving Member of the House of Commons, confronted Prime Minister David Cameron during the Prime Minister’s Questions on what he called the “growing sentiment” that Parliament should exercise the “ancient but still existing power of Back Benchers to commence the procedure of impeachment” against Blair.

The rapid-fire actions, of course, have everything to do with the raging pace of the offensive by the bestial ISIS jihadis in Iraq, which the war launched by Blair and Cheney/Bush set the stage for, and which has the

immediate potential for accelerating the British Monarchy’s drive toward a thermonuclear confrontation between the U.S. and Russia.

Meanwhile, Barack Obama—whose foreign policy advisor in the 2012 election was Tony Blair—is proceeding to carry out his *next* impeachable crime, by committing the U.S. to taking military action in Iraq, another unconstitutional, undeclared act of aggressive war, and he is running into resistance from both sides of the aisle in Congress, as a number of votes in Congress last week show. Prominent commentators, including a key author of the War Powers Resolution of 1973, have begun to raise the specter of impeachment.

Obama, like Blair, is ripe for immediate impeachment, as the necessary road to saving the U.S., and preventing nuclear war.

Blair ‘Totally Responsible’

The impeachment motion against Tony Blair is deadly serious. Although no such parliamentary proceeding has succeeded in Great Britain since 1806, the procedure for doing so is still in the law. As journalist Heffer pointed out, Parliament need only set up a Select Committee of MPs to draw up the Article of Impeachment, which, if it were voted up in the Commons, would be provided to prosecutors to present to the House of Lords. A simple majority of the Lords could convict, and, Heffer said, “could, in theory, involve Tony Blair being sent to prison.”



LPAC

Mind-meld: With Blair facing impeachment for his part in promoting the lies that led up to the 2003 Iraq invasion, and Obama now on the edge of a new Iraq intervention, will they go down together?

Heffer outlines a set of devastating charges: “Did Mr. Blair know he was lying to Parliament when he presented the ‘dodgy dossier’—which argued that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction that could be deployed against the West in just 45 minutes—and therefore gain Parliament’s authority to go to war on the basis of a deception?... Is he therefore responsible for the 179 deaths of British service personnel, never mind the tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians who died in the conflict? And for the £9 billion it cost us?”

“Above all, has he damaged the interests of this country by creating long-term instability in the region because of a decision that was either criminally negligent or possibly taken on a fraudulent basis?”

Heffer concludes: “I suspect that as things worsen in Iraq—and they will—getting a majority in the Commons to impeach Mr. Blair might not be impossible. What the outcome in the Lords would be, when they decide on his guilt or innocence, would depend on the evidence. The public is crying out for that evidence to be heard. And impeachment is the right constitutional tool for a former Prime Minister accused of such behavior.” And if impeached, “we would finally know, once and for all, just what Tony Blair’s true place in history should be.”

Blair, the Queen’s prime minister from 1997 to 2007, was a leading force internationally for the policies which led to aggressive war, and depopulation wars, by NATO and coalitions of its members, against numerous nations, including Yugoslavia, Iraq, Libya, Syria, among others. His “rationale” came directly from the Crown’s policy of eliminating national sovereignty, as enunciated in his 1999 and 2004 speeches in Chicago in favor of eliminating the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, and launching the so-called Responsibility-to-Protect doctrine. In plain language, that policy dictates permanent barbaric war, and depopulation—as we see in Iraq, in particular, today.

The former prime minister, who, shamefully still holds the position of the EU’s ambassador to the Middle East Quartet, is passionately hated in Great Britain. The monarchy has continued to protect him in the Chilcot Inquiry into the lies he told to start the Iraq War, and Blair

has stonewalled on providing the documents on discussion between him and George W. Bush which prove that Blair and Bush (and Bush’s controller Dick Cheney) had agreed to proceed with the Iraq war regardless of any alleged weapons of mass destruction.

Exemplary of what evidence is available is the exclusive interview given to *Huffington Post UK* June 18 by Cambridge University professor George Joffe. Joffe is a former deputy director at the Royal Institute of International Affairs and an Associate Fellow the British military’s Royal United Services Institute, and was invited by Blair to 10 Downing Street in 2003 to discuss the potential ramifications of an Iraq invasion. “It was clear that the decision had already been made,” Joffe said.

Asked “if a line could be drawn between the decision to invade and occupy Iraq in March 2003, and the current ISIS-led insurgency,” Joffe replied, “Absolutely”; Blair and George W. Bush bear “total responsibility” for what is happening.

The Crown Policy: War and Genocide

Blair has, however, endlessly protested that the invasion of Iraq was the “right thing” to do, despite the falseness of the claim of weapons of mass destruction,

and, claiming credentials as an expert on Islamic extremism, denied that the crushing war that began in 2003 had anything to do with the current mayhem. His continuous, lengthy self-justifications have simply increased the rage against him.

Blair is on record as favoring a de facto global war against Islam. Of course, it is well-known that military action in the relevant nations will simply provoke retaliation, and further fighting—a 100-year religious war. But that doesn't bother Blair, since, *as a current member of the Queen's Privy Council*, he is bound to remain loyal to the Queen, and thus Her Majesty's expressed agenda of reducing the world's population to 1 billion or less. And the British are not only in favor of such a war, but their intelligence services have, for more than a century, been intimately involved in creating jihadi groups and sects that will make it happen.

Thus, Blair is fully in favor of Western intervention in the Iraq crisis today.

And so, of course, is his buddy Barack Obama, as well as George W. Bush's actual controller, Dick Cheney. Puppets for the Queen do as they're told.

Obviously, given the array of opposition which is being expressed in Great Britain against Blair, including an editorial in the June 19 *Financial Times*, the Empress's view is not monolithic in that country. Leading figures in many institutions and parties oppose a new Iraq war, and, as in the case of the British parliamentary vote against bombing Syria in the Fall of 2013, British action can have a significant impact on the entire trans-Atlantic region, including the United States.

Obama's Predicament

Which brings us to what's happening with the Obama Administration.

As the narcissistic British puppet he is, Barack Obama had no trouble at all announcing that he would be sending military advisors to Iraq, without bringing this de facto war policy to the Congress for a vote. I'll keep you posted, was basically the way Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell characterized Obama's message to the Congressional leadership, with whom he met June 18. Obama insists he does not even need to refer to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force as enabling his action. He, like Cheney and Adolf Hitler before him, asserts the *Führer Prinzip*—that the ruler has the inherent power to act as he sees fit. In his view, his role as Commander in Chief trumps the explicit statement in the U.S. Constitution that it is Congress,

and no other body, which has the authority to declare war.

Obama has gotten away with this unconstitutional policy of violating the Separation of Powers and the Constitution repeatedly, without being challenged effectively by Congress—so he figures he can do it again. But this time, it's not so clear he'll get away with it. Coming on top of the buildup of hatred toward his Presidency—within his party and Congress, as well as the population—Obama's actions may just backfire, just as Blair's crusade for continuous war is doing.

The day after Obama announced his deployment of advisors and plans to prepare for further military action, huge bipartisan sections of Congress carried out a significant revolt in defiance of a number of Administration policies, by attaching amendments to the 2015 Defense Appropriations bill. Two of them passed: first, an amendment prohibiting the transfer of man-portable air-defense systems (MANPADS) to Syria, sponsored by Michigan Democrat John Conyers and Florida Republican Ted Yoho—by a voice vote; second, an amendment introduced by Kentucky Rep. Thomas Massie to curb NSA and CIA surveillance, which gained a veto-proof majority of 293-123.

In addition, large contingents of Democrats voted for four amendments, introduced by Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), against the Obama war policy. All aim at cutting funding for further military adventures by the Administration.

So far, of course, few Democrats—and none in Congress—have mooted impeachment of Obama. But some significant voices are being raised. Former Republican Congressman Paul Findley, a key author of the War Powers Resolution, who went against Nixon's veto threat to secure its enactment, on June 19 declared that "Just as with threats to attack Syria last year, an attack on Iraq would violate the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution. As with any President, he [President Obama] commits an impeachable offense if he does not follow the Constitution."

From the other side of the spectrum, Marjorie Cohn, a former president of the liberal National Lawyers Guild, laid out a clear case for saying Obama has violated the War Powers Resolution and the Constitution.

The responsibility, however, comes down to Congress itself. It takes just one member, as it does in Great Britain, to start the ball rolling on impeaching this President. Each day that goes by without it happening, puts mankind in increasingly mortal danger.

Evacuate All Americans From Iraq Immediately

by Jeffrey Steinberg

June 22—Lyndon LaRouche has called for the immediate evacuation of all Americans from Iraq, in response to the ongoing warfare and the growing danger of a mass hostage situation that could fully draw the United States into the crisis. Rather than sending in hundreds of American military advisors, as President Obama has ordered, LaRouche called on the U.S. Congress to demand the total withdrawal of all Americans. A Non-Combatant Evacuation Plan (NEP) is the vital first step to avert an even greater crisis. An estimated 25,000 Americans are in Iraq, including over 3,000 diplomats and support personnel at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

Over the weekend, an estimated 100,000 armed Shi'ite protesters took to the streets of the capital under the leadership of the prominent Shi'ite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr, who called for war against both the Sunni ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria) jihadists, and the Americans.

Col. Patrick Lang, the retired U.S. Special Forces and Defense Intelligence Agency officer who advised the Iraqi Army in the late 1980s, during the long war with Iran, has been warning for weeks about a mass hostage crisis on his widely read website, and has detailed the role of former Iraqi Army officers and soldiers from the Saddam Hussein era as key combatants, who have forged an opportunistic temporary alliance with the ISIS jihadists.

A Hundred Years War

The Iraq and Syria conflicts cannot be seen in isolation from the global showdown crisis overall. For the past years, the British Crown has been provoking a new Hundred Years War between Sunni and Shi'a Muslims as part of their global population warfare scheme. The same ethnic and religious conflict has been provoked in Central Europe, using the "color revolution" new form of warfare that was exposed by the Russian government on May 23-24 at the Third Moscow International Security Conference.¹

Using the mode of color revolutions, the British, operating through the two successive stooge U.S. presidencies of George W. Bush and Barack Obama, have been pouring billions of dollars into insurgencies aimed at regime change in Central and South Europe, in Southwest Asia, and in North Africa. In every instance, the net effect has been massive bloodshed, refugee crises, economic disintegration, and the growth of terrorist organizations that perpetuate the conflict. This has been the case in the Balkans, in Afghanistan, in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Georgia, and Central Asia. The recent upsurge of Uighur terrorism in western China is part of the same picture.

In effect, just as LaRouche warned in late 2011, a major war is being provoked against Russia and China by the British, using their surrogates in the White House and NATO. At the present moment, Ukrainian Right Sector and related neo-Nazi forces are staging a brutal ethnic-cleansing campaign against pro-Russian citizens of southeast Ukraine. The on-the-ground atrocities have been backed by a bombing campaign against cities and towns like Slavyansk and Donetsk. The intent behind the mayhem is far more dangerous than the ethnic cleansing per se: to draw Russia into a direct military conflict—not with Ukraine, but with the United States and NATO. So long as Obama is in the White House, the danger of a global showdown involving the use of thermonuclear weapons is live.

LaRouche's Four Laws

The only viable solution to this crisis is to wipe out the power of the British Empire before the crisis reaches the tipping point for general war. The solution is not military action. The solution is for the United States to adopt the "Four New Laws To Save the U.S.A.," spelled out recently by LaRouche:² Reinstate Glass-Steagall; put the U.S. banking system under Treasury Department supervision; issue directed credits for job-creating massive infrastructure; and launch an international crash program to develop commercial thermonuclear fusion as the driver for the world recovery. By reinstating Glass-Steagall, the power of Wall Street and the City of London will be wiped out in the largest orderly bankruptcy reorganization in history. With the power of the British Empire thus eliminated, the danger of war will cease. Without LaRouche's solution, the war danger will only grow.

pire's color revolutions, and Moscow's response.

2. [EIR](#), June 13, 2014.

1. See [EIR](#), June 13, 2014, for in-depth coverage of the British Em-

ISIS Represents Neither Sunnis nor Islam

His Excellency Hamid Bayat is the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Kingdom of Denmark. He was interviewed in Copenhagen on June 20, 2014, by Tom Gillesberg, EIR Copenhagen Bureau Chief, and chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark. The questions were prepared in consultation with EIR Counterintelligence Editor Jeffrey Steinberg, and EIR Arabic-language Editor Hussein Askary. Ambassador Bayat spoke in Farsi, and the following is a transcript of the English interpretation. The video and audio of the interview are posted at: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1872>.



Courtesy of Ambassador Hamid Bayat

H.E. Ambassador Hamid Bayat

EIR: Thank you very much for granting EIR this interview.

Lyndon LaRouche, and *EIR*, have been warning for some time, that as a result of the collapsing London-Wall Street-based financial system, what we call the modern British Empire—which has been working with the collusion of President Obama—is now pursuing a confrontation strategy against Russia and China, which can lead to nuclear war. We have been trying to prevent this, including, this weekend, the Schiller Institute held a conference celebrating its 30th anniversary, entitled, “Now Is the Time To Create a World Without War.” During the past couple of weeks, we have seen that the international conflict, with focus on Ukraine, has been augmented by the renewed conflict in Iraq, with the recent military victories of ISIS, or ISIL.

We see this as a continuation of the British strategy, first elaborated by Tony Blair in April 1999, to break up the nation-states of Eurasia and create the conditions for permanent warfare. Within the Islamic world, this has taken the form of promoting sectarian conflict between Sunni and Shi’a, which could lead to a multi-generational war, reminiscent of the Balkan Wars that the British manipulated soon after the fall of the Iron Curtain.

How are the two situations in Syria and Iraq interconnected, and how do you view this danger of the

British manipulating the current Iraq crisis into a trigger for such sectarian conflict that could be never-ending?

Imperialism’s Hidden Agendas

Amb. Hamid Bayat: First of all, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Schiller Institute and you too, personally, for taking the trouble to be here at the embassy today. First of all, I would like to say a few things regarding an analysis of the situation in the region. After the developments in recent years in the region, hopes among the people were raised for them to be able to get some form of democracy and self-rule, or rule of law in their countries. It was expected that after the fall of the dictatorial regimes, some form of government would come to power based on the voices of the people, through the ballot boxes.

Unfortunately, we have witnessed that some people do not see their interests compatible with the democratic process, and they don’t see their interests addressed by democracy in those regions. So, due to the interests of certain people, we now have a confrontation between what are, on the one hand, the people who

want anarchy and violence, and on the other, the people who are more interested in a democratic process. And this has resulted in the growth and the emergence of groups that are terroristic in their nature.

It has been proven, everywhere, that terrorism breeds on violence and instability, no matter where. The more unstable the situation, the more chances for them to flourish and to grow. And on the opposite side, what can contribute more to the process of democracy, and the establishment of peace and security, is the voice of democracy, and the process of democracy. What happened in that region over the past years, is that some countries of the region, and even some countries in the Western world, do not see their interest in the establishment of a democratic process in those countries. So, these extremist groups, terrorist groups, actually found new friends, or they found friends that could help them in their efforts to grow and to become stronger.

What we see today in Iraq, in the form of ISIS or ISIL, is not a new phenomenon. We have seen this taking shape over the years. We've seen them in Afghanistan. We've seen them even in some parts of Africa. This has been a process where they have grown and grown, and then they have become what we have today. From time to time, they might wind down a little bit, but then again, they re-emerge and take different shapes. But the fundamental thing is to know which actors contribute to the re-emergence of these groups, and what can be done to stop them.

If we want to look at what is happening in Iraq today, we have to first take a look at the events in Syria. As you mentioned, there is a very close connection between the developments in Syria, and what is happening today in Iraq. When the crisis in Syria began to unfold, we insisted all along, that this has to be resolved through dialogue. But, unfortunately, the funds, the weaponry that was sent to these groups in Syria, and the other help given to them, created the foundation for these groups to grow, and to spread, and to contribute to the development of the instability in the region. What these groups did in Syria, the atrocities they committed, and the destruction they brought upon the people and the country, united the people with the Syrian Army, and they were able to resist these groups in some ways. In a way, one could say that these groups were defeated on two fronts in Syria. One was the military front, and the other front was from the people, the civil front. The election that took place in Syria, and the re-election of President

Bashar al-Assad, showed that the majority of the Syrian people support Bashar al-Assad.

With the setbacks in Syria, they were after some new terrain for their activities. So, Iraq was the focus of attention. They saw that Iraq is a fertile ground for that, for different reasons. The first reason is that, unfortunately, over the past few years, Iraq has not been able to establish that level of security and stability that it should.

The second point, is the remnants of the former Iraqi Ba'ath Party, particularly the commanders of the former Iraqi Army, that have been giving help to these groups. The third point is the differences that remain in Iraq, particularly after the re-election of the al-Maliki government in the recent election—the differences between the factions there, were actually increased.

The next point, is the sectarian element, particularly the Shi'a-Sunni divide, and some people hide themselves behind this divide, and try to take advantage of this phenomenon, to advance their own cause. This has been no secret—that one of the hidden agendas of some imperialistic powers has been to use the Shi'a-Sunni divide to try to inflame this concept, to take advantage, for their own goals. The next thing, is to try to limit the power of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the region, in order, in the same way, to increase the power of some regions, and to the benefit of some powers outside the region. And the next point, is the hesitation, by some countries that have influence and power in the region, their hesitation to help the Iraqis repel these movements, and to stop their advance in some parts of Iraq.

So, this is basically a very brief run-through of developments that have brought us to where we are today, with the ISIS taking control of some sectors of Iraq, and thereby posing a threat to the people of Iraq, and insecurity to the countries of the region, and countries outside of the region.

A U.S.-Iran Alliance?

EIR: Right now, the Iranian government has come out and strongly supported the Iraqi government, in front of this danger. And, also, the United States is having a big discussion about what should be done, in order to avoid these anti-civilization forces taking over Iraq. The question is, what is then the attitude of the current Iranian government, and the Supreme Leader, towards a de facto military alliance with the United States to halt the violence in Iraq and defeat the

Dark Ages forces of ISIS? How do you envision such cooperation if you agree with the value of Iranian-American joint efforts? How would you avoid the danger of sectarian violence escalating under those conditions?

Ambassador Bayat: Let me address the second part of your question, about the sectarian divide. Iraq is made up of a diverse number of tribal societies. If we want to sum them up, Iraq is made up of groups of Shi'as, Sunnis, Kurds, and, also, Turkmens. The point is, that

differences among these various groups, are somewhat unavoidable. But the point about whether ISIS is a representative of the Sunni community, and whether this fight is actually a confrontation between, on the one hand, the ISIS, representing the Sunnis, with the Shi'as, is a totally wrong conception, and it is something to actually deflect attention from the main thing. For many years, Iraqi societies have been able to live, side by side, in peace. The spiritual leaders of the Sunnis, and the spiritual leaders of the Shi'as, have been living side by side, and they have never had any problems with each other.

The second point is that this extremist group, the ISIS, whenever they occupy a place, they don't even limit their violence and their atrocities just to the Shi'as. They actually attack the Sunnis as well, so much so, that the Sunnis, when these people come, actually flee, they try to leave the place, and the Christian community in the same way. They are destroying churches. They have special types of beliefs.

One of the fundamental things, one of the main reasons for the formation of these groups, for the emergence of these groups, and for the support these groups receive, is actually to show a very violent and unreal image of Islam to the world, and to show that Islam is a violent religion, and that Islam is an extremist religion. When people in other parts of the world, when a non-Muslim, particularly in the West, sees the footage, when they hear the news, the impression they get is, "This is Islam that we see," and this, of course, is a very, very



In this video, posted by the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), an ISIS fighter is shown carrying out a mass execution in Iraq.

ISIS

serious danger for the future of Islam. This will only bring about an Islamophobia in the Western countries, and the other countries, and this will also give a very negative image of Islam.

Whereas, on the contrary, true Islam is a religion of compassion, a religion of peace among nations. And when the Prophet, peace be upon him, when he was advent to the religion, he was given a mission of spreading compassion and kindness to the whole world. From the image that these groups are now creating of Islam, a non-believer would conclude that Islam is a religion of violence, and these groups, and their fight [with] the Shi'as, will actually strengthen this feeling that Islam is propagating division.

So, I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize, categorically, that what we see in Iraq, is that these groups are not representatives of Sunni Islam, and are not representative of Islam at all. And what is happening there, is not a war between the Shi'as and the Sunnis.

What Iran Can Do

Now, coming to what the Islamic Republic of Iran can do to help solve this problem, I would like to point out a few things.

We have, all along, when the developments in Syria took place, even way before that, when things were happening in Afghanistan, when this crisis started, we have always warned against the danger of the growth and the spread of these groups and terrorists. We have always called on, we have always invited, the countries



Presidency of the Islamic Republic of Iran

President Hassan Rouhani, at a recent UN General Assembly, proposed the idea of a world without violence and terrorism, said Ambassador Bayat, “and our expectation, from the rest of the world, is to cooperate, to try to stem the spread of these groups, and the growth of terrorism.”

of the region, and outside, for cooperation to confront these groups, and to prevent these groups from gaining strength. And for this reason, at the recent UN General Assembly, our President [Hassan Rouhani] proposed the idea of a world without violence and terrorism. Our expectation, from the rest of the world, is to cooperate, to try to stem the spread of these groups, and the growth of terrorism. We have condemned, at the highest level, the attack by these groups on Iraqi territory. We have announced our support for the government of Iraq, and to confront these groups; and we have emphasized the legitimate right of the government of Iraq, and the people of Iraq, to stand firm against these groups, and to defeat them.

