

the magazine. Teams of students volunteered to put it up. The students' enthusiasm was not cooled, even when two of their cars were involved in a bizarre accident, in which a truck hit them at a red light. "LaRouche's ideas are comparable to red-hot metal penetrating the conscience of the world, when he unmask[s] the oligarchical dark forces' methods and policies," Velkov explains. The lead editorial states the *raison d'être* for *Manifest*, in the context of the historical confrontation between republican and oligarchical principles. "*Manifest* will be an instrument in the battle for the truth. For Macedonia . . . for humanity." It further stresses the importance of organizing youth into a patriotic force that understands the real battle going on in the world right now.

The inaugural issue includes:

- A regular column ("The Open Conspiracy") on LaRouche's speech in Rome on July 2, on the Middle East war danger;
- Coverage of a study by Helga Zepp-LaRouche on Friedrich Schiller: "Why Are We Still Barbarians?"
- A feature on "How the IMF Executed Argentina," accompanied by the text of a parliamentary solution by former Italian Prime Minister, Sen. Giulio Andreotti and other Italian Senators, calling for a New Bretton Woods financial reorganization; the feature concludes with an appeal to Macedonia and other countries to act now;
- A dossier, "Macedonia Must Defend Itself Against the Soft Coup d'État," which describes the penetration of the "international community's fifth column," targeting Frckoski, whom it compares to Petronius Arbitr, Nero's *Magister Elegantiarum* who, when the Emperor changed his mind, was forced to commit suicide;
- Short profiles of the main destabilizing tools deployed inside Macedonia: Transparency International, Soros' Open Society Institute Macedonia, the International Crisis Group, the Institute for War and Peace Reporting (IWPR), Transfuse, et al.
- An exclusive investigative report on the origin of the "non-governmental organization" (NGO) concept, as an instrument invented by British colonialism, plus a devastating profile of Frckoski ("The Fascist Who Wanted To Be a Democrat");
- A "Strategic Insight" column by Macedonia government strategic adviser Emilija Geleva, titled "Development Versus Destabilization," which stresses the need for large-scale infrastructural development—the Eurasian Land-Bridge—and a New Bretton Woods;
- A first-hand report from the positions of the Macedonian Army, with exclusive photographs;
- An article on the "anti-globalization" movement as an instrument of the globalizers themselves, with profiles of Teddy Goldsmith and Toni Negri. With a youthful audience in mind, the author writes: "The real fight against globalization can only be based on the fundamentals of human civilization in its positive form: national identity, sovereignty, devel-

opment. . . ."

- A scientific column, "Back to the Moon, Then on to Mars," by Wendel V. Mendel.

Interestingly, the Executive Director of Soros' Open Society Institute, Vladimir Milchin, couldn't wait more than 24 hours before publishing a slanderous attack against *Manifest* in *Utrinski Vensik*, which ended up attacking this writer as a "conspirophile." Milchin presents himself and the other components of the "fifth column" as victims of a government "witch-hunt." In the Macedonian capital of Skopje, the rantings of Soros' man were immediately dismissed as "the bleating of the wolves."

Documentation

LaRouche Featured in New Macedonian Magazine

The main feature in the inaugural issue of the new Macedonian magazine Manifest is an exclusive interview with Lyndon LaRouche. Manifest, which hit the newsstands on Aug. 15, also elaborates the leading issues associated with LaRouche, from the need for New Bretton Woods monetary system and the Eurasian Land-Bridge to his intervention in the Middle East. LaRouche gave the interview from Wiesbaden, Germany on July 25, to Umberto Pascali. Here are excerpts.

Q: In the last few days, we've seen a very sharp collapse in the Wall Street stock market, which confirms what you have been saying for many years. So, this is not a disaster, but indeed it is an opportunity. Can you explain for our readers what is really happening now and, above all, what should happen?

LaRouche: What is happening now is a general breakdown of a system, which has developed internationally over a period of about 35 or more years. This was a change in the United States in particular, and also the United Kingdom, from a production-oriented society to an imperial consumer society—that is, relying more and more on getting, at reduced prices, material from overseas, from cheap labor, rather than producing it ourselves. In this process, what has happened is that we have built up a gigantic financial bubble internationally. This bubble is now disintegrating.

Nothing could be done to save the present monetary and financial system—in its present form. So the only thing that we can do, which is politically feasible at this time, is to compare the success of the Roosevelt recovery and the relative success of the post-war reconstruction up until the middle of the 1960s, with the degeneration which exploded from

1971 on, with the changed Bretton Woods system of today. Therefore, as a practical matter, we have to go back to the period of the Depression of 1929-1933 where, for different, but for somewhat similar reasons, the world had a depression. We are now going into a depression which is far worse—it's already on, and it is far worse than 1929-1933. This depression has been in full effect since the Spring of the year 2000. It has been going on for almost two years already. We're now going into a deeper phase of a worldwide economic depression caused by a monetary-financial system that has failed.

So under those circumstances, the only remedy that will work, that is also politically feasible, is to restore the model of the international monetary-financial system that existed between 1945 and 1958 in Europe, the United States, Japan, and so forth; to restore that kind of system. But we also have to put the entire system through bankruptcy reorganization, because we have hundreds of trillions of dollars of valuation of debt outstanding, but a total world product that is only estimated to be \$40-odd trillion. So you've got hundreds of trillions of dollars of obligations, on the record and off the record, which are now crushing down on a collapsing world physical economy, and obviously, the only thing that you can do is to put the system through financial bankruptcy, in which we will, over the course of time, write off most of that financial debt as worthless debt, and consolidate the remaining amount of debt to an amount that we can manage.

It is just like a bankruptcy reorganization. That is the only solution. And we are at the danger point, where if we do not solve this financial crisis, those forces behind the financial crisis are going to plunge us into a general world war, possibly beginning as soon as the August-October period.

Q: Is there is a direct relation between the status of this financial bubble and the strategic situation?

LaRouche: Absolutely. This is what has been said plainly by the U.S. Defense Secretary, Donald Rumsfeld. He has said, don't worry about the financial crisis, we are going into a new period of war. And people are talking about this war as lasting as long as 100 years. They call it "perpetual war," a long war, a "war against terrorism"—they call it by many names. But this is to change the social and political institutions of the world, with use of military force and terror, as a way of dealing with a financial crisis. In other words, set up a dictatorship, in the same way that Adolf Hitler did in the 1930s, as a way of dealing with a financial crisis.

Q: How is the collapse of this bubble going to affect the Balkans and Macedonia in particular? Is this going to change the attacks against the country's national sovereignty and territorial integrity? Will this affect the potential new war adventure in the Balkan area? And even more: If the "LaRouche recipe"—the New Bretton Woods and the Land-Bridge projects—would become U.S. policy and would be endorsed by a coalition of countries in the world, how fast and how directly



The inaugural edition of the Macedonian magazine Manifest features an interview with Lyndon LaRouche, and articles on various aspects of his strategic analysis and global perspective for economic development. The impact has been explosive.

could this change the situation for the better? Can you explain how this mechanism could work?

LaRouche: Well, it is very simple in a sense. It can change very rapidly, because on the day that we actually make a statement among a number of countries that we're going to do a reorganization of this type, you can immediately put into operation certain mechanisms of economic recovery. Most of the immediate measures which would cause a growth of employment—which, of course, is crucial for any recovery—would be in basic economic infrastructure. Now, therefore, take the case like the Balkans, the area below the Danube, all the way down to the Mediterranean, and the Black Sea, and the Adriatic. This whole area, while it is composed of different states, has a certain integral characteristic—geographic and otherwise. Thus, in this region, large-scale infrastructure development projects, of the type that we proposed in the European Productive Triangle program, that kind of approach could go into effect immediately, if international institutions—that is, governments—came to an agreement with Balkan governments, to share a general development program on developing routes of transportation, power generation and

distribution, and water management, and also use these as development corridors for concentration of industrial development. Under those conditions, we could have an immediate change in direction of the economic situation in the Balkans, and also the political situation.