We also emphasize the territorial integrity of Iraq, of a united Iraq. Before, and in the recent elections in Iraq, of course, there were groups and parties that were not satisfied. They were not happy with the outcome of the election. But the important thing is that there is no

doubt, that if these groups come together, they can defeat the voices of the extremists and what is happening in Iraq. And it is a known fact that if these extremist groups come to power in Iraq, of course, all groups, and all parties, people from all walks of life, will suffer as a result.

We believe the government of Iraq, and the people of Iraq, have the adequate potential to actually be able to confront these groups. Particularly the move by the people to confront these groups, following the call to arms from the religious leaders, particularly Ayatollah Sistani, and the people responding positively to that, is significant from our point of view. The point to mention here is that the role that these spiritual leaders play in the creation of unity among the various sections of Iraq is of significance.

Regarding the help from Iran, we believe that if the government of Iraq asks for help, within the framework of international law, and within the framework of the decisions made by the international community, Iran is ready to afford any help it can to the Iraqi government. Regarding cooperation between Iran and the United States, more than being anything of substance, it has been more speculation and rumors, advocated by, perhaps, some sectors of the media.

There is no talk of any military cooperation between Iran and the United States on this at all.

The Role of Saudi Arabia

EIR: The mass media in most Gulf states have been describing the ISIS takeover in Mosul and Tikrit also as a “popular uprising,” and have been attacking Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki for creating the conditions for this revolt; but, at the same time, there is also evidence that much of the initial money to launch ISIS came from Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states, even if not from official government channels. Prime Minister al-Maliki has cited some evidence of the Saudi support for ISIS, and denounced it as supporting terrorism.

It also appears that there is a genuine effort to avert the Sunni-versus-Shi’a conflict within the Islamic world, by attempting to improve relations with Saudi Arabia. Foreign Minister Zarif from the Islamic Republic of Iran had been invited to visit Riyadh, and there have been communications between Ayatollah Rafsanjani and Saudi King Abdullah.

What do you see as the merit and the prospects for such an improvement in relations, and how might this

impact the crisis now unfolding in Iraq?

Ambassador Bayat: There is no doubt that Saudi Arabia is an important and influential country in the region. Saudi Arabia might have differences of opinion with us on some issues in the region, including events in Syria and Iraq, but we have always emphasized that within the framework of negotiations, and within the framework of having relations, we can iron out differences through negotiations. We have always announced our readiness for constructive talks with the Saudi government.

We believe that the growth of these extremist groups and terrorism threatens the peace and security of all countries in the region. No country will be immune from the danger posed by these terrorist groups. I have to say that these people, these groups, are not, and will not be, the representative of the Sunni community. In fact, most of the religious leaders, most of the intellectuals in the Sunni community, have distanced themselves from the actions of these groups, actions that are terroristic in nature, and the atrocities that they commit against innocent civilians speak for themselves. The thoughts of these groups, and the violence and brutality of their behavior, is actually opposed by all the religious leaders, all intellectuals in societies, and by the public at large, including in the Muslim world. The era of changing the balance of power, through supporting these terrorist groups, is over, and supporting these terrorist groups, now, will impose heavy costs on the perpetrators.

Fighting Terrorism: An International Obligation

EIR: We certainly hope so. One sign of it is the fact that, in Britain right now, Tony Blair is coming under very heavy attack—that impeachment proceedings have even begun in the British Parliament, to put him on trial for the crimes that he has committed, since the official Chilcot Inquiry [into Britain’s role in the Iraq War—ed.] has not yet come up with any proceedings, outside the fact that Blair misled Britain to go into the war in Iraq in the first place, and by him “sexing up” evidence, also got the United States to go into the war. If anything, one could say that the ISIS is the baby of Tony Blair.



Tony Blair, shown here being grilled Feb. 3, 2010, by the parliamentary Chilcot Inquiry into his role in the fraudulent set-up for the war in Iraq, has called for an end to the Westphalian principle of national sovereignty.

So, one would think that it’s time that certain consequences would ensue. The forces that have been supporting this “divide and conquer” or “divide and rule” policy, which was that of the Roman Empire and any empires before, but which, also, specifically, was the British Empire—that those days are over.

But within that, the question is therefore, also, what can Russia, China, the U.S., and regional powers like Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and India, contribute to solving the crises in Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan, as the problem of sectarianism and terrorism seem to be interconnected in all these countries? What can, and what should these nations do?

Ambassador Bayat: There is no doubt, that confronting and fighting terrorism, is not the job of one, or a few nations. This is a world responsibility. This is an international obligation. Today, many, many nations are actually, in some ways, facing these threats, and they are involved in this. When we hear that thousands of residents of European nations, and from other parts of the world, are streaming into Syria and the region, to take part in these fights, the danger posed by these people, not only to the region there, but also back home, is something that cannot be ignored.

As I said earlier, the confrontation between the voices of democracy, on the one hand, and the voices of anarchy and violence, on the other, is now manifesting itself in the region of the Middle East. The countries, and the nations, must choose one of these two. We believe that it is the responsibility of the world community, to move in the direction of the part that is seeking democracy, to support that, to enable peace and stabil-

ity to return to the Middle East, and this will, in turn, benefit everybody in the world.

Some people might think that by supporting terrorists, or extremist groups, they might gain some advantages. In the short term, that might be, but the point is, those gains will not be permanent. That is the first thing. And the second thing, is that experience has shown that the terrorist groups do not remain loyal to the people who commission them, or the people who back them. The world community is now faced with this fact that it needs a determination to confront terrorism. So, we have said that the Islamic Republic of Iran is ready to cooperate with the international community, to confront, to defeat terrorism, and to work towards peace and security.

Return to the Principle of Westphalia

EIR: It's almost like you can say today, that the whole world, right now, has to learn the same lesson that Europe learned in 1648, where after the Thirty Years War, which actually was 150 years of war, where everybody supported this religion against that religion, this army against that army, and the armies took over all of Europe, and threatened all of civilization to go under. And at that point, people came together at the Peace of Westphalia, to say, "Now we established the principle of sovereign nation-states. We will not allow interference in other countries. We might have disagreements, but if we support groups in other countries, against the nations, this just creates permanent chaos and war." And if Europe had not done that in 1648, Europe would have ceased to exist as a civilization.

Now, what we have seen since—you could say that Tony Blair was very specific in Chicago in 1999. Later, he was even more specific, in saying that we should move into the post-Westphalian world. We should no longer have respect for nation-states. We should have this "responsibility to protect," and other ways of saying that it is okay to intervene into other nations. And now we're seeing that if this principle is allowed to spread, from what we have seen now in the Middle East, and it spreads to the whole world, then all civilization will cease to exist.

So what you are basically saying is that we have to go back to what actually worked. This principle of sovereign nation-states that might have disagreements, but solve those disagreements, not through war, but

through discussions, through working together. Through having this respect for your fellow nations, and saying that the progress of the other, is also to my advantage, because if we have progress, if we have development, we can all prosper, but if we have war, we all go under.

Is there anything else you would like to say?

Ambassador Bayat: I think, as you said, the sovereignty of nations is a key element here. I think we have to respect the sovereignty of nations, and I think, unfortunately, we experience a lot of double standards in the world today, where, on the one hand, in some areas, they reject, or even oppose, democratic movements. They think that a gain for a certain country, would be a loss to them. But I think these thoughts have to be put aside, and I think that, in the long run, a strong determination must come into force, from all nations. We must do away with double standards, and we have to unite, and work toward establishing peace and security in the world, and a gain by one country, can be, in the end, a gain for the world community.

Thank you.

EIR: Thank you.



The Al-Qaeda Executive

Financed and deployed by the British-Saudi Empire, al-Qaeda has

been protected by the Obama Administration to accomplish the Empire's global war. In this feature [video](#), LaRouchePAC documents President Obama's use of the al-Qaeda networks to overthrow Qaddafi in Libya, and to carry out bloody regime-change against Assad in Syria, by the same forces who attacked the U.S. consulate in Benghazi.

www.larouchepac.com

King Faisal and the Forging of The Anglo-Saudi Terror Alliance

by Richard Freeman

This is the second part of a series detailing the Anglo-Saudi alliance. Part I ran in EIR, May 23, 2014 (“Charles of Arabia: The British Monarchy, Saudi Arabia, and 9/11”). This installment details the critical role of the late King Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud in forging this alliance and transforming Saudi Arabia into a leading force behind the global “Jihad Without Borders,” targeting nations, particularly in Eurasia and Africa, for total destruction.

King Faisal bin Abdulaziz al Saud (reign 1964-75) was one of the most evil men of the 20th Century. He transformed the Saudi state into: 1) the hub for control and deployment of Wahhabi-based terror around the world; 2) the center for siphoning trillions of petrodollars that largely found their way into accounts in the City of London; 3) an internal police state under Wahhabi authority; and 4) the largest militarized state and purchaser of defense weapons in the Third World.

Although he was assassinated in 1975, King Faisal’s legacy lives on through the extended Faisal clan. Today, King Faisal’s five most politically important children and/or sons-in-law, are among Prince Charles’ closest collaborators in directing the British-Saudi Empire’s support for international terrorism. They are: Prince Turki bin Faisal; Prince Mohammad bin Faisal; Prince Bandar bin Sultan—the husband of King Faisal’s daughter, Princess Haifa bint Faisal; Prince Saud bin Faisal, and Prince Khalid bin Faisal. The imprint of Faisal’s fundamental changes is so significant that its evil still shapes the thinking and contours of policy of the House of Saud, and specific decisions, to this day.

Faisal’s Origins

King Faisal was born in 1906 in Riyadh; his father, Abdulaziz al Saud, was a warrior, a killing machine. As early as the 1915 Anglo-Saudi Treaty of Darin, the British government officially recognized Abdulaziz, who had conquered his rivals, as the ruler of the Nejd region, part of the modern Saudi state. He officially received

\$300,000 a year from His Majesty’s government, during the 1920s, a large sum in those days, as well as receiving British weapons.

Deploying a force he had created—the first Ikhwan, or Muslim Brotherhood—he drowned the Arabian peninsula in blood; in some villages, his forces killed every last man, woman, and child. By 1932, the Saudi Kingdom was created. Faisal’s mother, Tarfa, was equally important, as a member of Al ash-Sheikh family, the direct descendants of Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab (1730-92), the founder of Wahhabism, and the most powerful family in Wahhabism during the past 150 years. When Faisal was six years old, his mother died; he was raised by his maternal grandfather, Abdullah bin Abdullatif, one of the most powerful leaders of the Wahhabi-run Saudi Ulema (supreme religious council). Abdullatif raised Faisal in the most pure form of radical Wahhabism, which the future king advocated throughout his life.

Faisal and the British

Twice Faisal was deployed to be groomed in Britain: once, in 1919, when only 13 years old, he was received by King George V and Queen Mary, and members of the British aristocracy; the second time was in 1926, when he met and collaborated with King George V to concretize the creation of the Kingdom of Nejd and Hijaz, which is the core of the Saudi state. King George V—the grandfather of Queen Elizabeth II—awarded Faisal the Honorary Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, the highest honor that can be bestowed upon a foreigner.

With the creation of the Saudi state in 1932, Faisal’s father became King Abdulaziz al Saud, more commonly known as Ibn Saud. The Saud House had previously conquered the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, putting them under Wahhabite control. King Ibn Saud appointed Faisal as Saudi Foreign Minister, a post he would hold with an iron grip for the next 43 years, even after he became king. Working with the British, Prince

Faisal made Saudi foreign policy serve British interests.

Despite some modest oil income, during the 1950s and 1960s, the Saudi economy was weak and backward, and the British feared that Saudi Arabia was ripe to fall to the pro-development nationalist movement founded by Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

In 1953, King Ibn Saud died, and Prince Faisal's older brother, Saud, became King. From the British standpoint, King Saud was ineffective, and was seen as vulnerable to be toppled by Nasserite currents within Saudi Arabia. In 1963, the British deployed two of their top black operations officers, Lt. Col. Neil Bromage and Lt. Col. Kenneth Trimbell, to reorganize the Saudi Arabia National Guard (SANG), whose official purpose was to provide protection for the royal family. In late 1963, the Bromage-Trimbell-led SANG overthrew King Saud, and installed Prince Faisal as king, a violent action that was backed by Prince Faisal's close relatives in the Wahhabite Ulema, who issued a fatwa officially approving Faisal's usurpation of power.

In the interim period, in 1962, Prince Faisal created the Muslim World League (WML), as the coordinating center for Wahhabite and Salafist subversive activity, ultimately leading to the jihadist terrorism of today.

The Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood, which had taken refuge in Saudi Arabia after a crackdown by Nasser, quickly made a pact with Faisal, resulting in a merger of Wahhabi/Salafist ideology with Muslim Brotherhood pan-Islamist propaganda and recruitment methods. Under this arrangement, Muslim Brothers were able to reshape the harsh Salafi ideology and message to a modern form more acceptable to mainstream Muslim audiences. Sayyid Qutb and other Muslim Brotherhood scholars' books were published and distributed with Saudi money. The Muslim World League and several other organizations were formed under



Robert L. Nudsen

King Faisal upon his arrival in Washington, May 27, 1971. His evil legacy lives on today, through the murderous actions of the terrorist groups he funded.

Faisal, reflecting his collaboration with the Muslim Brotherhood.

During this period, key members of the Muslim Brotherhood from elsewhere in the Arab world also migrated to Saudi Arabia to avoid crackdowns like that in Egypt. (Sayyid Qutb, one of the most important Muslim Brotherhood proponents of violent jihad, was executed by Nasser in the mid-1960s.) Between the 1960s and 1990s, key members of Muslim Brotherhood were on the Muslim World League payroll.

Faisal's children believe Faisal bin Musaid (Faisal's half brother's son) was ordered by the United States to kill their father to im-

prove Saudi-Iranian relations. Musaid had just come back from a U.S. trip. King Faisal's successor, King Khalid, did significantly improve relations with Iran, and after the Iranian Revolution, he sent a congratulatory letter to Ayatollah Khomeini.

British 'Reforms'

Above all else, King Faisal promoted the Anglo-Saudi alliance and put the Kingdom under effective British control. Having been thrust into the position of king by the British, in 1964, Faisal made fundamental changes, which permanently transformed Saudi Arabia from a nasty, but strictly regional force, into the state that has helped bring the world to the verge of a thermonuclear war of annihilation. Some of the British-mandated reforms that set this process in motion were:

- *Internal police state intensified:* In the early 1960s, ARAMCO (Arabian-American Oil Company) workers in Saudi Arabia's Eastern Province went on strike. Faisal and the oil companies crushed them. In 1964, Faisal announced new anti-strike laws; one law led to widespread arrests of opposition activists in the Eastern Province, who were accused of being communists. Faisal banned all demonstrations of any type in Saudi Arabia; political formations, particularly in Shi'ite regions, were suppressed. Internal spying was

intensified, with new electronic surveillance methods introduced.

- *Reorganized the Saudi intelligence service:* Saudi Arabia created its own intelligence service in 1957, but it was a strictly low-level operation. In 1965, King Faisal ordered its reorganization into the Mukhabarat al-Amah, and appointed as its head Kamal Adham, his much younger brother-in-law, whom Faisal had raised as a son.

Under Kamal Adham, Saudi intelligence greatly expanded into dirty money, black market armaments, and drug networks. Adham would become, apparently, while head of the Saudi intelligence service, a major shareholder of the Bank for Commerce and Credit International (BCCI), one of the foremost weapons and drug banks in the world, which had a private mercenary army of over 1,000 people. In his book *Prelude to Terror*, Joseph Trento reported that the Saudi intelligence service undertook operations for the CIA, which the U.S. Congress had forbidden the Agency to engage in, between the time of Watergate and the end of the Carter Administration. Saudi intelligence played a direct role in the Iran-Contra operations, and during the 1980s, in building, financing, and directing the Maktab al-Khidamat, which in 1989 changed its name to al-Qaeda.

These intelligence operations were precursors to the 1985 Al-Yamamah deal between Saudi Arabia and Britain, which created the greatest pool of offshore cash for black operations ever conceived. The Al-Yamamah operation was organized by King Faisal's son-in-law Prince Bandar bin Sultan and during the tenure of the King's son Prince Turki bin Faisal as head of Saudi intelligence (1979-2001).

- *Created a military garrison state:* Prior to Faisal's 1964 coup, Saudi Arabia was not a military power; it had a small, backward armed forces. Faisal radically altered that. In 1965, he concluded a massive deal with Britain and the United States to purchase initially between \$300 to \$400 million worth of weapons. The deal included add-ons that would make it worth between \$10 and \$15 billion in today's dollars. Under the deal, Saudi Arabia bought 40 British Lightning and 25 British Strikemaster fighter aircraft, and dozens of the American Northrup Freedom Fighters, as its fighter jets. That was one part of the deal; in his book *The King's Messenger*, David Ottaway reported: "But [the Saudis] also bought U.S. Hawk anti-aircraft missiles, and signed up for the Pentagon to begin building a radar defense system," that would cover and protect a good

portion of Saudi Arabia. Faisal developed a plan to greatly increase the size of Saudi Arabia's armed forces, in particular, its Air Force.

Taken as a whole, Faisal's initiatives were the decisive step that catapulted Saudi Arabia into the largest Third World weapons purchaser.

Reuters reported that Saudi Arabia has a deal with Pakistan to rent or buy, and deploy nuclear weapons.

- *Implemented, with the British, the 1973-75 oil embargo/hoax which shattered the world economy:* Under the instruction of British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell, King Faisal launched the Oct. 17, 1973 oil embargo/hoax, which devastated industrial production worldwide, creating a depression, and aided in destroying the U.S. dollar.

During the Yom Kippur War (Oct. 6-25, 1973) between Israel and the Arab world, on Faisal's personal instructions, Saudi Arabia led the Organization of Oil Exporting Countries (OPEC), to adopt an oil embargo: The price of oil immediately rose from \$3 to \$5.11 per barrel; oil production would be cut by 5% at regular intervals; however, on Nov. 25, Saudi Arabia and some other countries imposed a 25% oil output cut-off. On Jan. 11, 1974, the OPEC nations raised the price of petroleum to \$11.65 per barrel, a quadrupling of the price since October.

Industrial production collapsed, from Japan, to Germany and Italy, to Brazil and Taiwan, and unemployment rose sharply. Between 1973 and 1975, in the United States, the acute effect was such that private gross investment fell 31%; the official inflation rate rose 26%; the stock market collapsed 45%; factories in closed, and the nationwide unemployment level jumped 75%.

On Aug. 15, 1971, President Richard Nixon had fulfilled longstanding British demands to take the dollar off the Bretton Woods fixed-exchange-rate system. Under the British-Saudi embargo that soon followed, the dollar crashed, and the U.S. lost sovereign control of its currency and credit. Saudi oil revenues rose from \$1.8 billion per year in 1964, the year Faisal came to power, to \$32.9 billion in 1975, almost a 20-fold increase. A portion of this, and increasing future revenues, were earmarked for dirty operations, and for terrorism.

The 1973-75 oil embargo-hoax was an act of deliberate economic warfare against the world, and in particular, the United States, by the British and King Faisal.

- *Set up the apparatus for world terrorism:* Through his personal establishment of the Muslim World League in Riyadh in 1962, among other steps, King Faisal set up

the apparatus for world terrorism. This will be the subject of Part III of this series, detailing the Saudi financial infrastructure upon which the neo-Salafist global “Jihad Without Borders” apparatus has been built.

In 1967, in England, King Faisal and Queen Eliza-

beth II held strategic meetings, in which they cemented an integrated working relationship between the House of Saud and the House of Windsor. That relationship has been the wellspring of much of the evil that has beset the world since that date.

What Is Wahhabism?

One of the most rigid and reactionary sects in all of Islam today is Wahhabism. It is the official and dominant Sunni sect in Saudi Arabia, whose sole constitution is the Holy Qur'an. Wahhabism was born in the middle of the 18th Century in the Arabian Peninsula's central region of Najd. The Wahhabi sect derives its name from the name of its founder Mohammad Ibn Abdul-Wahhab (1703-92). Like most Sunni Islamic fundamentalist movements, the Wahhabis have advocated the fusion of state power and religion through the reestablishment of the Islamic Caliphate, the form of government adopted by the Prophet Muhammad's successors during the age of Muslim expansion. What sets Wahhabism apart from other Sunni Islamist movements is its historical obsession with purging Sufis, Shiites, and other Muslims who do not conform to its twisted interpretation of Islamic scripture.

Wahhabism and Saudi Arabia's ruling House of Saud have been intimately intertwined since their births. Wahhabism created the Saudi monarchy, and the House of Saud spread Wahhabism. One could not have existed without the other. Wahhabism gives the House of Saud legitimacy, and the House of Saud protects and promotes Wahhabism. In 1744, Ibn Abd al-Wahhab forged an historic alliance with the al-Saud clan and sanctified its drive to vanquish its rivals. In return, the House of Saud supported campaigns by Wahhabi zealots to cleanse the land of “unbelievers.” In 1801, Saudi-Wahhabi warriors crossed into present-day Iraq and sacked the Shiite holy city of Karbala, killing over 4,000 people.

Various Saudi-Wahhabi terrorist acts and blasphemous crimes historically aroused the deep anger of Muslims around the world. In 1818, as the official ruler of the Arabian Peninsula and the guardian of Islam's holiest mosques, the Ottoman Caliph in Istanbul, Caliph Mahmud II, ordered an Egyptian force

to be sent to the Arabian Peninsula to punish the Saudi-Wahhabi clan. An Egyptian army destroyed the Wahhabis and razed their desert capital of Dir'iyah to the ground. The Wahhabi Imam Abdullah al-Saud and two of his followers were sent to Istanbul in chains, where they were publicly beheaded. The rest of the leadership of the Saudi-Wahhabi clan was held in captivity in Cairo.

Although Wahhabism was destroyed in 1818, it was soon revived with the help of British colonialism. After the execution of Imam Abdullah al-Saud, the remnants of the Saudi-Wahhabi clan looked at their Arab and Muslim brothers as their real enemies, and to Britain and the West in general as their true friends. Accordingly, when Britain colonized Bahrain in 1820, and began to look for ways to expand its colonization in the area, the House of Saud found it a great opportunity to seek British protection and help.

In 1843, the Wahhabi Imam Faisal Ibn Turki al-Saud escaped from captivity in Cairo and returned to Riyadh, where he began to make contacts with the British. In 1848 he appealed to the British Political Resident in the Persian city of Bushere “to support his representative in Trucial Oman.” The British sent Col. Lewis Pelly to Riyadh in 1865 to establish an official treaty with the House of Saud. To impress Pelly with his fanaticism and violence, Imam Faisal said that the major difference in the Wahhabi strategy between political and religious wars was that in the latter there would be no compromise, for “we kill everybody” (quoted in Robert Lacey, *The Kingdom: Arabia and the House of Saud* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981).

In 1866, the Wahhabi House of Saud signed a friendship treaty with Britain. The treaty was similar to the many unequal treaties imposed by Britain on other Arab puppets along the Persian Gulf. In exchange for British help, money, and weapons, the House of Saud agreed to collaborate with Britain's colonial authorities in the area.

— Ramtanu Maitra

International Intelligence

51 Million Refugees, First Time Since WWII

June 20—The British Empire’s genocidal wars have created the highest number of refugees since the Second World War, according to the latest Global Trends Report by the United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR). The number of refugees now exceeds 50 million, half whom are children, reported the June 20 London *Guardian*.

There are 16.7 million refugees who have fled their countries because of conflict. Apart from 5 million Palestinians, the largest refugee populations are Afghans, Syrians, and Somalis. The main host countries have been Pakistan, Iran, Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. Asylum seekers, defined as those who have submitted asylum claims, mostly in developed countries, number 1.2 million, with the highest number coming from Syria (64,300), followed by the Democratic Republic of Congo (60,400), and Myanmar (57,400). Germany was the largest recipient.

Another 33.3 million refugees have been displaced within their own countries. More than 25,000 unaccompanied children lodged asylum applications in 77 countries last year, a fraction of the number of displaced minors across the globe, reports the *Guardian*.

“We are witnessing a quantum leap in forced displacement in the world,” António Guterres (Portugal), UN High Commissioner for Refugees, said, as figures for 2013 showed a total of 51.2 million refugees, asylum seekers, and internally displaced people. He added, “There is no humanitarian solution.... The solution is political and the solution is to solve the conflicts that generate these dramatic levels of displacement.”

China Denounces Obama’s Marine Preserve Scheme

June 20—China’s *Global Times* today denounced Obama’s and genocidal “marine

preserve” in the central Pacific Ocean, which uses an Executive Order to lock up 782,000 square miles against fishing, drilling, and other commercial activities, extending out 200 miles from the seven U.S. territories around the Pacific. Obama announced the nine-fold expansion of the Remote Islands National Marine Monument June 17.

“[T]he international community has yet to figure out which international law it is based on,” the Chinese paper wrote, since Washington has not ratified the UNCLOS treaty which provides for a 200-mile exclusive economic zone.

“Whether Washington has other purposes remains to be seen.... It seems that the U.S. intends to break through some restrictions with the excuse of ‘protecting the ocean’ to further expand and intensify its presence in the Pacific Ocean.”

Obama’s announcement comes amid the process of intense negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, and “A myriad of world media outlets have simultaneously mentioned these two actions, demonstrating that the whole of the international community has sensed they are somewhat internally linked.”

NATO Chief: Russia Plots Against Gas Fracking

June 19—NATO’s Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen, on a trip to London to discuss plans for the upcoming NATO summit in Wales this fall, made himself an international laughingstock when he told journalists that Russia was waging a sophisticated disinformation campaign to try to discredit fracking.

Rasmussen met with Prime Minister David Cameron and gave a speech at the RIIA’s Chatham House, where he droned on about plans for the “Future NATO.” Among his plans were enhanced capability, more funding, and increased “readiness” to act globally, all based on the idea that the “trans-Atlantic bond is the foundation for the world order.”

On the sidelines of the event, howev-

er, Rasmussen made a number of more pointed comments. The first was to claim that Russia has once again sent troops to menace its border with Ukraine. The second, reported in all major British news media, was his wild comment about fracking.

“I have met allies who can report that Russia, as part of their sophisticated information and disinformation operations, engaged actively with so-called nongovernmental organizations—environmental organizations working against shale gas—to maintain European dependence on imported Russian gas. That is my interpretation.”

Environmental groups immediately went into an uproar. NATO, according to the media, declared that Rasmussen’s statements were his own opinion. The *Daily Telegraph* quoted Greenpeace sarcastically commenting on the number of Greenpeace activists Russia has jailed recently. A spokesman said, “The idea we’re puppets of Putin is so preposterous that you have to wonder what they’re smoking over at NATO HQ.”

Greenpeace Lost EU3.8 Mn In Speculation Last Year

June 18—Greenpeace International, the environmentalist/terrorist front, has used donations money to speculate on currency markets and lost EU3.8 million last year. GI issued a statement saying an employee at Amsterdam headquarters took out currency-exchange contracts that speculated on a weak euro in the second half of 2013. As a result of the euro strengthening later in the year, Greenpeace had to file record losses when closing accounts at the end of the year. Its 2013 annual report will show a budget deficit of EU6.8 million.

With an annual income of EU72.9 million in 2013, the loss of EU3.8 million represents a significant hit for Greenpeace International. Greenpeace claims independence, but maintains profound and enduring relationships with the Rockefeller funds.

SCHILLER CONFERENCE II

Bringing the Real America Into a World Without War

by Nancy Spannaus

June 23—Over the course of its one-day 30th anniversary conference in New York City June 15, the Schiller Institute brought together a stunning array of forces, from both within and without the United States, to discuss how to create a “world without war.” While the first panel was largely devoted to exposing the existential danger to mankind coming from the British Empire and its stooge Barack Obama, the rest of the day’s presentations were focused on defining the requirements for freeing Americans to be able to act once again in their true Constitutional tradition, and for bringing the United States into collaboration with the nations of Eurasia. Those nations, led by Russia and China, have already taken up the objective of intense, high-technology collaboration around the concept of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, a concept the Schiller Institute has been fighting for since the fall of the Soviet Union.

We provided the major speeches and messages from the first panel in our last issue;¹ in this, we publish the presentations from the second panel, Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s stirring discussion of the principles of, and necessity for, Classical poetry and music, and the additional important contributions to the conference as a whole.

Keynoting the second phase of the event was former Texas Senate candidate Kesha Rogers, whose remarks served as a “call to mission” for the audience, to bring the United States back to the tradition of John F. Kennedy, in particular, by lifting the cultural level of the

population such that it can participate in shaping effective solutions to the problems we face. Rogers identified Lyndon LaRouche’s “Four New Laws To Save the U.S.A. Now!,” as the immediate requirement, and challenged people with Vladimir Vernadsky’s concept of man as a “geological force” to manage the biosphere.

The subsequent presentations on Glass-Steagall and Classical culture by those involved in the fights to restore them were well-received. The conference was also privileged to receive a video presentation by former Congressman Neil Gallagher (D-N.J.), who described with passion, his own fight against the FBI’s police-state measures back in the 1970s; his full transcript is printed here.

The emotional capstone of the event came in the evening, with the Classical concert, and particularly the introduction to Schiller’s “Nänie” by Zepp-LaRouche, and the subsequent performance of the short setting of the poem by Brahms. Mrs. LaRouche’s presentation directly addressed the cultural disaster which prevents Americans, and others, today from acting on the most obvious solutions to the world crisis in the economy and strategically, by actually demonstrating the quality of Classical beauty which was conveyed, despite the fact that the poem was in a language foreign to most present.

The choral performance then had a stunning effect, leaving the audience momentarily silent, before bursting out into sustained applause.

The full audio and visual recordings of the conference have begun to be posted on the Schiller Institute’s website (www.schillerinstitute.org). It is expected that

1. See [EIR](#), June 20, 2014, for previous coverage of the conference, including Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s keynote speech.

the Institute will eventually produce proceedings in both DVD and written form, in order to spur further activity in this vein.

Kesha Rogers

Fighting for the Real American Tradition

The afternoon panel was moderated by Dennis Speed, who introduced the keynote speaker, Kesha Rogers. She ran in the recent Texas Democratic primary election as a candidate for the U.S. Senate, winning 28% of the vote against the Obamacrat candidate who spent \$5 million of his own money to defeat her.

Dennis Speed: ...One of the elements of the Schiller Institute that we always emphasize is Friedrich Schiller's warning, that often in history, great moments find little people, and that there are certain apertures in history, in which you can change everything. Helga LaRouche often remarks that one of the very first pieces that she wrote in her political career was called, "A Revolution Is a Question of Time." And when you have the time, you need those people to stand up and be heroic. The person who is going to give our keynote speech has demonstrated that kind of heroism and that kind of character: Kesha Rogers, who is a member of the National Policy Committee of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, and former U.S. Senate candidate of Texas—Kesha.

Kesha Rogers: Thank you. Well, I have to say, first of all that I'm not heroic. When I'm given a mission, I answer the call. And I think that what I'd like to do today, is to give each and every one of you a mission and give you a calling, that you must seek to answer.

The first panel started off with the discussion of what has happened, and what has gone awry, what has gone wrong with our nation, and how the world looks at the United States. Well, what I want to talk about, is that the conception that you have of the United States is not the real American tradition. I want to talk to you today,

about how we must fight to restore the uniquely true American tradition, that once inspired all nations, and get rid of the imperial tradition which has now usurped what we once were proud of, in this great nation. That's the optimism that Helga was speaking of earlier [see last week's issue of *EIR*], the nation of the United States represented under the leadership and the ideas of Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, and others, who were not heroes, but actually had a calling and a mission that they answered to.

Joint Campaigns: Texas and California

Many of you know, throughout the United States, that I led a campaign in the state of Texas, joined by my colleague in San Francisco, Michael Steger, running for the U.S. House of Representatives against the infamous Nancy Pelosi. We ran our two campaigns in two leading states in the Union that once actually represented a direction for the nation, of the greatest commitment to agricultural-scientific progress; the state of Texas, where you saw President John F. Kennedy lead the way in crafting a vision and commitment, with the commitment to the space program; and California, where you saw the food production that was essential, that went out to most of the population and most of the world—all of that, that identity, was taken away when you saw, from West of

the Mississippi, all the way throughout the two largest states of the United States [by population], Texas and California, being destroyed by an identity which had usurped the real American patriotic tradition, for the benefit of the imperial push for war, economic chaos, and social distress.

As I intervened in the state of Texas, the most conservative state in the Union, and Michael intervened in the state of California, the most liberal state in the Union—in San Francisco, mind you—what we were both able to do, is to recruit the entire generation of "forgotten men," in the segments of the population from both parties, in the tradition of John F. Kennedy. And we found that people who thought that there were no common interests among these two groups, found that their common interest lay in something greater, in their commitment to act for the betterment of our children, our grandchildren, all recognizing that President



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Kesha Rogers: "When I'm given a mission, I answer the call."

John F. Kennedy brought that out in everyone. That that was something that actually took away the divisiveness of party politics, which, as George Washington once said, was the bane of our nation's existence.

Our two campaigns reflected a universal quality of the American System, to the international aspects of our constituents. And as we went around and organized throughout both Texas and California, we recognized that it was a vast array of people from different backgrounds, whether it was Chinese, Russian, Mexican, Latin American—that all of these of these people had one, unique goal in mind: They came to the United States because of the vast greatness that it once represented. And they saw, in running into our campaigns, that that can become a reality once again. When these people came to the United States, whether it was the Chinese working with President Lincoln on the development of the Transcontinental Railway system, the Irish, the Russians—that that was the United States they knew of, it was the United States which invoked the international reflections of an America which was embodied in great leaders, such as Sun Yat-sen, Benito Juárez, and other great minds who saw that the traditions of the United States were not just “for” the United States, but they were for all of mankind, to be able to partake in this true freedom, which they could participate in, as well.

Break the Grip of Empire

Let's take a look at what we've been living through, with three Bush administrations and one and a half Obama administrations: You've got Papa Bush, too evil; Baby Bush, just dumb; and Obama, well, he ain't “just right”! All of these administrations have shown how far astray we as a nation have gone, how far we have gone away from that American tradition, as you see Presidents acting as pawns for a bankrupt British Empire, destroying the very core of the American tradition defined in our nation's Constitution and its Preamble, which uniquely identifies us as sovereign and free from the destructive grip of empire.

The fight for this identity has not always come easily. Throughout the tests of our nation's strength, great leaders have had to fight off the grip of the ugly control of the Empire's intent to suppress mankind, through the evil of the Satanic Zeus, to take away and destroy the creative powers of mankind that would create a world free from thermonuclear war and hunger; that come together to solve the problems that confronted mankind.

I waged my campaign to stop the outbreak of ther-

monuclear war, of World War III. And the focus of my and Michael's campaign together, was to bring about a renewed mission for the United States, to inspire the world, as Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy had intended, to bring an end to war.

Now, interestingly enough, in order to do this, I ironically had to put a Hitler moustache on the President of the United States, as a Democrat, in the United States. And I put this moustache on the President of the United States, to actually lead the nation out of fear, to free people from the bestial grip that had started not with President Obama, but with a society that had gone along with popular opinion over truth, and which had set out to destroy itself since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Throughout the recent period, more and more people have come to realize that popular opinion is wrong. It tells you, the way to avoid war is to be divisive, and not tell the truth. What more and more people have come to understand, as they encountered my campaign in the United States, Michael's campaign, the work of the La-Rouche movement and the Schiller Institute, is that only through defying popular opinion and telling the truth, can you gain victory over the enemies of mankind.

As we know, victory is not simply expressed in a vote. I think about what we did in Texas. Those who did everything in their power to make sure that my campaign was attacked, viciously, for telling the truth, and tried to do everything to make sure that we were not victorious, actually failed in their endeavors, because victory is not a Pyrrhic victory: Victory is a victory to actually save the existence of all of mankind from an empire. And as those individuals are sitting there, looking at what they just did, they realize they don't have a direction, where to go next, and where to actually lead this nation, and they will be calling us back in, soon.

So, victory is not simply expressed in a vote; it is transforming the thinking of your society, to not be enslaved, to fight for a better future. And that's what people were encouraged by and inspired by, as they encountered our campaign; that they, too, can actually free themselves from the grip of empire, can actually restore a commitment we once had, with the identity of our uniquely American patriotic tradition under our Constitution. And when people ran into our campaign, they realized that this was something that they *had* to participate in, and they had to defy popular opinion, because it was the only thing that could save their lives. And it's only through breaking free of empire that we can put an

end to war. Only by defining a vision for the future of mankind, can mankind truly be free.

Four Steps to Recovery

Economist Lyndon LaRouche has put out what I define as the scientific and revolutionary four points, which define the future for mankind, to crush empire. The United States, if we do our job, can and must now be saved, and must retake its rightful place as a leader in society, in promoting the most advanced scientific progress of mankind. And the institution of the Presidency of the United States must be redefined according to the principles laid out in the Preamble of our Constitution, and act within its limits of power, as we have not seen under this current administration, as invoked in the administration of our first President, Gen. George Washington, along with his brilliant Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton.

The four crucial steps for recovery were referenced here earlier today by Mrs. LaRouche; they must be put forth immediately to save the world and promote a world of truly sovereign nation-states. These steps call for freeing our nation of the grip of the evil Empire and its control of Wall Street interests, to crush Wall Street, now; Glass-Steagall banking reorganization, as a first step, must be redefined; secondly, we must restore a credit system, defined by Alexander Hamilton; and three, the use of Federal credit; four, adopting a fusion-driver for the nation.

That is the vision that we once had, when we actually said, “We do these things,” with President John F. Kennedy, “not because they’re easy, but because they’re hard.” This was a vision for going to the Moon, to actually recognize that we were going to act for the benefit and interest of all mankind, and not for Wall Street and not for an empire.

And so, the question at hand, as Mr. LaRouche has defined it, is: What is the value of human beings? What is the significance of human beings? What is mankind’s unique role? That power lies in recognizing the creative powers unique to human beings. History and events are not trapped in an empty vacuum of space and time, because we, as human beings, have the power to direct and change the course of history, and to define our future. We must put an end to the bankrupt British Empire, and all of its intent to reduce the population throughout the planet, destroying the productive and creative powers of mankind to replenish, multiply, and subdue the Earth. We must eliminate the financial oligarchy’s system of



JFK Presidential Library/Cecil Stoughton

President Kennedy speaks at Muscle Shoals, Ala., May 18, 1963, to celebrate the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

bail-in, once and for all. The anti-science Green agenda must be eliminated: No more fracking!

The revolt that we’re seeing coming from within the United States, against this bestial agenda, and within nations around the world, is from those who understand that we cannot live in a world, as President Abraham Lincoln once said, “half-slave, half-free.”

The current war-drive that’s being pushed on behalf of the British Empire, contributing directly to a global war of extinction, can only be brought to an end, through the development of truly peaceful relations among sovereign nations. This signifies a return to the productive powers of mind, and an increase in the commitment to scientific progress, with an increase in higher and higher states of energy-flux density.

Man’s Promethean Identity

We must soar, and take dominion over our Solar System. We must move forward, with a commitment to man’s identity in space, to answer and solve the problems of hunger, of economic collapse, that actually devastate the planet today. We can bring about a collaboration among nation-states, on the common aims of mankind. This has been the inspiration of the United States, when it has acted in accordance with the truly Promethean identity of man to define a future of progress for all mankind.

President John F. Kennedy spoke at the 30th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority at Muscle Shoals. He speaks of the inspiration of this powerful

work, which gave the world an impact that it would bestow on generations to come, and he said:

“As a final example of its national role, I would cite to you—and I consider this one of the most important contributions of the Tennessee Valley, and it isn’t written in any credit or debit book—the 2,000 people who come from abroad to the TVA, from other lands, kings, prime ministers, students, technicians, people who are uncommitted, people who don’t know which way to go, people who are unsure. They come here and gain an impression not by merely visiting Washington or New York, but by coming to this valley. They gain an impression of vitality and growth, and the ability of people to work together in a free society. This has been one of the most powerful advertisements for the picture of the United States around the world that we have had, for these people come from nations whose poverty threatens to exceed their hopes, who do not feel they can solve their problems. They come here and compare this valley today to what it was 30 years ago, and they leave here feeling that they, too, can solve their problems in a system of freedom.”

Think about how John F. Kennedy was looking at how the past was shaping the future. He was living in the future, and what happened during the period of the Tennessee Valley Authority of President Franklin Roosevelt, was a thought-process in mind, for what would shape the future to come. And as Kennedy said, “We can look forward into the future, and say, what will shape the year of 1984?”

We now are in the year of 2014: What will shape the year of 2030? That’s my task for you all.

I want to close by sharing a personal story with you. Having just concluded both my campaign and Michael’s campaign, in which we effectively went to war with profound ideas, to save mankind from war with thermonuclear weapons, my mind was naturally drawn to a moment of profound reflection. So my husband and I took a trip, and we took the opportunity, as we were out helping Michael with his campaign in San Francisco, to take some time to visit the majestic Muir Woods National Park, just north of San Francisco. And here you find great redwood trees, hundreds of feet tall! These are one of the oldest living species on Earth. These trees have been around for millions of years, longer than any nation!

At the entry of the park, there’s a stump, showing a tree that was born in the year 909. It was alive when Columbus sailed the Atlantic; it was alive when the Declaration of Independence was written; it was alive for well over a thousand years. And to our delight,

walking among this living cathedral of trees, we came across a plaque, and it turns out, after World War II, when delegates from 46 nations of the world came together [to found the United Nations] to put an end to war, and to dedicate themselves to the peace that comes through mutual progress, this was the spot in the forest, that President Franklin Roosevelt had intended them to be brought through. For as it says: “Not only would this focus attention upon this nation’s interest in preserving these mighty trees for posterity, but here in such a ‘temple of peace’ the delegates would gain a perspective and sense of time that could be obtained nowhere in America better than in a forest.”

I would suggest that we all, in remembrance of that, go find a park or a forest, and reflect.

But I think it’s fitting that two minds, separated by almost 90 years, but engaged in the same struggle for freedom of man, would reach the same conclusion in the same place. And this is an example of what Mr. LaRouche defines in his fourth point, as he talks about the unique role of man and the example of Vernadsky, to actually gain power and dominion over our Solar System. And the Vernadskyian conception of man, as that identified with the Promethean idea of looking into the future.