Q: Your name has recently popped up quite a few times in Macedonia, lately in the form of a bizarre approximation of a slander by some figures who insist that the Macedonian leadership is so bad that they “read LaRouche.” Obviously, after several interviews with you both on TV and in print, your name is quite well known in Macedonia, and people, including young people, want to know more about your ideas and your proposals. The apparent paradox is, that you represent, in economic and philosophical terms, the American System that emerged from a revolution against the British colonial empire, but the official U.S. now is acting in opposition to those original American principles, including in disregarding Macedonia’s rights as a sovereign nation. How can the real America emerge? How can this historic paradox be solved?

LaRouche: Well, it depends on who is President of the United States. It also depends on other things as well. But, the United States government has been at times my friend, and at times it has acted as my enemy. For example, I got along well with some people at various points—not that we agreed, but we had correct relations, we talked to each other, we found points of common agreement, and we proceeded on that. For example, the SDI, and other things I agreed upon with President Reagan, during the period that he and I were cooperating. We didn’t agree on the economic policy, we disagreed on a lot of other things. But we had relations which were proper and decent relations. Now, we also had, to a certain degree, proper and decent relations with President Clinton, and with many political figures in the United States. So the answer is, that I represent a certain tradition in U.S. history which can be traced from Benjamin Franklin, through John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin Roosevelt—that’s called the American Patriotic Tradition. We have also in the United States, an opposite view, which has always been of the opposite view since 1763. So there are two forces in the United States; I represent one, and some of the other fellows in government represent the other, and the other guys do not come out and honestly debate me, they simply rely on spreading slander and misinformation and threats.

So if you know that, that answers the question. The other guys obviously fear me. In the United States, those forces are probably more afraid of me personally than any other individual. So far, even though they have tried to assassinate me a couple of times, and it didn’t come off—officially even, by official agencies—but, on the other side, many people who would like to have me dead, don’t want me to be a martyr. So, they don’t kill me, but they do everything else they can possibly do to embarrass me. . . .

U.S. Utopians Move In On the Philippines

by Michael Billington

Philippines Defense Secretary Gen. Angelo Reyes was welcomed into the parlors of the utopian war faction at the U.S. Defense Department, and the closely allied think-tank, the Heritage Foundation, on Aug. 12-13. The purpose of the visit was spelled out in unambiguous terms by both the U.S. Defense Department and General Reyes: to create a *civilian-to-civilian* line of command between the United States and the Philippines, to override the existing military-to-military institutions which have guided policy thus far.

Under normal circumstances, it may appear that the idea of “civilian control over the military” would be the appropriate policy objective. But these are not normal times, because the war-mongering civilian leadership of the U.S. Defense Department, centered around Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and his assistant, Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, are attempting to initiate global religious warfare under the guise of the “war on terrorism.” The uniformed military, including some members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are in open revolt against the insanity of these “Clash of Civilization” ideologues. Placing U.S. military policy in the hands of the civilian fanatics is a sure bet to unleash the dogs of war in the Philippines, while also serving the broader objective of the utopians: a clash with China.

The New ‘Defense Policy Board’

After a meeting with Rumsfeld at the Pentagon on Aug. 12, General Reyes told the press that a new forum had been established, to be called the Defense Policy Board, between the civilian side of the military establishments of the two nations. The Pentagon’s spokesman, Lt. Cmdr. Jeff Davis, said that for years there had been several dialogue venues “for uniformed military officers, but no forum for defense officials who are civilians.” The details and the composition of the board will be determined at a later time.

The very name of the board is ominous. The world’s press is currently full of reports on the infamous presentation on July 10 by a RAND Corp. analyst, calling for the United States to invade Saudi Arabia and seize the Saudi oil fields. This lunatic proposal was presented to a forum, also called the Defense Policy Board, which is also a civilian board, formed to advise the Defense Department, and headed by Richard