I want to read a quote from Vladimir Vernadsky, as we think about the representatives from those 46 nations, sitting among these beautiful forests, where the idea of the noosphere coming together with the biosphere couldn’t have been more clear. Vernadsky says: “Mankind’s power is not connected with its matter, but with its brain and its work, guided by its mind. In the geological history of the biosphere, a great future is opened to man, if he realizes it, and does not direct his mind and work to self-destruction.”

He goes on to say, “Mankind taken as a whole is becoming a powerful geological force. Humanity’s mind and work face the problem of reconstructing the biosphere, in the interests of freely thinking mankind as a single entity. The new state of the biosphere that we are approaching without notice, it is the noosphere.”

This is the true American identity, that nations around the world have come to love and admire, and which we can once again restore in a world free of empire. And that is the mission, and the very purpose for mankind, which brings us here together today, on this 30th anniversary of the Schiller Institute, to dedicate mankind to a peace which comes only through mutual progress.

And I leave you with that.

Schiller Institute's Land-Bridge Policy Will Change the World

*Mike Billington reports on Asia
and the Pacific for EIR.*

We have heard today about the threat of war and the necessary solutions. I want you now to think strategically about how we are to implement those solutions. This requires looking down, from the top, at the entire world, at the entire Solar System, and to look at it from the future, not as a fixed snapshot of today, but as a dynamic unity, and to think how we must act to achieve that future which we foresee, which you are capable of doing precisely because you are human. You must think as if you are personally responsible for the fate of mankind, because in a very real sense, you are.

After 70 years of Britain's Cold War, and the failure to implement Lyn and Helga LaRouche's plan for Eurasian peace and development after the fall of the Soviet Union, Americans have accepted the false conception that Russia and China are somehow our natural adversaries, or even our enemies. In fact, the opposite is the case. While the U.S. has fallen under the control of the British system of financial dictatorship since the death of Franklin Roosevelt, and "regime change" imperialism under Bush-Cheney and Obama, the legacy of the American System has lived on in Russia and China, and is now expressing itself in the leadership of those two great nations.

Global Reach of the American System

A brief review of that history will show both the role of the American System, which made Russia and China

our closest allies before the death of Franklin Roosevelt, but also the direct influence of Lyn and Helga LaRouche in bringing that tradition forward in those two nations today, as well as in India, although the centuries of British domination in India have left its mark there.

The Russian-U.S. ties were concretized by America's greatest statesman, John Quincy Adams, who was the first Ambassador to Russia, from 1809 to 1914. When the British instigated the Civil War in the United

States in 1860, both to divide the U.S. and to retain the slavery system providing cotton for the British textile factories, Tsar Alexander II deployed the Russian fleet right here in the New York harbor, as well as the San Francisco harbor, as a clear warning to the British that its intervention to support the South would mean war with Russia.

Lincoln and his economists, especially Henry Carey, introduced the Greenbacks to break the British and Wall Street control over credit during the Civil War. He also launched one of the greatest infrastructure projects of our history to that time, the Transcontinental Railroad

(**Figure 1**), at the peak of that war, in 1863. After the war, these economists took the American System ideas to Europe, and the model of the Transcontinental Railroad inspired Russia to launch the great Trans-Siberian Railway (**Figure 2**), which was built between 1891 and 1916. Thus, the Atlantic and the Pacific were linked by rail across North America, and the Pacific and Europe were linked across Eurasia.

In China, the Revolution of 1911, which overthrew the monarchy and established the Republic of China, was led by the great statesman Sun Yat-sen, who had been educated in Hawaii by Christian missionaries from the school of Henry Carey. Sun modeled his economic policies on the credit system of Alexander Hamilton; his Three Principles of the People—national sovereignty, republican government, and the general welfare of the people—were taken directly from the U.S. Constitution and from Abraham Lin-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Mike Billington

FIGURE 1
The Transcontinental Railroad



coln's formulation in the Gettysburg Address: "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Sun Yat-sen released his plan for the industrialization of China in 1919 (**Figure 3**), based on large-scale infrastructure, especially rail, which criss-crossed the nation and extended out of the country, connecting with the Trans-Siberian Railroad, and to the west and the south. Although the plan was sabotaged by the British, look at the map of China's rail today (**Figure 4**), including extensions to the northeast to connect to a tunnel under the Bering Strait, which China has now offered to build together with the Russians—and we insist, with the United States; to the northeast, which connects to the Trans-Siberian; to the west, which, as of 2013, has been transporting goods from China to Europe through Central Asia; and three branches to the south, to Viet-

FIGURE 3
Sun Yat-sen's Railroad Plan



FIGURE 2
The Trans-Siberian Railway




nam, and operative plans to build rail through Laos, Thailand, and Malaysia, to Singapore—the Orient Express, to the northwest—and through Myanmar, Bangladesh, and India, over the old "Burma Road," built by the Americans in World War II, and on to the Mideast and Africa.

Schiller Institute Organizing

Now look at the map presented by Helga Zepp-La-Rouche at the conference in Beijing in 1996, on the Eurasian Land-Bridge (**Figure 5**), a conference she was primarily responsible for organizing, and where she became known as the "Silk Road Lady." The lasting influence of her work at that time can be seen in the

FIGURE 4
Railway Map of China




recent announcement by the new Chinese President, Xi Jinping, to adopt the New Silk Road and the Maritime Silk Road as a primary focus of China's outreach to the world.

Following Helga's visit to China in February 2014, where she held meetings and press interviews in Beijing and Shanghai, the leading international journal of China, *Beijing Review*, ran a cover story of their weekly magazine on Helga's ideas and proposals (Figure 6), with both an article and a [link](#) to the video interview.

In all her meetings, she emphasized that the rail proposals only have meaning if they are perceived as strategic interventions into the collapsing world economy and the immediate threat of global thermonuclear war. The proper concept is that of a "development corridor," not only connecting centers of civilization through often desolate and extremely difficult terrain, but transforming these regions, using new technologies to create new cities and farmland suitable for human habitation. This means especially power and water, especially nuclear power, and water, through water management and the application of the high energy-flux densities of nuclear and fusion power for desalination where feasible, and through new technologies, such as drawing water from the atmosphere through ionization processes, as is being investigated intensely by our science team, to transform deserts, from Africa through China, as well as in the Western Hemisphere.

Now look at the Bering Strait Tunnel plan (Figure 7). This was one of the Great Projects supported by LaRouche in the 1980s, for transforming the world to meet the common aims of mankind. When the Soviet Union fell, and LaRouche was brought into Russia by scientific and economic leaders of the nation in the

FIGURE 5
The Eurasian Land-Bridge




EIRNS/John Sigerson

FIGURE 6



1990s to plan for the necessary future of mankind, the idea of the tunnel connecting the United States and Russia was embraced as a means of both transforming the barren regions of the Russian Far East and of Alaska and the Yukon, as well as initiating a great project which directly unites the two nations through their actual mutual benefit.

FIGURE 7
Bering Strait Tunnel



In 2007, Lyndon LaRouche was invited to give a keynote presentation at a conference in Moscow on the building of the tunnel under the Bering Strait. President Vladimir Putin showed his insight into the future by describing the project as a “war avoidance policy,” the Peace Through Development concept so drastically lacking in the imperial West today.

A team at *EIR*—*Executive Intelligence Review*, our weekly magazine, which you should definitely subscribe to if you have not already—is now nearing completion of a fully updated version of the programmatic report we produced after the 1996 Land-Bridge Conference in Beijing. This is a Global Land-Bridge (Figure 8). It reviews the progress on the great projects since that time, but also where progress has been stymied, and


where the failure to develop has created huge areas of desolation and poverty and war, and even the expansion of desertification due to the failure of mankind to assert its power of self-evolution through scientific and technological progress.

We will present the necessary solutions for these problems, such as the “Revolutionary Development Plan for the Near and Middle East,” authored by the Schiller Institute’s Hussein Askary. We have programs for the development of Africa and Ibero-America, and similar programs for other parts of the world. We will review the campaign led by Lyndon LaRouche in the 1980s to build a sea-level canal through the Isthmus of Kra in southern Thailand (Figure 9), which was sabotaged by the British, but is now back on the table—this time with support from both Japan and China (Figure 10). Our Japanese friend Mr.

Kotegawa¹ is strongly backing this as a necessary joint

1. Daisuke Kotegawa’s greeting to the conference was published in last week’s *EIR*—ed.

FIGURE 8
Main Lines of a Worldwide Rail Network, as Sketched by H.A. Cooper



EIRNS, 1997

project between China and Japan—not only because it will be of great benefit to both, but also because it will help China and Japan get past the conflicts between them.

We will report on the Tumen River Project, where Russia, China, and North Korea come together, where just this past week the Russians and the North Koreans, with full South Korean support, agreed to proceed with the construction of rail and pipelines through the North to the South—again, Peace Through Development—whereas Obama simply threatens to do as he says or face military confrontation.


We will review the plans put forth by our friends in Russia for the transformation of Afghanistan and Central Asia, in cooperation with China's New Silk Road. Just this past week, our good friends in Russia Yuri Krupnov, head of a major development institution, and Viktor Ivanov, the nation's anti-drug czar, met with other Eurasian leaders in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, presenting their proposals for ending the chaos in Afghanistan and the region. As Krupnov said, "It is obvious to everyone that there will be no stabilization in the region unless the drug-based economy is replaced with a positive one."

All these are necessary, but they cannot be achieved if we do not first achieve the alliance of the four great powers—Russia, China, India, and the U.S.—the U.S. under new leadership, of course, American System leadership, as provided by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche.

Lyn has therefore focused on the area from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Basin, the far western border of China, the Russian Far East, Southeast Asia, and India. The Eurasian nations

FIGURE 9


Proposed Route of the Kra Canal



have retained the idea of progress, where every meeting of heads of state agrees to yet more cooperation in energy, rail, water, space, and scientific research, and fighting drugs and terrorism. Yet every meeting of heads of state in the West can discuss nothing but new


FIGURE 10

Lyndon LaRouche in Thailand, 1983



EIRNS

FIGURE 11
Major Deserts



NASA

means of printing money to bail out the banks, while imposing deadly austerity on their populations, and cutting development and science funds to the bone, while preparing for war on Russia and China, in collaboration with terrorists and neo-nazis. We must bring the U.S.

is true leadership, which we must reproduce in ourselves, in our cowardly political leaders, and in the population.

Now look at the map of the global deserts (**Figure 11**). It is not coincidental that the vast stretch of desert from the western shore of North Africa, through the Middle East, Central Asia, and into western China, is extremely poor (except for a few oil sheikdoms owned by the British), and also the scene of perpetual warfare, “color revolutions” run by London and Washington, which leave nations in ruins, and overrun by terrorist organizations spawned in London, as well as harboring the majority of global drug production, also run by London and its banks.

Only a return to the American System in the United States, and an alliance with Russia and China, where that system is still alive, can make possible the realization of these great projects, and the necessary return to global cooperation in the exploration and development of space, of the Solar System and beyond.


Against these policies, today as over the past many centuries, stands the British Empire, using its genocidal green ideology, its controlled terrorist gangs, and its drug trade to prevent development, destroy minds, and poison the future, all to sustain the power of its bankrupt financial system, and to cull the world’s human population to a more “manageable” size of a billion or so, from the current 7 billion plus.

We know the future, and we know the enemy. It is our task to fulfill the mission presented here today.

**THE
EURASIAN
LAND-BRIDGE**

**‘The New Silk Road’—Locomotive
For Worldwide Economic Development**

An EIR Special Report



(1997) 260 pages **\$100**
(EIR 96-007)

Available from
EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Phone: 1-800-278-3135 or www.larouchepub.com

Winning the Fight For Glass-Steagall

Andrea Boland is a Democratic State Representative from Maine.

...I was introduced to the fight for Glass-Steagall in my own legislature: We passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the President to return to the law of Glass-Steagall, and I knew something about it, a little bit about it. And certainly I had a vivid memory of when I first heard on the news that it had been disposed of. I remember I heard it on the news; I was waking up in the morning—I went, “What on Earth are they doing?”

And it was funny, that moment in time just stayed with me. And then, I was at a conference in Atlanta, the National Conference of State Legislatures, on a different issue, and I was there also to support Glass-Steagall in another committee.¹ But what happened there was that the state senator from Delaware, who was there to present a resolution—it’s the largest conference of state legislatures in the country—to return to Glass-Steagall. And [the senator who had] stood up to the banks for some time, with great courage and determination, finally succumbed to their pressure, there, in Atlanta. And for some reason, I was recognized as someone who might be able to pick up that banner.

Which I did. Happily. I have taken on some other big industries in Maine, and so this wasn’t any different, and I knew it was important. What was interesting,

is that it was a very fair resolution; it was modest, I would say. And I knew that there were others, too, that would back me up, because it was somewhat organized—well organized, really.

So that’s what we did, and what was stunning to me, is the number of legislators who did not stand up for it. And that was really troubling, but it was also an indication of how powerful the lobbyists are that are in the employ of what we now refer to as the banksters. It was really something, and it was troubling, and luckily, all my fellow Mainers did stand with me on that.

That was the beginning of my introduction to more deep thought about this, but certainly I had been looking at the effects in the state legislature, as more and more, we were abandoning some of our commitments to pensions, and health insurance, welfare of those most in need, and understanding that we just didn’t have the dollars, and couldn’t get them.

Also, problems about economic development: We didn’t have the roads that we really

should have. Of course, Maine is kind of a uniquely problematic place; it’s got a small population and many, many miles of roads.

Derivatives vs. Rail Lines

But anyway, at this time, I was happy to accept the invitation to speak to you and share with you a little bit of what I do know now, and that is, that we’re just hundreds of billions and trillions of dollars away from being a successful society. And the money that is being spent on such things as derivatives and mortgage-backed securities, that are traded and re-traded, is depriving us of the most basic things that we need in our society. While China has built 12,000 miles of high-speed rail lines, in just the last few years, we have built none! Russia and China are signing agreements to build rail line tunnels from Siberia to Alaska, but we have no plans to meet these lines, when they hit the United States. The southwestern United States is undergoing terrible drought conditions, threatening our food supply, but we have no



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis
Maine State Rep. Andrea Boland

1. See “Fight over Glass-Steagall: State Legislators, Bankers Clash at Legislative Forum,” *EIR*, Dec. 13, 2013.

new water projects, of any significance, over the last 50 years. California has abandoned 500,000 acres of farmland, and the cattle herd is at a 65-year low!

We haven't addressed some of these major problems. The problem that I was discussing, when I was first in Atlanta, and met with the LaRouche group, was the security of our electric grid, from extreme solar storms and electromagnetic pulse weapons of foreign nations, and devices of terrorists. One strike from the Sun, which is 100% probable, and could come at any time—and in fact, is somewhat overdue—could take down our entire national grid, and it would be down for months, or years, and we are without replacements for the major transformers on which it depends. We've left such projects undone.

And although it's been tried for years to get it past Congress, I'm happy to announce, I was able to get it through Maine! That does continue to be somewhat of a struggle, to make sure the utility companies actually get the protections on. But the point is, at least in this one case, I knew a little bit more about how the infrastructure has been ignored, and obvious solutions have not been employed, inexpensive solutions: The kind of fixes that we're talking about would cost the average household less than \$2 a year for four or five years, to protect us from totally being destroyed by such an event.

Instead, we have the problem of the commercial banks and the investment bankers having been able to do the work that each one used to do separately. In the process, apparently looking over and seeing the grass looked greener in the other yard, they made kind of a mess of the yard, both of them. So now, we have banks that are gambling, instead of investing in such things as infrastructure, economic development, Main Street instead of Wall Street, and we are left with the job of bailing them out, which we've been doing, billions and billions of dollars a month.

And the peculiar thing about it, that I've come to understand, is that while we've bailed them out, they have not written their losses down. They have not taken those losses: They've kept the assets there, on their books, causing the rest of the country, our average folks, to think that the banks are in better shape than they are. And in fact, it appears that their assets have grown about 30% over the last five years—these are at artificially inflated values. And they're kept artificially inflated, so as not to worry us poor souls who think our money's okay in their care.

One of the things that I also noticed, as I've just been campaigning, and going around communities in Maine: There are so many homes that are abandoned. They're empty, and they have been for a long time, and their neighbors know it, whether they're foreclosures, or people have left them, they stand empty. And that brought home to me a little bit more about what the banking crisis was, because one would ask oneself, well, why don't the banks at least rent them to the depressed owners or others, at some price that is reasonable? Well, maybe because it's to their advantage to leave them sitting there, assessed at their former valuation, rather than what they really are now, in depressed circumstances. It's all really very cynical, and really just more than one can bear, as you look from one place to the next.

Bail-In Is Here

We worry about bailing out these banks, that are so disconnected from reality. But now, the problem we also face is bailing in! So that, in this case, the banks may very well come to the point of seizing our own accounts, to help pay off their debts, their problems. Our investments, our bonds—as it was done in Cyprus and Spain, and the people lost their deposits! What kind of upside-down sort of thinking is that? And terribly depressing!

Again, as I'm walking around campaigning, talking to people, they talk about the loss of their pension funds, and they talk to me about the decrease in the amount of their state pension funds, teachers' pension funds, things that were promised to them. And what else is that, except the states responding to a need that they have, as a result of not having the wealth to move forward: no investment in infrastructure, and business, education, science.

I work with some fabulous scientists in some of the different things that I do, and the one that I am closest to, rely on the most, has multiple PhDs—he probably is a genius—and he talks about how our best scientists are leaving this country, because we're not investing in them, and in good science, and in doing the best things that we can do. And all this is just making a circular problem here, where if we can't afford to invest in science, then we're really not going to advance.

So, as I became more familiar with this problem about abandoning Glass-Steagall, I've certainly joined hands with those from the LaRouche people, the Schiller Institute, in support of the bills now before Con-

gress, which would immediately break up the big Wall Street banks, and only protect commercial banking. Instead of the investment banking being covered by what only commercial banking should be, that kind of insurance, they would have to fend for themselves. They don't like that.

That's *why*, when I was in Atlanta, they approached me and tried to talk me out of making my statement to the banking committee, there, on returning to Glass-Steagall. They came up to me in the lobby, and said, "You are about to go on a national stage: Are you sure you want to do this?" It was very scary. Of course, I said, "Yes." And they said, "Well, why didn't you contact us? Why didn't you call us, before you took this step?" And unfortunately, it was actually sad to me that these were bankers from Maine: They were representing J.P. Morgan and Bank of America, but they have their banks in Maine, and they told me how they had—I think it was Bank of America—about 1,300 employees in Maine—and 8 in my town! So, it was overwhelming.

My hope and belief is that if we return to Glass-Steagall, those people who are employed in banks, in Maine and elsewhere around the country, will be more secure, not less, as a result, as people understand the banks are now working for them.

So, I'll continue to work with legislators that I know, and try to push these issues. It hasn't been easy. I seem to come up with different things that are problematic to our leadership. And in fact, all I can really say at this point—because I don't know what my future is—I'm, in fact, a state representative, not a state senator; I'm term-limited out this year. And the campaign that I just referred to was a campaign for state senate, which I just lost by 19 votes. But the stunning thing was that the leadership of my Democratic Party was stunned that I came that close. They were stunned that so many people in the district supported the message that I had, which had to do with things such as banking reform, Glass-Steagall, protection of the electric grid, and some other things, and pushing back against lobbyists and special interests that patrol the halls of our state capitols.

So, in closing, I guess I would just exhort everyone here, to continue to reach out and remind your own members of Congress and state legislatures of the importance of returning to Glass-Steagall and some of the other subjects that have been covered here today. But also, don't forget about the states. Because, in fact, the states may be the places where you can make more progress, faster—not the whole thing that we'd like for

the whole nation—but perhaps we can shame Congress if we pick off some states, like Maine and others, one at a time.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Anthony Morss

Why We Need Classical Culture

Anthony Morss is the Music Director and Principal Conductor of the New Jersey Association of Verismo Opera, Inc.



Schiller Institute

Conductor Anthony Morss

What I'd like to do is ask three important questions, and provide the best answers that I know to them.

First, why must we restore Classical culture to its former splendor? And why must we do it now? How does our Summer Music-Science Program (July 28-Aug. 15, 2014) tie in with this purpose?

The value of Classical culture lies in great part within its uplifting and life-giving store of cultural treasures; but also, now especially, we need it to counterbalance the horrifying glorification of violence in our popular culture and entertainment.

Novels and movies have always staged confrontations between good and evil, with some violence at the end of the story when the showdown occurs. But times past presented *nothing like* the current villains and monsters. Many of the latter resemble Tyrannosaurus Rex, and in almost every case the villains are far more memorable than the heroes. The Joker and the Penguin, for example, always walk off with the Batman movies, being repulsively colorful and entertaining in comparison to the drab and laconic Batman. Notice also, that the intellectual level is literally that of comic books, ini-

tially to be read by children, but now designed for dumbed-down adults as well.

In the Star Wars series, despite some fine imaginative work, especially in the first film with its profound mythical resonance, the impression which stays the longest with the spectator when the series is over is the menacing breathing of Darth Vader. He owns one's memories, easily overbalancing the good characters.

Several movies put us through the end of the world, the terrifyingly realistic sinking of the Titanic, the collapse of multiple Manhattan skyscrapers, and physical attacks by the most savagely insane murderers, to say nothing of vampires, werewolves, and zombies—the last three, very popular these days.

The many video games all create a war zone where the players must kill or be killed. These games are adapted directly from British military training videos designed to remove the slightest vestige of compassion which might make a British soldier hesitate to kill an enemy soldier on the battlefield. These video games figured prominently in the numerous shootings at U.S. schools, in that almost all the shooters were completely addicted to the games. Some of them were even able to acquire highly developed marksmanship using the games. Healthy-minded children can, of course, play the games without becoming warped, but at the very least, one has to admit that the games are not conducive to wholesome attitudes.

All this negativity crushingly weighs down the atmosphere in which our children are growing up. We need to provide them with a healthier view of life; one which includes compassion, loyalty, nobility, love, and beauty. Classical culture does *exactly* that.

A Deeply Ordered Universe

Most interestingly, Classical culture is not limited to positive emotions and events. It deals with negative feelings and tragic situations as well, since it must include the heartbreaks of mankind as much as the joys—indeed, it must speak to the totality of the human condition.

However, it presents these negative situations in a language of beauty, no matter how dark they may appear. Mozart explained this very well when he wrote, in one of his letters, that music can express great tragedy and extreme emotions, but that the expression must never turn ugly itself. The language must remain musically tempered, organic, and logical. Thus Mozart writes an aria for a comic character named Osmin, in his opera the “[Abduction from the] Seraglio,” who is

sputtering and squalling with murderous rage, and the aria certainly embodies all of that, but is, in addition, both very funny, and also beautiful!

In Donizetti's opera “Lucia di Lammermoor,” the heroine, Lucia, is driven mad on her wedding night, having been forced to renounce her engagement to the man she loves and marry a bridegroom politically convenient to her family. The famous “mad scene” depicts Lucia out of her mind with grief and absolutely pitiable. When well-acted, it is extremely moving. But the orchestral accompaniment proceeds mainly in even four-bar phrases, using this rational, organic compositional speech to “redeem” the wildness of overthrown reason. The result is deeply touching, and actually beautiful. A composer outside the Classical tradition would have presented Lucia's aimless staggering with realistic, jagged music, which might have depicted her wretched state convincingly, but at the price of producing no music which is beautiful.

Another example of Classical “redemption” of profoundly negative feelings: Consider Chopin turning the deepest melancholy into liquid loveliness. The Classical tradition allows us to recognize that, despite surface appearances, underneath, the universe is deeply ordered.

The Anti-Classical: Stravinsky

It might help us gain a clearer picture of Classical culture by examining something outside, something opposed to its ideals. A major work, in fact, by common consent *the* most important and influential music of the 20th Century, is Stravinsky's “Rite of Spring” (“Le Sacre du Printemps”). It is a ballet depicting the rites of ancient pagan Russia, leading up to the ritual murder of an innocent young girl as a sacrifice. The sacrifice is offered to the cruel pagan gods, in order to ensure a good harvest.

For society to kill an innocent citizen would be for us, the most repellent act society could commit. But this ballet is set in a far distant time of primitivism and barbarous darkness, untouched by the restraints of modern civilization, and other various religious denominations.

Thus, the sacrifice of this scapegoat is really a sacrifice to the ignorance and fear of the barbarous tribe.

By any standard of ethics, this story should appall us. It is not, however, presented that way at all. The primitive was very much in vogue in Europe at the time this work was composed, 1913, and was widespread in the visual arts, particularly, with Picasso leading the way. The primitive was considered vital, admirable, a

breath of fresh air.

Stravinsky, in “Le Sacre,” created a world of bewitching colors and radically new sonorities, fascinating harmonies, and rhythms never heard before—all designed to lure the listener into the atmosphere of an ancient and awe-inspiring society, conveniently freed from all restraints and individual conscience.

This is mass man in his most repellent form, forced to collaborate with tribal custom, a forebear of all the most horrific forms of mass man as murderous aggressor under the banners of national socialism [Nazism] and communism, later in the same century.

The most daring effect of the whole piece occurs at the end of it, and it concerns rhythm. Now, a slight digression. Rhythm refers to a pattern of stresses which sets up expectation that the pattern will be repeated. The pattern requires exceptions, weak beat accents and off beat accents, called syncopations, to create a variety. Every one of these exceptions, these variations from the expected pattern, energizes the music. The listener requires that the expected pattern can be frequently confirmed, but also that there be enough exceptions to produce energy.

Example: In the great swing bands of the '30s and '40s, my youth, you could see all the sections of the bands with feet and knees bobbing up and down, keeping the beat, while the men were playing constant syncopation against the beat, and thereby creating enormous tension and energy in any lively tempo, and also creating such strong and happy feelings among the listeners that everyone wanted to get up and dance.

By the final section of Stravinsky's *Sacre*, the *danse sacrale*, the sacred dance, the audience is completely under the sway of the rhythms and vibrating with them. But then something unheard-of happens. The ever more powerful rhythms become so irregular that the public cannot feel the beat any more, however much it wants to. All sense of rhythmic expectation and individual control vanishes. We all become helpless prisoners of totally unpredictable rhythms, as the scapegoat dies.

This aesthetic buries individuality, and makes the audience willing collaborators in ritual murder—not just spectators.

Classical culture, by contrast, promotes promotes individual responsibility, and the individual's deepening understanding of the world around them, as opposed to the tyrannically imposed customs, myths, and superstitions of primitive tribal societies.

Thank you.

Wayne Madsen

The NSA Collects It All; Shut It Down!

Wayne Madsen is an investigative journalist, author, and columnist; he served as an officer in the Navy, and worked briefly for the NSA. He is a senior fellow with the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), and has been in the forefront of fighting to expose and to tear down the massive surveillance state.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Investigative journalist Wayne Madsen

It's kind of serendipitous: I arrived here in New York last night, while en route from spending the last week at

both the Dwight Eisenhower and Harry S. Truman Presidential libraries, where I was doing research in the early days of our national security state.

Now, they've been experiencing a lot of earthquakes in the Midwest, and some have been attributed to fracking. I actually believe that some of them are probably a result of both those gentlemen, Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, spinning in their graves over what has become of the Cold War instruments that Truman created, and Eisenhower, of course, built up on. The CIA was created in 1947; the NSA was created in 1952.

The revelations of Edward Snowden, of course, were shocking to a lot of people, but to a lot of us who have followed the NSA's history, since about the early '90s, late '80s, it really wasn't a surprise. When I worked at NSA in the mid-'80s, I started hearing the term used by several NSA engineers working in signals intelligence—they were talking about “total hearability.” Now, I even had to look up that word, “hearability,” in a dictionary: It didn't exist! It didn't exist. But this was the day when NSA was basically in an analog world, listening to all

kinds of communications over the phone, telemetry, etc., etc., a lot of it radiofrequency spectrum, not on fiber optic cables as we see data transmitted today.

So that was their intention: “total hearability.” They wanted to hear everything.

Then we came into the ’90s, the end of the Bush 41 Administration, the Clinton Administration, and the NSA had a new program where they said, look, we know people are encrypting their information, but the NSA needs to have access to it. So they came up with something called key escrow encryption; it had various names, “Clipper Chip,” “Capstone Chip,” one I especially liked was “tessera.” The tessera was a tile worn by Roman slaves, to identify themselves to the Roman authorities as slaves. I mean, the NSA, I don’t know who their PR people are when they roll these things out, but that certainly wasn’t met with any great favor by those of us in the privacy community.

I think one of the funniest programs: The NSA says that they develop these names of these various systems, because they have a master book they go to. As a result of the Snowden revelations—I had to laugh at one called “Egotistical Giraffe.” And I just remember some of the tall, lanky people I worked with at the NSA! And the one that was used to spy on the Mexican President was called “White Tamale,” and we’re supposed to believe that was just happenstance that they came up with that term?

So the Clipper Chip created probably the first firestorm as far as the public’s view of the NSA, offering the public these new gifts, of key escrow.

The All-Seeing Eye

Then we had, of course, 9/11. But even before 9/11, we know that the NSA, the minute the Bush Administration came into power in that fraudulent election of 2000, they already were pressuring telephone companies, telcos, to give them access to their data switches: AT&T, Verizon; one in particular refused, Qwest, and their CEO went to prison on some trumped-up, inside trading accusations. He was convicted, and spent some time in jail. I think he’d be the first to tell you that that was a political prosecution because he wasn’t going to play with the NSA.

Then we saw something develop called the “Total Information Awareness” program; that was done in DARPA, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. So who did they haul out to head up that program? A guy named John Poindexter. Admiral Poindexter, one of the perpetrators of the greatest government conspiracy

since Watergate, the Iran-Contra scandal, and they put him in charge. And people in the administration said, “We’re accused of all kinds of conspiracy theories, these are not true.” So why did they get one of the conspirators in Iran-Contra to head up Total Information Awareness? They talk about “conspiracy theories”—the logo for that program was the pyramid with the all-seeing eye, looking down the planet! And they said people that complain about that are conspiracy theorists!

When the 9/11 Commission [was created], for the first time, I was approached by whistleblowers. Now, I had worked at the NSA. The idea of a whistleblower there was just unheard of! We had spies in the ’80s, we had the Raymond Pelton case and the Walker spy ring, but to have whistleblowers come forward, not because they wanted to expose secrets, but they wanted to expose wrongdoing! And this was shocking to me. And I said, things must really be bad at the NSA, for this to happen.

So how were these people dealt with? They were talking about warrantless wiretapping, Stellar Wind, you’ve seen some on TV, even before the revelations of Snowden; Russ Tice, there was Tom Drake. In the Justice Department, Thomas Tamm was a Justice Department prosecutor. All these people were basically hauled in to answer questions; some went before grand juries; the FBI wanted to charge them. We saw *this* administration, the Obama Administration, charge eight to nine people under the Espionage Act of 1917! Obama has done more prosecutions under that act than all of his predecessors combined, just to silence whistleblowers!

And then we heard kind of a takeoff on “total hearability”: “collect it all.” the NSA’s mission is to “collect it all.”

The Snowden Revelations

Then we had the Snowden revelations. The most important thing about the Snowden revelations—we knew they were doing this, we knew they were surveilling journalists: I wrote about a program called “First Fruits” that was collecting not only what journalists were writing about the NSA, but who they were talking to on the telephone—so they were mixing signals intelligence intercepts on our communications and then putting it in their database.

What Snowden showed us was *how* they’re doing it. We knew they were doing it, but he gave us the technical document showing how they were doing this surveillance, and this is across the board. We now have what’s called SIGADs, Signal Intelligence Activity De-

scriptors; their nomenclatures used to be for the NSA stations, like Menwith Hill [U.K.], like Masawa, Japan. Now they have SIGADs for AT&T and Verizon switches in this country! Also for Yahoo, for Google, for PayPal. And you know, this group that Pierre Omidyar founded, PayPal, gives \$100 million to [Glenn] Greenwald and some other journalist to write about the NSA. I believe the real reason for that, is that he didn't want information coming out that PayPal is a major supporter of NSA surveillance. So how do you silence that? You buy off some journalists with \$100 million—it might work! I didn't get my offer, yet. I'm a little upset about that!

We also heard from Snowden about the third parties to the NSA surveillance. (The second parties are the English-speaking countries: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Britain, United States.) [German Chancellor] Angela Merkel expressed total surprise when she found out her “handi,” her cell phone, was being listened in on by the NSA! But did she bother to go to the Bundesnachrichtendienst [BND], her Federal intelligence service, to find out? Yes, we're cooperating with the NSA in that program, and we've been listening to all your communications! I likened her to the Inspector in the movie, “Casablanca,” Inspector Reynaud, when he says, “I'm shocked to find gambling in this establishment”—and then he's handed his winnings.

Okay, the NSA, they are collecting it all. You play online games, you surf porno sites, they're in there, they're using this information. It's across the board; there is no such thing as privacy in this world of the NSA.

We know about tailored access operations, introducing viruses, malware, a lot of the spam you get is the NSA—they're involved with that. As far as them monitoring world leaders, well, that's actually in their charter; they've been doing that for years. And if the world leaders—I think the world leaders are upset because they thought they were immune to this, because we're “leaders.” We're the G20—how can we be listened in on by the NSA? When you're a target of the NSA, there's no safe harbor.

What Can Be Done?

Now, in closing, because I know we want time for questions, I just want to say: What can be done? There's a lot of people who say, look, Obama, he had some internal reports, let's modify what the NSA does; let's restrict them. Let's reimpose the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act requirements.

My feeling on the NSA: It's an out-of-control intel-

ligence agency. End it, don't mend it. Get rid of it! When the Shah was overthrown, they didn't mend SAVAK, they got rid of SAVAK. When apartheid in South Africa fell, they didn't mend the Bureau of State Security (BOSS), they got rid of it. They got rid of the KGB; they got rid of the Stasi; they got rid of the Securitate in Romania; they got rid of the State Research Bureau, after they got rid of Idi Amin; they got rid of Tonton Macoute in Haiti, when they got rid of Baby Doc. *So, let's get rid of the NSA.*

You can take that facility. It's a wonderful facility campus they have. We have a shortage of engineers and scientists in this country, and it would make a *wonderful* training center for engineers, vocational/technical people, and with all those unemployed NSA people, they'll still have jobs: They can teach mathematics and engineering to all these people that need that training. Or it can be just the University of Maryland Columbia Campus.


Anyway, it was interesting to read through the papers of Eisenhower and Truman. I have to say, if they were around today, they would also agree with me, that what you do with the NSA, what it has become, you have to end it, don't mend it.

Thank you very much.

Treason in America

NOW AVAILABLE ON KINDLE!

Anton Chaitkin's *Treason in America*:
From Aaron Burr to Averell Harriman is an
 authoritative inquiry into the criminal apparatus
 of the British
 Empire and its
 arms in Wall
 Street, Boston, and
 the Confederate
 South—that
 usurped power in
 America.



The Kindle edition
 (from Executive
 Intelligence Review,
 1999) is available at
www.amazon.com
 for \$9.99.

'Art Emotion' versus Political Correctness

Eric Larsen is Professor Emeritus from the John Jay College of the City University of New York, and the author of a number of books, including "A Nation Gone Blind," and "The Decline and Fall of the American Nation."

Hi, I'm glad to be here, I'm grateful for having been invited, and I will be as brief as I can. But I have a story here, essentially of two books, they are both mine. The more recent is a book called *The Skull of Yorick*; the subtitle is long, it's called "The Emptiness of American Thinking at a Time of Grave Peril," and then the subtitle to the subtitle is, "Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11." Preceding that by a number of years, a book that came out in 2006 was called *A Nation Gone Blind*, with the subtitle "America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit." I want to just tell you a little about the first one and then a little bit about the second one, and then wrap it up as a story, and it's a story about reading.

I'm the literary guy for this panel, and you might think of what I'm saying as a sort of footnote to much else of what's been said, but it's an important footnote, as footnotes often are.

I think, that part of the dilemma, the trouble with terror, the dead end, the calamity, the blindness of the nation—this may sound absurd—but I think some of it is due to the fact that Americans have forgotten how to read, or they've been taught how *not* to read.

When I was in grade school, middle school, junior high school, the teachers always said, "You learn a lot by reading; you can go to foreign lands, you can meet

foreign people, you can shake hands across the sea, you learn how to make a camp fire." Yes, but, when I got bigger, I thought, I don't think reading for information is the real reason for reading, especially not what you call literature.

When I talk now about literature, please assume me to be talking about the arts. Few people understand how to use the arts, and what they're for (the Schiller Institute not included). I have this long paragraph that I won't read (a beautiful one, though; you can never trust a writer, because they always want to read their own stuff out loud!). So, in any case, this is my page 125, from *A Nation Gone Blind*, and I met a guy, whom I've lost touch with, but, because he wrote me and we got in touch, because he was floored by page 125, I've always called him my "Page 125 Guy."


Art Emotion

And the point there is, in answer to this question, that one should read, not for information, but for experience, and

the question is, experience of what? And the answer is this: When you're involved with a piece of art, if it's going well, you are in what I call—and so did T.S. Eliot; I have to give him first credit—"art emotion." And this is a unique and vitally important thing for the human race, whereby you are using both your mind and your emotions, and art is almost the only place where that can be *caused* by human manufacture. It's almost the only thing that we have, that can be designed in order to produce the full use of the mind and of the heart, *at one and the same time*.

Now, when you read a book, if it's a good one, and you're reading it well, and it's working and you get that "art emotion"—I call it sometimes feeling-thinking, or thought-feeling, or art emotion—what you realize is this: You realize that you're *absolutely alone* in the universe.

Now there's much more to be said about that, but you realize that every single one is alone, and that what you have in eyes, are a couple windows to look out



Prof. Eric Larsen

Schiller Institute

through. You're in here, and the world's out there, and you see it only through those things. Maybe, the ears and the nose, too, but through the senses. And so, it's that sense of aloneness, that is the experience, the central experience, that one gets from reading.

Now, I will read a little tiny bit, here: "This simple, rudimentary thing, art experience, or art emotion"—it could be called felt understanding, or awareness feeling, as I said—"brings into one's awareness the existence of the meaning-respondent self." That is, you realize that you're alive! You realize that you're alive, too, if you have a good dinner, but it's not both mind and heart in a highly intense unification. It's more the belly says, "Oh boy, that's good!" But in other words, you are taught the vital, absolute importance, the essentialness of self, as an entryway to all other experience, or perhaps to all other experience, that can contain meaning.

I was raised that way. And in college, I learned all about that, and I began to review the great writers and I studied them, and I wanted to become one of them. I thought I was sort of getting there. I want to write novels, and I had done that—*The Decline and Fall of the American Nation* is a novel, oddly enough, not a nonfiction book.

And Then Came ... Political Correctness

But some time around 1991, maybe Sept. 17, I'm not sure, the world went dead around me, the literary world died. And I have an example of how it died, and it became evident that art emotion was of no interest to the American readership, inside or outside of academia any more.

And so, what replaced the art emotion, and the significance of the understanding of the self, and the relation of the self to the universe, and all of the other selves, what replaced it was four words: race, class, gender, and ethnic identity. Political correctness came. And it was here to stay, and I think I blame it for the cover-up of 9/11, largely.

So, I went to an old magazine I had published in, years earlier, the *North American Review*, the oldest literary quarterly in the U.S., founded by Thomas Jefferson. I am happy to have appeared in it, and I thought I would look at it and see whether it had been struck by the plague—and indeed, it had. What I read in the note from the editor, "*The North American Review* is the oldest literary in America, founded in 1815, and one of the most respected. We are interested in high-quality

poetry, fiction, and nonfiction on any subject, but we're especially interested in work that addresses contemporary North American concerns and issues, particularly with the environment, gender, race, class, and ethnicity"!

Well! I ask! Where is the rest of life? Where is everything else? This reminds me of Orwell, you know? "All animals are created equal, but some are more equal than others." So "on any subject, so long as..." Okay.

Now, I just have to touch on one metaphor, because I like it: "The age of simplification" that's what I'm calling it, "is real, and the confusion between thought and feeling is real, where thinking should come first, as in the classroom, feeling does, instead." And my advice to kids nowadays: Don't go to college. Find some smart person and read with them. So anyway, "feeling comes first in the classroom. And where feeling should come first, as in the *vital germ of life* in spiriting a piece of writing," I say in here, that what should begin a piece of writing isn't a concept, an issue, or a public concern like race or class, no! It should be *some small element of life* that the writer cannot *not* write about. It's not the issue first! It's the *impulse* of life first. It may lead to issues, sure! But it depends on whether the horse or the wagon goes first. And so, "the vital germ of life in spiriting a piece of writing is taken over by abstraction, which takes the lead instead, akin to a plough horse stepping on a rosebud." You know, plough horses' hooves are about like that, dinner plate size, and the ones I knew when I was a kid were, and the poor little thing would step on a rosebud, and that's it!

So, there is art. It's been lost. And how does this affect education? Well, it affects education in this way: I call a class of people in the universities now, whom I call the "New Professors"; people think I don't like them, just because they're young and I'm old. But I don't think that's the case. Many of them are really nice! But, they don't see things, they don't feel things; they talk about ethnicity and so on, and that's it.

So, the New Professors, at least in the literary part of the humanities—it's true in art, too; music may have escaped, because it's the purest of those arts—but, they're not so much educating their students as they're doing the equivalent of poking out their eyes! Making them passive and mechanical, instead of encouraging and strengthening them, or the capacity and talent they have, for whole and autonomous intelligence: intelli-

gence of the kind that's needed, if there is to be, accordingly, an intelligent nation.

Too Close to the Bone

There's more that comes up in *The Skull of Yorick*, but that's the theme. And when the book came out, people said, oh, you've got to set up a website, and publicize it. Well, I was the only one in the nation publicizing it! It was completely un-reviewed, and nobody liked it; the *New York Times* hated it, though they'd liked my previous two books, *real* well. But this one was too much, too close to the bone, told the truth too clearly. I think what happened in *The Skull of Yorick* is, I set up the website, but I didn't have anything to do, except vent my spleen about all of the blind people I saw in the arts and in the news, and in information and media: everybody from Amy Goodman to Thomas Friedman, Frank Rich.


So, I wrote essay after essay after essay. And a bunch of them are here, in *The Skull of Yorick*. And so, it's the same story, but it's with the *huge* application of studied, institutionalized—I don't know, how many of the major people that we read daily in the paper, and books, how many of them *know* they're lying! How many of them don't. It doesn't matter in the eyes of God, to me, but it certainly matters on the human realm.

But in any case, the beginning of *A Nation Gone Blind* is more true now than it was then. I talked about television a bit—I didn't want to, but I had to. Can't get away from it. And that subject, the subject of our media-drenched culture, is the subject of lying.

I start my America in 1947; I was born in 1941, and became a little bit aware in 1946, or '7, and have some memories from then. And I'm very grateful for having had that glimpse, before the mass media changed the country forever. But those 60 years that brought us the New America have also brought us a virtually perfected socio-political culture of lies and lying, a culture built on a foundation of lying, framed by walls of lying, covered by a roof of lying.

And now, the greatest lie of all continues with us, stripping us of our freedoms, of our Constitution, of our republic, of our rights. And the only way to fight back, the only way to *be able* to fight back, is first, use the "I": Realize that you're in it, all by yourself, and I'm in it all by myself, and the initiative has got to come from each tiny, tiny little flame, that will then influence all the other flames.

Anyway, that's the narrative reading. Thank you very much for your time.



Schiller Institute

Helga Zepp-LaRouche discussed Schiller's "perfect Classical poem," "Nänie," set to music by Johannes Brahms, prior to its performance by the Schiller Institute Chorus.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Remarks on the Poem Nänie by Schiller

Helga Zepp-LaRouche introduced the performance of Brahms' "Nänie" ("Song of Lamentation") by the Mid-Atlantic Schiller Institute Chorus, by reciting Schiller's poem, on which the song is based, in German, followed by an English translation by Choral Director John Sigerson.

The extreme importance the Schiller Institute puts on Classical culture has everything to do with the hope to come out of this civilizational crisis, because we're not only having a financial crisis, a political crisis, a military crisis, but we have profoundly, a cultural crisis. And if we want to come out of it, we have to make Classical music and Classical poetry accessible to the population in general, because it's the only way we can make people have access to the inner source of their own creativity. And there is almost nothing else but Classical music and Classical poetry which does that.

Now, most people have no idea what "Classical" means. They think Classical music is the Rolling Stones, or some such ancient thing. And in reality, Classical art,

as it has been developed in Germany, in particular, in the Classical period, and naturally, in other countries too; but the German Classical period represented, really the highest standard in both music and poetry, and it had the very highest standard of what goes into it.

The Classical poem, for example, *Nänie*, which we hear now in a composition of Brahms, is a *perfect* Classical poem. It has every ingredient which Schiller, Goethe, and some other of the great poets who established universal, aesthetical laws, defined. It has a beautiful, poetical idea. That idea is thoroughly composed. It has a transformation to a higher idea which you cannot express in prose, and there is not one word too much.

It would require more to say, but I leave it at that, and I want to read to you, first in German, the *Nänie*, and then John Sigerson will read it in English, and then I will give you a couple of comments on it, because most people have forgotten how to open up poems. They read something written by Shakespeare or by other poets, Shelley, and they say, "This doesn't make any sense." But they don't make the effort to actually, word by word, line by line, strophe by strophe, *conquer the poem*, and that way, get inside, into what it means. And when you do that, then you will see, that it accesses the most tender, most lyrical part of your soul. And you know, poems are really the absolute, necessary way of accessing creativity. And the fact that that art is so much lost has everything to do with the present crisis in which we find ourselves.

So, I read to you this *Nänie*:

Nänie

*Auch das Schöne muss sterben! Das Menschen
und Götter bezwinget,*

*Nicht die eherne Brust rührt es des stygischen
Zeus.*

*Einmal nur erweichte die Liebe den
Schattenbeherrscher,*

*Und an der Schwelle noch, streng, rief er
zurück sein Geschenk.*

*Nicht stillt Aphrodite dem schönen Knaben die
Wunde,*

*Die in den zierlichen Leib grausam der Eber
geritzt.*

*Nicht errettet den göttlichen Held die
unsterbliche Mutter,*

*Wann er, am skäischen Tor fallend, sein
Schicksal erfüllt.*

*Aber sie steigt aus dem Meer mit allen Töchtern
des Nereus,*

*Und die Klage hebt an um den verherrlichten
Sohn.*

*Siehe! Da weinen die Götter, es weinen die
Göttinnen alle,*

*Dass das Schöne vergeht, dass das
Vollkommene stirbt.*

*Auch ein Klaglied zu sein im Mund der
Geliebten ist herrlich,*

*Denn das Gemeine geht klanglos zum Orkus
hinab.*

[English translation:]

Nenia¹

Even the beautiful must perish! It vanquishes
men and gods alike,

Yet it moves not the steely breast of the Stygian
Zeus.²

Only once did Love make the Lord of the
Shadows relent,

But, still on the threshold, he sternly withdrew
his gift.³

Aphrodite failed to stanch the beautiful boy's
wound

Which the wild boar had gruesomely gashed
into his delicate body.⁴

The divine hero could not be saved by his
immortal mother⁵

When, dying at the Scaean Gate,⁶ he fulfilled
his fate.

And yet, she rises from the sea, with all
Nereus's daughters,⁷

And lifts her voice in lament over her glorified
son.

Look! The gods are weeping! All the goddesses
are bemoaning

That the beautiful must pass away, that the
perfect must die!

Even a song of lament in the mouth of she who
is loved, is glorious,

Because tawdry goes down to Orcus⁸ unsung.

1. Song of lamentation.

2. Pluto, god of the underworld.

3. Orpheus attempted to retrieve Eurydice from the underworld.

4. Venus (Aphrodite) mourning over the hunter Adonis.

5. Achilles' mother, the goddess Thetys (daughter of the sea god Nereus).

6. The gate of Troy.

7. Nereus had 50 daughters.

8. The underworld.

So, to just take the first reference to Greek mythology which Schiller uses, the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice: Now, this is a very beautiful mythology, where Orpheus received from the god Apollo, the power of a beautiful singing voice, and also playing the lute so powerfully that he would not only move people to tears, but even trees and stones would be moved. He fell in love with Eurydice, who was a river nymph, and they married, but very soon she died. And then Orpheus was so completely distraught that neither prayer nor song nor anything would get him out of his sorrow, or bring her back.

So he took a decision which no human being had ever taken before. He decided to go down into the realm of the dead, to take her back, into the Tantaros, and there he talked to Hades, the ruler of the underworld, and he was singing to him of his immortal love and his pain, which was stronger than he could bear. So he called on Hades, and reminded him that he had fallen in love with his wife, Persephone, whom he had stolen from some foreign town and then married. And this had never happened before, so all the shadows of the underworld, all the mythological figures, gathered around him and listened to his beautiful singing. And even the Eumenides, the goddesses of revenge, were moved to tears by this expression of beauty and love.

Even Hades, the sinister ruler of the underworld, was moved; and then his wife, Persephone, calls the shadow of Eurydice, and tells Orpheus that his great love has moved them, and that they will fulfill his request and she can follow him—but only on one condition: He must not look back. Because if he looks back once, then he has lost Eurydice forever.

So Orpheus goes, and naturally, Eurydice follows him, but since she is a shadow, he cannot hear her. So at one point, he gets completely panicked, and he looks back, and sees that, indeed, she is there. And she looks at him for one moment, sadly, very tenderly, and at the moment when he wants to embrace her, she disappears into emptiness.

Totally beside himself, he throws himself into the Styx, which is the river that separates the underworld from the upper world, and he weeps for seven days and seven nights, but in vain: The gods remain unmoved.

Now *Nänie* is the name for the song of lament, which was a very common phenomenon in Greek mythology. Every time a great figure of mythology died, there was a song of lament, a *Nänie*. And that *Nänie*, that song of lament, became its own category of poetry.

Now, obviously, this poem, *Nänie* starts with a very

emotional statement, which means something for every human being, because everybody experiences it one or more times in his life, “Even the beautiful must die!” How often have we not said, “Why is [the] beautiful dying?” It’s a universal human emotion. Schiller, however, does not talk about the loss of a person; he talked about the loss of beauty, and he gives three examples: The first one is the Eurydice/Orpheus example which I mentioned, which is the beauty of Love. The second is the myth of Aphrodite, the goddess of Beauty, and her lover, the handsome youth Adonis, who is wounded by a wild boar and dies. And the third one is a reference to the death of Achilles at Troy. Achilles, in Greek mythology, was the son of Thetys, who was in turn, the daughter of Nereus, and wife of Peleus.

Now, Schiller calls Achilles “the divine hero,” and his beauty is one of character, of virtue, and of bravery. He fought, but even his immortal mother could not save him. But then, she, the immortal mother, arises out of the ocean, with all of the daughters of Nereus, and they sing the *Nänie*, the song of lament for Achilles.

And then, something very beautiful happens: There is a shift in the poem. It says,

“Look! All the gods are weeping, and all the goddesses are bemoaning that beauty vanishes, that the perfect must die.”

Now, the three examples Schiller gives in this poem, are all starting with a “not,” in the German—it’s lost in the English translation, because it requires a poet to translate a Classical poem, equally beautifully, in another language. And I’m not saying John is not a poet, I’m just saying he didn’t have enough time to do it! And he wanted people to have access to a relatively difficult text.

But in the German: “Nicht die eherne Brust...”; “Nicht stillt Aphrodite...”; “Nicht errettet den göttlichen Held...” is an artistic trick with which you make sure the audience understands that it’s really the same subject.

Then, in the German, there are also very beautiful forms, like *Distichen*, which is a sequence of hexameter and pentameter, and in German, the word *Dichtung* [poetry] has a very special meaning: *Dicht* means dense or intense, so *Dichtung* means intensification. So you intensify the prose in such a way that you arrive at a higher level.

So, in the first case, even the beautiful must die, and all the gods and goddesses weep. The beauty has not died, because—and this is where the transformation occurs—in the song of lament, the beautiful becomes

immortal: So the subject of the poem is not the loss of beauty, because the beauty is in *Nänie*, in the song of lament, in the poetry. Because the mean, the tawdry, vanished without a song, into Orcus.

Beauty, in Art, Is Immortal

Now, what is said here is that beauty, in art, is immortal. Even where death destroys the beautiful, the beautiful reappears in the art, and that is obviously also true for every person who contributed something with his or her life, to the immortality of the species of mankind, and its progress.

Now, Nicholas of Cusa said that the soul is the place where all science and all art is created, and the fact that the science created, the art created, *is* immortal, that means also that it's an absolute proof that the soul is immortal, because obviously that which creates is of a higher order than the created. So once a soul creates immortal things, the soul is immortal.

Beauty in all of this is extremely important, because Schiller, in several poems and writings, talks about the conflict between lust—the joy in the here and now, the joy of the senses—and the beauty of the mind, which is related to universal principles and to immortality. And he struggles, and conveyed that struggle, that in order to be a universal mind, to be a philosophical mind, to be a beautiful soul, to be a genius, you have to resolve that conflict, because if your mind is demanding one thing, and your emotions are telling you something else, you cannot resolve it. And if you only follow the duty, then you end up like Immanuel Kant: You become one of the Kantian types who do their duty, but are totally joyless.

So Schiller resolves that by saying that beauty is the realm where the conflict between the happiness of the senses and happiness of the soul is overcome, because without any question beauty belongs to the realm of the senses: You can feel it, you can see it, you can enjoy it with your emotions, but it is also something which affects the mind. So it is therefore that which resolves that conflict, and that has everything to do with the need for an aesthetical education of civilization. And it has been a total conviction of the Schiller Institute, and one of the reasons why it was founded, that we have to educate mankind *aesthetically*, because the barbarism which we see today in the world, is just a complete lack of that kind of aesthetical education.

So therefore, I ask you all, help us to spread Classical culture, because only if you love Classical culture, are people truly human.

Terry Strada

The Truth About 9/11 Must Be Told Now

Terry Strada is co-chair of a committee of victims of 9/11, entitled Justice Against State Sponsors of Terrorism Action Committee (JASTA). Her husband was killed in the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, 2001. She addressed the conference by videotape.



Schiller Institute

Terry Strada, Co-Chair, JASTA

Hello. Thank you for inviting me today, and I apologize for not being able to appear in person. Today is Father's Day. It is a day in my home to reflect on what we have lost, honor my late husband Tom, and celebrate who he was as a person: a devoted family man, with a charismatic smile, and a love for the great outdoors.

My name is Terry Strada. I am the national co-chair, along with Sharon Premoli, of the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism. Our group consists of over 6,500 victims, family members, and survivors, in the tragic terrorist attacks that occurred here, in America, on Sept. 11, 2001.

Like thousands, my husband was brutally murdered on 9/11, just four days after we brought home our third child. Our other two children were seven and four years old. Tom worked in the North Tower of the World Trade Center, as a partner with a firm called Canter-Fitzgerald.

On Sept. 11, 2001, it was clear from the beginning what had happened. Four commercial airplanes were hijacked: Pilots, flight attendants, and passengers were cruelly murdered, and the planes were used as missiles, to crash into our landmarks, and murder innocent souls. They attacked capitalism, by destroying the World Trade Center. They attacked our defense by slamming into the Pentagon. And they were headed for our nation's Capitol, to kill our government officials. It is likely that the lives of many members of Congress were spared that

day by the brave passengers on Flight 93, who valiantly tried to take over the controls of that fateful flight.

When the smoke cleared, and the fires were extinguished, along with the carnage left behind, three questions remained. Who attacked us? Why did they attack us? And how were they able to carry out such a multifaceted plot that took years to plan, train for, and implement?

Some of the answers to these questions lie in the redacted 28 pages of the Joint [Congressional] Inquiry into Intelligence Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001. They were signed into secrecy by former President George Bush, and remain hidden from the American people.

Today I would like to speak to, who was behind 9/11, and how were they able to attack us.

The Money Trail to Saudi Arabia

Contrary to what our government allowed us to believe, al-Qaeda did not act alone. Long before 9/11, there was a complex financial network of wealthy individuals, banks, and so-called charities, referred to as the Golden Chain, established to give financial aid, material, and logistical support to the 19 hijackers. This intricate web of money leads to mainly one source: Saudi Arabia.

The 19 terrorists who carried out the heinous acts of violence and murder on 9/11 first met in faraway places, and then traveled to our country and joined people already here, waiting for their arrival. They quietly blended into our culture, and remained under the radar. For nearly two years, they lived amongst us. They rented apartments, cars, and took very expensive flying lessons. They traveled first-class, stayed in hotels, ate in restaurants, shopped, and frequented expensive bars. They barely spoke English.

So how did they obtain drivers' licenses and find their housing? They did not work, so that they could buy food, clothing, and health club memberships. They were flush with cash, and bought those first-class airline tickets to learn our aviation security practices. Or, should I say, our lack of security.

From Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., to Little Falls, Va. and Sarasota, Fla., the 9/11 operatives were supported through an established network of handlers and enablers, likely named, and many more not named, in those redacted 28 pages.

The same infrastructure that was set in place prior to 9/11 still exists today. We have no reason whatsoever to believe these cells were ever dismantled. In fact, we believe they are still in place, financed by the same bankrollers of the 9/11 attacks.

One thing is clear: The common thread that runs through all terrorist attacks around the globe, including 9/11, is the money that finances them, and the source of that money.

Our organization, the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, has been fighting for justice, accountability, and the truth over the past decade. We want to cut off the flow of money, the lifeblood of terrorism, and thwart future terrorist attacks against Americans here and abroad. We want to stop the bloodshed, and the sacrifices our troops make, each and every day since 9/11.

Is it possible that after years of war, we will never know who financed the terrorist attacks here, that prompted this declaration of endless war? Terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda operate behind the cloak of darkness. While they depend on secrecy and silence, in order to grow and spread, they cannot operate without the massive sums of money it takes in order for them to exist. Not just in the far-flung places of the world, but here, in America, as well.

We agree with Congressmen [Walter] Jones, [Stephen] Lynch, and [Thomas] Massie, and completely support their efforts to shine light on the truth.⁹ The truth has been withheld from us, the 9/11 families, the survivors, and from you, the American people, long enough. Timely declassification of the 28 pages is essential for our national security. It is declassification that will actually protect us, not endanger us.

Take Action Now

We need to know who our real enemies are. As long as those pages remain hidden, we will continue to be proxies in the wars of those who are the subject of the 28 pages, and they will remain with impunity, to repeat themselves, again and again. While I'm not able to answer all the questions raised since 9/11, we demand to know who really was behind 9/11. They must be exposed, stopped, and punished for their crimes against humanity that took place *here*, on American soil, or we will never be safe.

As long as radical Islamic ideology that fuels hatred toward the United States continues, and terrorists remains committed to killing Americans, we will never be safe. And as long as the pipeline of money that flows freely from the actors into the hands of terrorist organizations, like al-Qaeda, Boca Haram, and the newest, and possibly most frightening of all, ISIS, we will never be safe.

9. See "Congressional Press Conference: Members of Congress, 9/11 Families Demand: Release the 28 Pages Now!" *EIR*, March 21, 2013.

Again, our group of over 6,500 victims, family members, and survivors support Representatives Jones, Lynch, and Massie's introduction of House Resolution 428, and for that, we thank them with gratitude. I ask all of you to take action now, and join us in our quest for the truth. I would also like to ask you, to please visit our website, www.justiceagainstterrorism.org. There you'll find how easy it is to contact members of Congress, and also learn about the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, JASTA. There's a petition you can sign in support of JASTA. Read further about House Resolution 428, and learn about an important Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed against the FBI, in Florida, regarding the Sarasota Saudis suspected of having 9/11 ties.

Thank you.

Nomi Prins

Glass-Steagall: An Idea Whose Time Has Come Again

*Nomi Prins is an economist, journalist, and author of several books, including "All the President's Bankers: The Hidden Alliances that Drive American Power" (2014). Prins was a managing director at Goldman Sachs, a senior managing director at Bear Stearns in London, a strategist at Lehman Brothers and an analyst at Chase Manhattan Bank. She is currently a Senior Fellow at the policy thinktank Demos. She delivered these remarks to the conference by video-recording.*¹⁰



Schiller Institute

Economist and author Nomi Prins

First of all, thank you very much for inviting me to speak to you here today. It's really quite a great honor.

I want to talk about a few things, one of which is the Glass-Steagall Act, and what it meant to our country's history, why it was passed, how it helped. How the

repeal of that Act in 1999 has created a tremendously unstable environment for individuals at the hands of banking institutions, political alliances, governments, and central banks.

And also how some of the remedies that have been proposed in the wake of the 2008 subprime crisis, including the Dodd-Frank Act, and its allegedly most important component, the Volcker Rule, are really ineffective at combatting this risk; and what we really need to do is go back to a time, and go back to a policy, and continue to use the real strength of the Glass-Steagall Act and a new Glass-Steagall Act, in order for us to be safe going forward. And when I say "us," I mean everybody in this room, I mean the population of the United States, I mean the populations throughout the globe.

Because what we have today, and what we've had in the wake of the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act, is an environment where the largest banking institutions have been able to increase the concentration of their capital, of their influence, of their power, and this has been subsidized and substantiated by political forces within the White House, the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, governments throughout the world—in particular, throughout Europe, the ECB—and it's something that we really need to contain and look forward to changing, if we want to have more economic stability for the greater citizenry at large.

How the Glass-Steagall Act Came To Be

So, going back a little bit in time, to how the Glass-Steagall Act came about. We had a major crash in 1929. It was the result of a tremendous amount of speculation, and also rigging of markets by the larger financial institutions, as well as things called trusts, which were small components of these institutions, that were set up in order to bet on various industries, and collections of companies within those industries, and so forth, as well as to make special bets

on foreign bonds in foreign land; as well as to make bets on the housing market, which is something that we've seen and been familiar with quite recently.

Also, a lot of the activity that was done, in particular, by the Big Six banks at the time—which included National City Bank and First National Bank, which today we know as Citigroup; the Morgan Bank and the

10. See the Jan. 24, 2014 [EIR](#) for an interview with Nomi Prins.

Chase Bank, which today we know as JPMorgan Chase; as well as two other Big Six banks—got together in the wake of the crash in 1929, which they had helped to [perpetrate], and decided that they needed to save the markets, as they were deteriorating very quickly.

And the reason they wanted to save the markets was not because they wanted to protect the population at the time; it was because they wanted to protect themselves. But the way they chose to do that, was to put in \$25 million each, after only a 20-minute meeting that occurred at the Morgan Bank on Wall Street, No. 23 Wall Street, which was catty-corner from the New York Stock Exchange at the time. And after this 20-minute meeting, which was called together by a man named Thomas Lamont, who was a major banker at the time, and the acting chairman of the Morgan Bank, these six bankers, they broke, they went out into the streets, the press heralded them as heroes who would save the day, and in particular, heralded the Morgan Bank as an institution that would yet again save the economy from virtual catastrophe.

It [the press] compared the decision that was made after that 20-minute meeting to something that had happened after the Panic of 1907, when J.P. Morgan, the patriarch of the Morgan Bank, had been called upon by President Teddy Roosevelt, to save what was then a situation of deteriorating markets, and of deposits being crushed, and of citizens losing their money because of rigging of markets that had happened back then.

So this was a repeat of something very similar.

After the meeting, the decision was to buy up stocks. And the stocks that were bought were the ones in which the Big Six banks had the most interest, and that is what they did. The market rose for a day, which is why the newspapers were so happy. It was why President Herbert Hoover, at the time, decided he might actually get re-elected, as opposed to facing not just un-election, but also, a bad historical legacy. And everybody was quite pleased with the results.

Unfortunately, as we know, after the market rose, after that day, after they put in the money to buy those stocks, it crashed by 90% over the next few years, and the country was thrown into a Great Depression. Twenty-five percent of the individuals in the country were unemployed. There was a global depression that was ignited because of this. Foreclosures skyrocketed, small businesses closed, thousands of smaller banks, and the country was in very, very dire straits.

FDR's Bankers

Into that, came President FDR, and something that's very interesting historically, that I did not even know before I did my latest book, *All the President's Bankers*, is that FDR had friends, and they were bankers. And two of the friends that he had that were bankers, were men named James Perkins, who ran the National City Bank after the Crash of 1929, and Winthrop Aldrich, who happened to have been the son of Nelson Aldrich, who happened to have been a Senator at the time that the Federal Reserve Act, or its precursor, was created at Jekyll Island in 1910.

And so these were men of pedigree. And these were men of power. These were men of wealth. And these were men who were friends of FDR.

And even before the Glass-Steagall Act that we know today was passed in the year of 1933, and signed into law, these men worked with FDR, because they believed that if they separated the institutions that they were now running, their banks, some of the biggest banks in the country at the time, from keeping deposits of individuals safe and divided from speculative activities, and the creation of securities that can go sour very quickly, and tank not only their banks but the general economy—they believed those two things should be separate.

That was the theory behind the Glass-Steagall Act: It was that if you separate risky endeavors, and risky practices, and concentration of that risk, from individual deposits and loans, that you create a more stable banking system, you create a more stable financial market, you create a more stable population, and create a more stable economy.

FDR believed that, and the bankers believed that. That's something we don't have today.

So, before the Act was passed, Winthrop Aldrich, James Perkins—they had meetings in the first 10 days of FDR's administration, in which they promised FDR they would separate their banks even before the legislation was passed. And that's why it was more than just legislation. It was a political/financial alliance at the time. It was policy at the time to stabilize the economy and to stabilize the system, so that everybody could benefit.

And those men did benefit. Their legacies benefited. The National City Bank that was run by James Perkins, the Chase Bank that was run by Winthrop Aldrich—those banks exist today. But the Glass-Steagall Act at the time enabled them to grow in a more stable aspect. Winthrop Aldrich and James Perkins chose to

keep the deposit-taking and the lending arms of their banks. They separated them before, as I said, the Glass-Steagall Act was passed. They promoted the Glass-Steagall Act. FDR promoted the Glass-Steagall Act. Congress, in a bipartisan fashion, unilaterally and enthusiastically, passed the Glass-Steagall Act.

So, it was very much a national platform on every level.

The Take-Down

What we've had since—and it started to a large extent in the late '70s, and accelerated throughout the Reagan Administration, the Bush Administration, the Clinton Administration, and the ramifications through the second Bush Administration and the Obama Administration, is a disintegration of the idea of that Act. The idea that risky endeavors and deposits should be kept separate in order for stability to exist throughout.

In the '80s, banks were allowed to merge across state lines. In the '90s, banks were allowed to increase their share of financial services by re-introducing insurance companies, brokerages, the ability to create securities that we now know today can be quite toxic, as well as ultimately to do trade in derivatives and other types of more technologically complex, but nevertheless, even more risky, securities, all under one roof.

And in 1999, under President Bill Clinton, at the end of the year, an act was passed, the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, that summarily repealed all the intent of the Glass-Steagall Act. And what it created in its wake, was a free-for-all, merging and concentration and consolidation of these largest banks, into ever-more powerful and influential entities: influential over our capital; influential over our economy; influential with respect to the White House.

And this is not something that the bankers pushed on the White House. We should realize this. This is something that Washington, under several administrations, under bipartisan leaderships throughout, under different types of Treasury secretaries that came from the very same banking system that they were supposedly going to be in public office to watch over—they all collaborated to repeal this Act.

In 2002, 2003, 2004, when rates started to be very low, and subprime loans started to be offered, these banks, that now had much more concentration over deposits, over insurance products, over brokerages, over asset management arms, were able to create securities out of a very small amount of loans. Out of a half a tril-

lion dollars worth of subprime loans, extended to individuals, they were able to create a \$14 trillion mountain of toxic assets. And they were able to leverage that mountain, \$14 trillion, to \$140 trillion of risk, by virtue of their co-dependencies of the Big Six banks, by virtue of the derivatives that were involved in the securities, that were laced with these mortgages, and by all sorts of complex different types of financial engineering.

As we know, that concluded in 2008, and the result of that implosion was *not* to chop off the arms of these banks. It was *not* to have men at the top of these banks, like Winthrop Aldrich, say, "You know, this was a bad idea. We screwed up our banks, we screwed up the markets, we screwed up people, we screwed up the economy—let's separate. Let's go back to a time that wasn't simpler, but that was saner."

That wasn't the decision that was made. What was made instead was a decision at the highest levels of Washington, the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, the New York Federal Reserve, to coddle this very banking system, and to subsidize it, to sustain it, and all its flaws, and with all the risks that permeated around the entire population in the United States, and throughout the world, with trillions of dollars of loans, of cheap money, a zero-interest-rate policy which is now going into its fifth year of existence, which means these banks can continue to be liquid, even though they are very unhealthy.

A quantitative easing program, not just in the U.S. Federal Reserve, but now it's potentially going to grow in Europe as well, because those banks are also co-dependent on the U.S. banks, and because they are so unhealthy, they need institutions on the central banking level, and in the U.S. government, and in the Treasury departments, and in Federal Reserves and other treasury arms of different countries, to sustain their activities, to back their bad debts, and to promote their interests over the interests of the wider stability of the population.

Dodd-Frank: The Banks Are Bigger Than Ever

The Dodd-Frank Act that was passed and signed into law by President Obama in July 2010. President Obama, then-Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner, then-Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, as well as many pundits in the media, said it would be the thing that would dial back this immense risk, that would get us back to the sweeping type of regulation that was like it had been in the Great Depression.

But it has done absolutely nothing of the kind. In the

wake of the 2008 crisis, the big banks are bigger. JPMorgan Chase was able very cheaply [to acquire] Bear Stearns and Washington Mutual, to become the largest bank in the United States again. This ties back to the legacy of J.P. Morgan in the 1907 Panic, throughout the decisions that were made at its request in 1929, in the wake of the 1929 Crash, and so forth.

Citigroup has managed to survive. Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, Wells Fargo—all of these banks, the Big Six today, which are largely variations of the Big Six banks, historically, 100 years ago, with a couple of additions and many mergers along the way—have been able to sustain themselves in the wake of government policy that has enabled them to grow, and to sustain themselves, and to continue to promote risky types of practices that can be very dangerous to all of us.

The Dodd-Frank Act doesn't separate those banks. It doesn't make them smaller. It doesn't diffuse their derivatives concentration. The Big Six banks today in the United States, control 96% of all the derivatives trading in the United States. They control 45% of all the derivatives trading throughout the globe. They control 84% of the FDIC-assured deposits throughout all of the

banks in the United States, and 85% of the assets throughout all of the banks in the United States. So their concentration, their power, is immense in the wake of the 2008 crisis, in the wake of this alleged remedy to the crisis, which is the Dodd-Frank Act.

And the final component of that Act, which is supposed to at least reduce their riskiest trading practices, what's called proprietary trading: The Volcker Rule is an "892 Rule," which is 55 pages of definitions and rule, and all of the rest is exemptions to that rule. So the banks can continue to make markets, to hedge, to provide hedge funds and private equity funds, just under different language, to keep their insurance arms, to keep their brokerages, to be co-dependent, to create complex securities that are so interlocked that if one fails, the rest of them fail. And if the bank that has the most of them fails, the other banks in this entire system will fail as well.

So, nothing has been done in that language of the Volcker Rule in the Dodd-Frank Act to change anything.

Resurrect Glass-Steagall!

What we need is a resurrection of the Glass-Steagall Act. We need to realize it wasn't just a law, it was a policy of stability. It was a political and financial alliance between the White House and the biggest bankers of the time, and the population, and that's what we need to have come back today. That's what we need to press, and that's the *only* thing—a complete separation of risky endeavors from our money, from normal lending practices—that can even start to foster a more stable financial system, banking system, and economic environment for all the rest of us.

So, that's the take-away from what I wanted to tell you about today. There's more information about it historically, particularly the lead-up to the Glass-Steagall Act that was passed, the swipes at it over the time, the Presidents that were stronger, and the bankers that were stronger, and caring about the population as well, as the ones who didn't care at all about it with respect to financial stability at the hands of the banking system. And that can all be found in my book *All the President's Bankers*, which I also urge you to check out, simply to get more knowledge about the reasons for why we have that Act, and the reasons why it's more necessary than ever, to resurrect it today.

So, thank you very much again for listening. Thank you for your time, and the rest of the conference today is fantastic.

REVIVE GLASS-STEAGALL Now!



"The point is, we need Glass-Steagall immediately. We need it because that's our only insurance to save the nation.... Get Glass-Steagall in, and we can work our way to solve the other things that need to be cleaned up. If we don't get Glass-Steagall in first, we're in a mess!"

—Lyndon LaRouche, Feb. 11, 2013

LaRouchePAC is now leading a nationwide effort to push through legislation for Glass-Steagall
(www.larouchepac.com).

WATCH the LaRouchePAC video:
'Glass-Steagall: Signing a Revolution'

SUBSCRIBE to EIR Online
www.larouchepub.com/eiw
toll-free: 1-800-278-3135
e-mail: fulfullment@larouchepub.com

The Lantern of the Prophet Still Shines

Former New Jersey Congressman Cornelius (Neil) Gallagher (1959-73), now 93 years old, was a friend of President John F. Kennedy, and worked in Congress to expose FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's violation of Americans' freedoms and privacy, and Hoover's threats and blackmail against government officials, for which Gallagher was ultimately driven out of office by Hoover. He addressed the conference by video.



Schiller Institute

Former Congressman Cornelius Gallagher

Thank you very much, for the invitation to attend the 30th anniversary of the Schiller Institute. I certainly want to compliment Helga on this great institution that has been so helpful in developing the intellectual contact of the last 30 years of some of the great problems that we face. And I'm delighted to send my greetings to Lyndon LaRouche, for whom I've had such great admiration for so many years, for the inspiration he has given to so many thinking Americans. And to my friend Attorney General Ramsey Clark, I send my greetings, and I regret that I am not there in person to say hello to all of you and to all of the attendees to the Schiller 30th anniversary. I wish you all well.

You are certainly discussing some very, very important subjects that remain dear to my heart, and to the hearts of many thinking Americans, who wonder if anybody's doing anything about anything, as we drift off course in so many areas. Especially, lately, with the revelations of the NSA. You know, I might say, while the Snowden revelations are a shock to most people, the whole idea of surveillance in America, is not one that came upon the scene in the last several months, in this last year. This has been going on, growing like a cancer, ever since the end of World War II, where we would accept many infringements on our liberties, in order to win a war.

Your conference of "A World Without War," I think is so important. But one of the things that's very important, is that we see that there is a war *within* our country, by the people who control the surveillance state, against the very people who are its victims and potential victims. And I single out, too, our Congress: One of the things that I find extremely troublesome, is the fact that so many good men, both Democrats and Republicans, in positions of great importance, of knowledge in the intelligence areas, are resigning from the Congress. That is most troubling, and at the height of their careers, and where their election is not ever in question, they are strictly walking away.

'Healthy To Lie'

Why is that? One of the problems is that the intelligence is so overwhelming, that it's really taking away the freedom of expression and freedom of thought, that might be directed in saving our country, now by the very men who do not want to put up with the kind of surveillance that is taking place.

Now, you might say, well, the old cliché, "I have nothing to hide." It's not a question of nothing to hide. It's a question of how that information can be used to destroy careers, families, people, who may not agree with one agency of the government, but may agree with the others: The ability of any agency now, to destroy any political career is beyond question.

Now, you might say, "How is that?" Well, the old *New York Times v. Sullivan* case which said that it's healthy to lie about people, gave unparalleled power to the government agencies who controlled the flow of information, in that that can be handed to what they call "investigative reporters," who can then generate interest against any public figure, with impunity, and therefore, making life very, very difficult.

I speak of this with some authority: I was a member of the Congress, and my field was foreign affairs. Several of my bills were the Peace Corps, which I helped draft, and I co-managed the passage of the Peace Corps; the Arms Control Agency, the Law of the Sea, various foreign affairs matters that I was very interested in as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

However, I did not seek to get into the privacy thing,

it was thrust upon me, by a lady whose young daughter was totally abused by a government agency using a polygraph to examine her sex life and her religious beliefs, and all sorts of racial innuendoes. Only because she wanted a job as a clerk-typist! And this 17-year-old girl's mother ran down, and happened to run into me in the hall of Congress as she was looking for a Congressman. I have four daughters, and I was shocked that our government was this intrusive. So much so, that later on, I caused a hearing to be held on the use of polygraphs and personality testing, which were discriminatory by the user. All you had to be would be 21 years old, a high school graduate, and two weeks training at Ft. Gordon to be a polygraph examiner. Now, this young boy could determine your career, whether you get a job, if he didn't like you because you might have been Jewish, or black, or Catholic, or Italian, whatever it may be, he had that power to control that interview, through the knowledge that he acquired.

That was 40 years ago. Now, look at what we're going through today, where every single individual is now subject to all the intrusions that are going on in life today. And who controls all of this? That is the great mystery that I think we must examine. Is it controlled at all? Or is it out of hand? Is it, in fact, threatening the very tenets of our democracy?

When I was down in Congress, I can't really say that there was anyone down there that didn't deeply believe in our country. We were just coming off the war, many were in World War II, and to be shot at makes you believe that there's some purpose to put your life on the line. I think, for many of the men of that age, who went down to Congress with me, we *believed* that! We *did not* believe that we went down there, to serve a Mr. Hoover, at the fear of losing our career.

Is there anyone around now? We don't know who's around now; all we know, unless the information comes under control, unless Congress starts setting up some limitations, unless the responsibility of justice is returned to the Federal benches, I believe that there are continuing problems.

The Warren Commission

I set an example in my own career, two examples: One was, [Louisiana Sen.] Hale Boggs, who was Majority Leader, a dear friend of mine; he was a member of the Warren Commission. There were only seven people on the Warren Commission: He represented the House, along with Gerry Ford, from the House of Representatives. He came to the conclusion that the Warren Commission

should be reopened, and that the information that they gathered about the killing of President Kennedy was insufficient and tarnished, and wanted to reopen the case.

There's a lot of history on this, on the various people involved in this, but Hoover was determined to destroy Hale Boggs, and in fact, in my opinion, he *did*! As you may or may not know, after [Hoover's] doing all sorts of terrible things to him and his family, Boggs was making a speech in Alaska and his plane mysteriously blew up. And to this day, nobody's ever found the remains of Boggs or the other occupants of that plane.

In my case, by *refusing* to prostitute my committee, they came after me with a series of lying stories, about a body in the basement in my home, and that I had to ask the Mafia to remove a body in my basement. It was the most ridiculous thing—it was a joke in my hometown! But it played in Peoria, when *Life* magazine started writing these stories.

When it appeared that I would survive the election, and in fact *did* survive the election, the number three man in the FBI got ahold of my lawyer, and said Mr. Hoover wanted me out of the Congress in seven days, or they would write another story *about my family*, my family, and that the body in the basement died in my bed, sleeping with my wife. They were going to write another story. And this was in my home, where I have four daughters, my mother and my mother-in-law would live with us, and it was *ridiculous*, and yet, they were about to write another story.

It was at that point, that I went a little crazy, and took on Mr. Hoover, and started making speeches about him, demanding his impeachment, demanding that the President fire him; and I went after him, and I hope, really, I contributed somewhat to his mysterious death, that they said was a heart attack, but which remains one of the great mysteries in America—how Hoover *really* died.

The first man from the Nixon Administration, a man by the name of Egil Krogh, who ran the [Watergate] “plumbers,” he was the first man over at Hoover's house. I asked him, later on, as we became friends—while they had the motive, they had the means, they had the cadre, they had the ability, and they had the men who would do it, who did in fact fear Hoover, and what later would spill the beans, if Nixon wanted him to resign over what later became Watergate. I asked him, did they really kill Hoover? And he jumped up and said, “Hoover killed himself,” ran out and never spoke to me again.

When one of the men, Anthony Summers, was writing a book about the death of Hoover, [he reported that] there was never an autopsy, nobody ever knew how he

really died. He was laid out in the Rotunda for four hours. Everybody marched around him to make sure he was dead, and didn't get up again, though there was some doubt whether he would or would not, because of his power. But Anthony Summers asked Krogh about his statement to me. Krogh said, "Well, I remember talking to Neil," but he said, "I never remember discussing Hoover's death." So that remains one of the great mysteries, and maybe one of these days when the files are opened, 60 years from now, we'll really find out how this monster really died.

So, these are some of things that are troublesome, and coming up to date, the fact of the matter is that one man, with his information, could control the members of the Judiciary Committee, threatening to indict Chairman Emanuel Seller's brother, if they didn't oppose my bill to create a permanent committee to preserve privacy, then he would make sure that Seller's brother would be indicted. Now, this is was the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee! The man who delivered the Civil Rights Bill; this was giant in the Congress! And yet, he was frightened by the threat of Hoover.

I was different. Not that I was not frightened, I was *enraged*, that I, a sitting member of the Congress, could be subject to the kind of thing that Hoover and several of his elite troops were going to subject my wife and me to. I made a speech every single day, and finally, he said, what was I mad at him for? And took back some of the stuff that they had written. But then, Nixon got in, they controlled the Justice Department, and the first thing that the whole Nixon crowd did was, start sending Democrats to jail.

So, does it have anything to do with today? Yes. It has to do with today, because of the information systems that Snowden has disclosed, and of which we are all aware of, makes us all vulnerable, *unless* steps are taken to protect freedom, democracy, democratic institutions, and our privacy. Or else, what is the use of a government that is turning its back, and enlarging this threat each day, under some new excuse? Whether it's drugs, whether it's the Mafia, terrorism, whatever all of these threats are, the career police will manage it. That does not mean that every single citizen should be under a presumption of some kind of guilt, or has something to hide from his own government.

You know, I recently recalled the words of W.H. Auden, in his book *Being There*. He mentions the change in ages, when Winter sets in to one age, and a new age begins. I think we are at that stage. And I'm

happy to think about one of the lines in the book, that "the lantern of the prophet has gone out" as Winter sets in to our civilization. And I'm happy that you're all there today, and to know that the lantern of the prophet, the economic prophet Lyndon LaRouche, that his lantern still shines brightly. And I think that that's a very hopeful sign, that people can build on that kind of faith, and that kind of trust. And I believe that if we do that, we will be more successful in not allowing the Winter of the American Age to come to pass and set in. Because we do not know what the new age will bring us.

So, Helga and Lyndon, Ramsey, and all of you in attendance, I applaud you. You give hope that our future will be a better one, rather than one that we should fear. And I thank you for your invitation and the invitation to join with you. I wish you all well. Thank you.

Richard Black

Syria: Illegal U.S. Regime-Change Policy

Senator Black represents the 13th Senate District in Virginia. He sent the following prepared remarks to the conference, under the title "Syria, a Case Study of How the U.S. Has Engaged in a Policy of Regime Change in Violation of the U.S. Constitution and International Law." Black was wounded during fierce fighting with the 1st Marine Regiment in Vietnam, where he also flew 269 combat missions as a helicopter pilot, and crash landed after his helicopter was damaged by enemy machine-gun fire.



State Senator Richard Black

Over the past several years, I have become deeply concerned about the destructive course of our foreign policy in the Middle East and Northern Africa. We



White House/Pete Souza

President Obama meets with then-Ambassador to Syria Richard Ford, Aug. 1, 2011. Ford was well qualified to carry out the Obama Administration's policy of working with radical Islamists against the al-Assad government.

have aligned ourselves with the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda jihadists against governments that afforded their population the opportunity to practice their respective religions and to live in peace with their fellow citizens.

I have taken a number of initiatives to address this problem: On July 12, 2013 I wrote to Speaker John Boehner and members of the House, urging them to prohibit expenditure of funds to support the revolution in Syria; in October 2013 I publicly urged Egyptian General al-Sisi to run for the office of the Presidency of Egypt to restore stability to that nation; on April 1, 2014 I wrote Syrian President al-Assad, thanking the Syrian Arab Army for its rescue of Christians and Alawite Muslims imprisoned along the Qalamoun Mountain Range; on June 10, 2014 I wrote Syrian President al-Assad congratulating him on his reelection; and on May 18, 2014 I wrote President Barack Obama urging him to block the release of MANPADS anti-aircraft missiles to Syrian insurgents.

The evidence is overwhelming that the so-called Arab Spring was deliberately designed to violate the national sovereignty of several stable, secular Arab countries, none of which had been involved in 9-11. Arab Spring was intended to achieve regime change, turning those countries over to the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda affiliates. Evidence suggests that the

overthrow of Qaddafi in Libya was conceived and executed as part of a larger scheme devised to overthrow President Assad of Syria, without regard to the U.S. Constitution or international law.

I will focus on the case of Syria and the role of Ambassador Robert S. Ford to show how the overthrow of Qaddafi was conceived as an integral component of the attempt to overthrow Assad.

Ambassador Ford in Syria

Robert S. Ford was nominated by Obama to be U.S. Ambassador to Syria in late 2010. A dozen Republican Senators opposed his nomination, because the U.S. had not had an Ambassador in Syria since 2005.¹ The Obama Administration bypassed Congress, and Ford was given a recess appointment, making him the Syrian Ambassador. Ford arrived in Damascus in January 2011, just one month before the first demonstrations against Qaddafi began, on Feb. 17, 2011, in Benghazi, Libya. The first demonstrations in Syria occurred shortly afterward, on March 18, 2011, in the city of Hama, Syria.

1. *Foreign Policy*, "Republican Senators threaten to block Ford nomination," May 18, 2010, http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/05/18/republican_senators_threaten_to_block_ford_nomination

Plans to overthrow President Assad had been under development since 2005. On April 17, 2011, one month after the first demonstration in Syria, WikiLeaks released secret diplomatic cables revealing that the U.S. State Department had been funding opponents of Syrian President Bashar Assad beginning under the Bush Administration in 2005 and continuing under Obama.

The files showed that the U.S. gave \$6.3 million to the Movement for Justice and Development—a London-based Muslim Brotherhood organization—to operate the Barada TV satellite channel broadcasting anti-government propaganda into Syria. The Movement for Justice and Development, which openly advocated Assad's removal from office, was banned in Syria. Another \$6 million went to other initiatives, including the Middle East Partnership Initiative and the Civil Society Strengthening Initiative.²

An April 2009 diplomatic cable from the U.S. mission in Damascus read: "some programs may be perceived, were they made public, as an attempt to undermine the Assad regime. The Syrian Arab Republic government would undoubtedly view any U.S. funds going to illegal political groups as tantamount to supporting regime change."³

Ford was uniquely qualified to carry out the Obama Administration policy of working with the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda against the government of Syria based on his prior experience in Iraq where he reportedly helped form Kurdish and Shi'ite death squads.⁴

From 2004 to 2006, Ford served in Iraq. In January 2004 he was the U.S. representative to the U.S. occupied Shi'ite city of Najaf in Iraq. A few months later he was appointed as the "number two man" (Minister Counsellor for Political Affairs) at the U.S. embassy in Baghdad under John Negroponte.⁵

In 2005 the Pentagon confirmed a story leaked to Newsweek that it was "considering forming hit squads of Kurdish and Shia fighters to target leaders of the Iraqi insurgency in a strategic shift borrowed from the American struggle against left-wing guerrillas in Central America 20 years ago."⁶

The person Negroponte assigned to a new counter-insurgency unit in Iraq, the Special Police Commandos, under the Iraqi interior Ministry was Ret. Colonel James Steel, who had previously been employed as an advisor to crush an insurgency in El Salvador.⁷

After this two-year stint in Iraq, Ford was appointed Ambassador to Algeria in 2006 and then in 2008 returned to Baghdad as Deputy Chief of Mission, at which point he undoubtedly became involved in the implementation of the Syrian destabilization project.

Upon his arrival in Syria in January 2011, Ford began publicly supporting forces which the U.S. and its British and French allies had been organizing since at least 2005. Ford's first provocative action was to visit the city of Hama, Syria, on July 8, 2011 without the permission of the Syrian government, where he promised rioters the support of the U.S. government.⁸ Both he and the French Ambassador violated diplomatic protocols, slipping through Syrian security to reach the demonstrators in order to demonstrate public support for them.

Who were the people Ambassador Ford supported and labeled "moderates"? In several Syrian cities, and especially in Hama, extremists supported by Ford marked every Christian house, then unleashed violent mobs who forced Christians to flee those homes; they carried out ethnic cleansing against Alawite Muslims. With methods reminiscent of the Nazis' anti-Jewish pogroms on *Kristallnacht*, gangs rampaged through Hama, yelling: "Christians to Beirut; Alawites to the Grave." Seventy-thousand Christians abandoned their homes and businesses, fleeing to Damascus with only the shirts on their backs. The vicious mobs were described as "moderates" in Ambassador Ford's decep-

dovsky, Aug. 16, 2011, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-pentagon-s-salvador-option-the-deployment-of-death-squads-in-iraq-and-syria/26043>

6. *Newsweek*, "The Salvador Option," by Michael Hirsh and John Barry, Jan. 8, 2005, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/6802629/site/newsweek/>

7. *Nexus*, "A History of America's Death Squads," by Prof. Michel Chossudovsky, February-March 2013, www.nexusmagazine.com

8. "Low-key U.S. diplomat transforms Syria policy," by Mary Beth Sheridan, *Washington Post*, July 12, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/low-key-us-diplomat-transforms-syria-policy/2011/07/12/gIQA5kSBI_story.html

2. *Washington Post*, "U.S. secretly backed Syrian opposition groups, cables released by Wikileaks show," by Craig Whitlock, April 17, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/pb/world/us-secretly-backed-syrian-opposition-groups-cables-released-by-wikileaks-show/2011/04/14/AF1p9hWD_story.html

3. CBC News, "U.S. admits funding Syrian opposition," April 18, 2011, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/u-s-admits-funding-syrian-opposition-1.987112>

4. Global Research, "Who is Ambassador Robert Stephen Ford? The Architect of U.S. Sponsored Terrorism in Syria," by Prof. Michel Chossudovsky, June 6, 2014, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/who-is-ambassador-robert-stephen-ford-the-architect-of-us-sponsored-terrorism-in-syria/5385973>

5. Global Research, "The Pentagon's 'Salvador Option': The Deployment of Death Squads in Iraq and Syria," by Prof. Michel Chossu-



Creative Commons/Freedomhouse 2

Victims of the massacre in Houla, Syria, May 25, 2012. The fratricide in Syria has been aggravated by U.S. support for al-Qaeda-linked forces.

tive diplomatic communiqués.^{9, 10} In August, Ford left Damascus once again to visit the southern village of Jassem, where he met with more opposition activists.¹¹

In October, Ford met with Hassan Abdul-Azim, who heads the outlawed Arab Socialist Democratic Union Party, and was attacked with eggs and tomatoes by government supporters who now understood his motives.¹² On Oct. 24, 2011, Ford was recalled from Syria due to what the U.S. State Department described as “credible threats” to his safety. According to American officials, Ford had been attacked by an armed pro-government mob, and Syrian state television had begun running reports blaming him for the formation of death

squads similar to those in Iraq.¹³ He returned to Damascus in December 2011, but in February 2012, as the security situation in Syria sharply deteriorated, the American Embassy was closed.

He later became the chief American envoy to the Syrian opposition,¹⁴ a position he only recently gave up in March 2014. On June 10 Ford, once again called for regime change by arming the “right” opposition, and he has called for arming the rebels with advanced man-portable anti-aircraft missiles capable of downing Syrian MIGs—or American passenger jets.¹⁵

Ford became so identified with the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda that when John Kerry recommended that he become the U.S. Ambassador to Egypt on Aug. 4, 2013, the Egyptian government vehemently rejected the suggestion. Thirty million Egyptians had risen up to oust the President Mohamed Morsi, who was closely linked to the Muslim Brotherhood. Egyptians were not going to accept an ambassador known for his role in destabilizing nations.^{16, 17}

9. *Spectator*, “Die Slowly Christian Dog,” Oct. 27, 2012, <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/8708121/die-slowly-christian-dog/>

10. *New York Times*, “The World’s Next Genocide,” Nov. 15, 2012 by Simon Adams, https://www.google.com/webhp?hl=en&search=search&gws_rd=ssl#hl=en&q=The+World%E2%80%99s+Next+Genocide%2C+Nove+mb+er+15%2C+2012+by+Simon+Adams+

11. *Daily Mail*, “U.S. Ambassador egged by angry mob in Syria who tried to storm building in Damascus,” by Leon Watson, Oct. 24, 2011 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-article-2043344/U-S-Ambassador-Robert-Ford-egged-angry-mob-Syria-tried-storm-building-Damascus.html?openGraphAuthor=%2Fhome%2Fsearch.html%3Fs%3D%26authornamef%3DLeon%2BWatson>

12. *Ibid.*

13. CNN, “U.S. pulls envoy from Syria over safety concerns,” Oct. 24, 2011, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/10/24/world/meast/syria-us-ambassador/index.html>

14. *New York Times*, “Former Envoy to Syria Said to Be Choice for Cairo Post,” by Michael R. Gordon, Aug. 4, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/05/world/middleeast/kerry-picks-former-syria-envoy-as-ambassador-to-egypt.html?_r=0

15. *New York Times*, “Arm Syria’s Opposition,” by Robert S. Ford, June 10, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/11/opinion/ford-arm-syrias-opposition.html>

16. *New York Times*, “Former envoy to Syria said to be choice for Cairo post,” by Michael R. Gordon, Aug. 4, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/08/05/world/middleeast/kerry-picks-former-syria-envoy-as-ambassador-to-egypt.html?_r=0

17. *Washington Post*, “Robert Ford almost ambassador for Egypt,” by Al Kamen, Feb. 4, 2014 http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/an-almost-ambassador-for-egypt/2014/02/04/fee18060-8ddf-11e3-95dd-36ff657a4dae_story.html

Operations in Libya

Now let's look at how developments in Libya mesh with Ford's activity in support of the opposition in Syria:

The United States had normalized relations with Libya years earlier, and its government was helping the west in many ways. Nonetheless, the administration orchestrated a coordinated attack on this neutral, non-beligerent nation, ostensibly because they were too tough in dealing with an uprising in Benghazi. In fact, its purpose was to liberate Libya's large arsenal of sophisticated weapons.

In Libya, the Obama Administration worked closely with the al-Qaeda-affiliated Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG), led by Abdel Hakim Belhadj. With Washington's approval, Qatar and the UAE supplied the LIFG with weapons, in violation of the UN arms embargo. This allowed Belhadj to emerge as the military commander of the Tripoli Military Council in August 2011, once Western air power reduced Libya to ruins.

Soon after taking charge, Belhadj and the head of the Libyan Transitional National Council, Mustafa Abdul Jalil, traveled to Qatar to meet with NATO officials and financiers of the Libyan Revolution.¹⁸ In October 2011, Burhane Ghalioun, the Muslim Brotherhood-influenced head of the Syrian National Council, and Jalil signed an agreement in which Libya agreed to assist in the overthrow of the Syrian government of Assad.¹⁹ Soon thereafter, in November 2011, Belhadj traveled to Turkey and met with the Syrian Free Army.²⁰

On Dec. 11, 2011, an agreement was reached at a meeting in Tripoli involving Jalil; Youssef Qaradhaoui; Rached Ghannouchi, head of the Tunisian Muslim Brotherhood party, Ennahda; Hamad Jabber bin Jassim al Thani, the Foreign and Prime Minister of Qatar; the number two of the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria; and Belhadj. The group would arm and send fighters from Libya and Tunisia into Syria.²¹

In November 2011, six hundred al-Qaeda-linked LIFG fighters led by Mahdi al-Harati, the deputy commander of the Tripoli Military Council under Belhadj, went to Syria to fight Assad.²²

Throughout 2012, according to the UN, weapons were shipped by boat from Benghazi, Libya into Turkey, for delivery to jihadists in Syria. Weapons were also shipped by plane from Libya to Qatar and then to Turkey and Jordan for delivery to jihadists in Syria.^{23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29} These shipments violated the UN arms embargo.³⁰

To facilitate shipping captured Libyan weapons to the Syrian rebels, NATO assigned control of the Benghazi airport to Turkey during and after the overthrow of Qaddafi.³¹

While at the State Department, Ford was part of a small team which oversaw the recruitment and training of terrorist brigades to be deployed to Syria. This team included Frederic C. Hof, who served as Washington's "Special Coordinator on Syria," and Derek Chollet,

com/2013/03/31/qaradhaoui-et-ghannouchi-associes-a-lenrolement-des-djihadistes-tunisiens-en-syrie/

22. *Foreign Policy*, "The Syrian Rebel's Libyan Weapon," by Mary Fitzgerald, Aug. 9, 2012, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/08/09/the_syrian_rebels_libyan_weapon?page=ful

23. *New York Times*, Dec. 5, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/06/world/africa/weapons-sent-to-libyan-rebels-with-us-approval-fell-into-islamist-hands.html?pagewanted=all>

24. *Wall Street Journal*, "Tiny Kingdom's Huge Role in Libya Draws Concern," Oct. 17, 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052970204002304576627000922764650>

25. *The Independent*, "America's secret plan to arm Libya's rebels," by Robert Fisk, March 7, 2011, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/americas-secret-plan-to-arm-libyas-rebels-2234227.html>

26. *New York Times*, March 24, 2013 "Arms Airlift to Syria Rebels Expands, with Aid from CIA" <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/25/world/middleeast/arms-airlift-to-syrian-rebels-expands-with-cia-aid.html?pagewanted=all>

27. Reuters, "Adventures of a Libyan Weapons Dealer in Syria," June 18, 2013, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/06/18/us-libya-syria-idUSBRE95H0WC20130618>

28. *New York Times*, "In Turnabout, Syria Rebels Get Libyan Weapons," June 22, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/22/world/africa/in-a-turnabout-syria-rebels-get-libyan-weapons.html?pagewanted=all>

29. *London Review of Books*, "The Red Line and the Rat Line," by Seymour Hersh, <http://www.lrb.co.uk/v36/n08/seymour-m-hersh/the-red-line-and-the-rat-line>

30. Final report of the Panel of Experts established pursuant to resolution 1973 (2011) concerning Libya, Feb. 15, 2014 http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2014/106

31. *Today's Zaman*, March 29, 2011, "Turkey Will Run Benghazi Airport," <http://www.sundayszaman.com/newsDetail.action?jsessionid=OLRsBj1mF+EvaGkBUAWoMQHy?newsId=239481&columnistId=0>

18. Associated Press, "Libya Rebel Commander Plays Down Islamist Past," Sept. 2, 2011, <http://news.yahoo.com/libya-rebel-commander-plays-down-islamist-past-122316090.html>

19. "Qaradhaoui et Ghannouchi associés a l'enrolement des djihadistes tunisiens en Syrie," March 28, 2013, <http://tunisitri.wordpress.com/2013/03/31/qaradhaoui-et-ghannouchi-associes-a-lenrolement-des-djihadistes-tunisiens-en-syrie/>

20. *Telegraph*, "Leading Libyan Islamist met Free Syrian Army opposition group," by Ruth Sherlock, Nov. 27, 2011, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/libya/8919057/Leading-Libyan-Islamist-met-Free-Syrian-Army-opposition-group.html>

21. "Qaradhaoui et Ghannouchi associés a l'enrolement des djihadistes tunisiens en Syrie," March 28, 2013, <http://tunisitri.wordpress.com/2013/03/31/qaradhaoui-et-ghannouchi-associes-a-lenrolement-des-djihadistes-tunisiens-en-syrie/>

head of the National Security Council's Syria Task Force. This team operated under the leadership of Jeffrey Feltman, former Assistant Secretary of State of Near Eastern Affairs, who is now UN Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs.³²

Feltman was reportedly in contact with Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Saud al-Faisal and Qatari Foreign Minister Sheikh Hamad bin Jassim al-Thani. He was also in charge of a Doha, Qatar-based office for "special security coordination" pertaining to Syria. Prince Bandar bin Sultan of Saudi Arabia was part of this group.³³

Unconstitutional War

As demonstrated here, the Obama Administration has been involved in plotting and carrying out aggressive war in violation of the U.S. Constitution and in violation of international law. It has allied itself with and given material assistance to the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda, which have committed war crimes against Christians and other religious minorities.

32. Global Research, "The Pentagon's 'Salvador Option': The Deployment of Death Squads in Iraq and Syria," by Prof. Michel Chossudovsky, Aug. 16, 2011, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-pentagon-s-salvador-option-the-deployment-of-death-squads-in-iraq-and-syria/26043>

33. Ibid.

Yet despite a decade-long process of subversion, the Syrian people rallied powerfully for President Assad during recent elections. Syrian voters dealt a stinging rebuke to the violent jihadists, demonstrating their revulsion at beheadings, public executions, cannibalism, and crucifixions that came to characterize the rebellion. Public support for the revolution has dissipated.

The *New York Times* reported that Assad's landslide re-election "surprised no one," and that "the huge margin of victory was entirely believable." The 89% vote margin and the 73% turnout were equally stunning.³⁴

The Associated Press reported strong backing, not just from Christians and Alawites, but from Sunni Muslims too. Without them, President Assad could never have won such a wide margin of victory. Sunnis staffed many of the polling places, and at one mosque, 10,000 Sunni women prayed for Assad's reelection. It is now clear that foreign plots to divide Syrians along sectarian lines have failed, and the people remain united.³⁵

Conclusion: American foreign policy is chaotic because it lacks a central, organizing intellect. This leaves us to the whims of lobbyists for Mideast nations, competing for oil, power, and religious supremacy. The Western foreign policy intelligentsia must develop a clearer notion of the War on Terror and what it entails. First, you cannot have a "War against Terror," any more than you can have a "War Against Hand Grenades." Our struggle is against al-Qaeda—the organization that murdered 3,000 Americans on 9-11. Al-Qaeda affiliates and those ascribing to the goal of Global Jihad are a mortal threat. Those who aid Global Jihad are our mortal enemies; those who reject it should be embraced, for, as the saying goes: "The enemy of my enemy is my friend."

This week, ISIL, Global Jihadists controlling much of Syria and Iraq, have beheaded 1,700 innocent people in Mosul, Iraq. Their armed columns are driving toward Iraq's capital, Baghdad. I have warned of arming and training jihadists, and now the chickens have come home to roost. By undermining stable Arab states, and by arming and financing al-Qaeda-linked jihadists, we have unleashed an unprecedented wave of savagery that threatens to consume the civilized world. We must find a new direction, and do so quickly.

34. *New York Times*, "Victory in Syrian Election Is Show of Assad's Control," June 4, 2014, <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/05/world/middleeast/former-syria-ambassador-ford-criticizes-us.html>

35. AP, "Syria's Election Shows Depth of Support for Assad," June 4, 2014, <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/syrias-election-shows-depth-support-assad>

EIR Special Report

Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two

**NEW, UPDATED
EDITION**

A new, updated edition of the EIR Special Report, "Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two" is now available from larouchepub.com. The expanded report is an urgent intervention into the ongoing strategic crisis brought on by the British/Saudi/Obama alliance behind the overthrow of Qaddafi, and the subsequent explosion of jihadist uprisings throughout Africa and the Arab world.



EIR Special Report

**Obama's War on America:
9/11 Two**

February 2013

Price **\$100** (Paperback or PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax)
 Order from **EIR News Service** 1-800-278-3135
 Or online: **www.larouchepub.com**

LaRouche: Hillary Clinton's Benghazi Revelations Mean Obama Must Be Impeached Immediately!

June 24—Lyndon LaRouche today demanded that the U.S. House of Representatives launch immediate impeachment proceedings against President Barack Obama, based on then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's account of the President's lying cover-up of the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya on Sept. 11, 2012, in which U.S. Amb. Christopher Stevens and three other American officials were murdered in cold blood by the al-Qaeda-affiliated Ansar al-Sharia terrorist organization.

The Clinton revelations are contained in the just-released book *Blood Feud* by Edward Klein. According to the Klein account, provided by a close Hillary Clinton aide and attorney, at 10 p.m. on the night of Sept. 11, 2012, after Clinton had received detailed accounts of the terror attack in Benghazi, and knew that the al-Qaeda affiliated Ansar al-Sharia had launched a heavily-armed premeditated assault, she received a personal telephone call from President Obama, ordering her to release a false statement claiming that the attack had been a spontaneous demonstration protesting a video that had slandered the Prophet Mohammed.

After Clinton protested to the President that there was clear intelligence that the attack was an al-Qaeda revenge attack, on the anniversary of the original 9/11 attacks, Obama persisted and demanded that Secretary Clinton immediately issue Obama's false statement to the American people and the world. Both Secretary Clinton and former President Bill Clinton concluded that President Obama, fearing that his re-election would be jeopardized by letting out the truth about the Benghazi attack, ordered the fake story to be issued. At 10:30 p.m., Secretary Clinton, on Pres-

ident Obama's orders, issued the false account.

EIR has confirmed from two highly qualified sources, including one with first-hand knowledge of the events of Sept. 11, 2012, that the Klein account of the telephone call between the President and Secretary Clinton is accurate.


Based on this solid corroboration of the Clinton account, Lyndon LaRouche today demanded that President Obama be immediately impeached for lying to the American people and covering up one of the most heinous crimes against American officials since the original 9/11 attacks. "Obama lied to cover up the murders of four American officials and this makes him an accomplice after the fact to those murders," LaRouche declared. "The President lied. He is unfit to be President and he must be immediately impeached."

The Clinton revelations put President Obama personally in the middle of the lies and cover-up. There is no longer any doubt about the President's complicity in the cover-up. "Hillary Clinton has confirmed that the President was lying. The President can no longer deny his own personal role in the lying to the American people," LaRouche declared. "Now, Congress must act. The House Select Committee on Benghazi has no choice but to immediately initiate impeachment proceedings against President Obama. This is no time for partisan opportunism. Unless President Obama is immediately subject to impeachment articles, the very foundations of our Constitutional Republic will be shattered. President Obama has nowhere to hide any longer. Every patriotic American must stand up and hold Congress accountable for the President's immediate impeachment."

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- ☐ **\$360** for one year
☐ **\$180** for six months
☐ **\$120** for four months
☐ **\$90** for three months
☐ **\$60** for two months
- ☐ Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my ☐ MasterCard ☐ Visa
☐ Discover ☐ Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____