

PROSPECTS FOR 2012

World War III, or the Onset Of the Age of Reason?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Dec. 16—Christine Lagarde, the head of the IMF, recently painted a grim picture of the world economy, comparing it to the Great Depression on the eve of the Second World War. All the economic data are worse than expected, she said; growth is lower, the deficits are bigger, the national debts are higher. And what is her proposed solution to this dire situation? More of the same incompetent policies that caused this crisis in the first place, as long as we “act together.”

What is urgently needed instead is an uncompromising analysis of the flawed assumptions of the political and economic elites of the trans-Atlantic region, which have made them so blind to the consequences of their policies, that the world today has once again reached a point where a “crash of the world economy” threatens, as well as a new world war that would be a *thermonuclear* world war this time.

The fact is that every member of the governments in Europe and the United States knows full well that we are heading into such a war at breakneck speed, as the logical consequence of the policies of Obama, NATO, and the EU, continuing the policies of George W. Bush and Tony Blair, today against Russia and China. Both the missile-defense system that is currently being built by NATO in Eastern Europe, and oriented against Russia, and the current gigantic military buildup in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and the Eastern Mediterranean, can be interpreted only as preparations for world war. With four aircraft carriers and a large number



IMF managing director Christine Lagarde says we're in danger of a Great Depression, but her only recommendation is more of the same policies that have led to disaster.

of destroyers and frigates deployed, ostensibly because of the situations in Syria and Iran, all the weapon systems have actually been put in place that are necessary for a large war.

Silence Reigns

And why is no one in these governments saying anything about the imminent danger, which is so much greater than that in 2003 before the Iraq War, when then-Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and former President Jacques Chirac refused to allow Germany and France to participate in that war? Why is it that so far only Danish Foreign Minister Villy Søvndal has pub-



NATO Media Library

Russian Chief of the General Staff Nikolai Makarov warned of nuclear war as result of the NATO anti-missile deployments near Russia's borders. Here he is shown at a meeting with NATO officials in 2010.

licly declared that Denmark will absolutely not participate in any way in a war against Syria or Iran?

Why does the German government not respond to the statement by the Russian Chief of the General Staff, Gen. Nikolai Makarov, that there could be a regional war in Central Europe in which nuclear weapons could be used¹—and especially, what the German government intends to do to prevent such a war?

The head of Russia's National Security Council, Nikolai Patrushev, wrote on Dec. 14 in the newspaper *Argumenti i Fakti*, that the American and NATO missile-defense systems in Europe are directed, from Moscow's point of view, against Russia and China: "Very convincing calculations by our experts make it clear that the American arguments about a threat from Iran or North Korea are inventions. At the same time, it is obvious that the American ABM systems are directed against Russia and China. But more than that: With the planned development of the system, ship-based anti-

1. In a speech on Nov. 17, citing NATO's eastward expansion, Makarov said, "The possibility of local armed conflicts along nearly the whole border has increased dramatically. In certain conditions, I do not rule out local and regional armed conflicts developing into a large-scale war, including using nuclear weapons"—ed.

missile systems will be in close proximity to the Russian coastline, in addition to the deployment of ABM radar systems near our borders."

Or, what does the German federal government say about the statement of a professor of the Chinese National Defense University, that China should not hesitate to protect Iran, even if it means launching World War III?

The Bankrupt Euro

Financial Times columnist Wolfgang Münchau has now come to the conclusion that the euro is a hopeless case, and he writes in *Der Spiegel* that it is impossible to rescue the euro, because the internal dynamic of the crisis is now so powerful that a little spark would suffice, "and the euro area would explode." But why were the governments of Europe so blind as not to have foreseen this when, for example, this author warned, long before the introduction of the euro, that this flawed design could not work? Since it was introduced, I have also written dozens of articles, almost non-stop, about how to get out of this dead end, so the information was definitely there, for anyone with economic competence to anticipate what would happen.

And why are the governments of the trans-Atlantic region so totally irresponsible as to have thrown one "bailout package" after another at this hopelessly bankrupt "common currency," destroying the European community and splitting it into hostile camps? They must certainly know that this will quickly lead to hyperinflation like that in Germany in 1923, only this time not in just one country, but proceeding from Europe and the United States to the entire world. The government of the Weimar Republic had the excuse for its money printing, that this policy was forced on it by the Versailles Treaty; but what excuse is there when the trans-Atlantic governments today repeat the same mistake of hyperinflation, the most brutal form of looting of the population?

What is the mentality of these governments and parliamentarians who support this policy and have learned nothing from the mistakes of the past, who have access to all the information about the bankruptcy of the financial system and the threat of war, and yet continue a policy that can lead to the extinction of humanity? And why do these governments not introduce a two-tier banking system, which, surprisingly, Social Democratic Party head Sigmar Gabriel and Finance Minister Wolfgang Schäuble recently suddenly endorsed? Whose dictates are they submitting themselves to this time?

The Euro Would Never Have Worked

The fact is, the design flaws of the euro could never be solved, for the simple reason that there cannot be a single European state. Europe is not a nation, not in any way, shape, or form. What do Germans know about France, not to mention Slovenia or Estonia? There is no common political venue for discourse, no common cultural identity. And the explanation that the EU Commission had not realized that what was then the Greek government had falsified its financial statements to allow entry into the Eurozone, has now been supplied with the argument that the EU bureaucrats did not speak Greek well enough to be able to read the Greek newspapers.

Instead of ensuring peace in Europe forever, the euro, since the signing of the EU's Maastricht Treaty in 1992, has taken nations that were living together relatively peacefully, and set them against each other, spurred by the interests of the British Empire and its "Fourth Reich" campaign against Germany, and irresponsible media that have spread caricatures about "lazy Greeks," "ugly Germans," "Italians who can't cope," or the "hedonistic French."

"If the euro fails, then Europe fails," Chancellor Merkel has repeated over and over again, as if such a mantra could finally drum the wisdom of such a statement into the heads of the annoying euro-critics. Exactly the opposite is true: Europe only has a chance if we stop the imperial design of the euro, restore sovereignty over our own currencies and economies, renounce the EU treaties from Maastricht to Lisbon, introduce a two-tier banking system, adopt fixed exchange rates among sovereign governments, and agree on a new credit system for long-term cooperative projects, like a Marshall Plan for Southern Europe and Africa through the expansion of the World Land-Bridge.

And instead of meekly watching as the eastward expansion of NATO and the EU, with their openly aggressive projects, provokes a war with Russia and China, Germany should launch long-term economic cooperation with the Asian countries.

Who asked or authorized EU Commissioner Neelie



Creative Commons

Neelie Kroes, EU Commissioner for Digital Agenda, is driving to destabilize governments that she deems repressive. Who gave her the authority to do that?

Kroes and Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg² to initiate the "No Disconnect" strategy project, by which Internet users in states ruled by authoritarian regimes are supposed to be helped to have free access to the Internet—but on closer inspection, is intended to bring about an "Arab Spring," i.e., regime change, and indeed all over the world, as Kroes said—obviously also in Russia and China? The Internet-savvy zu Guttenberg wants to use his military contacts to promote this project, and it is also supposed to help the intelligence agencies to obtain information on-location, so that the "extent of suppression" can be ascertained. Asked what exactly this project means, Kroes

did not answer, saying that would be far too dangerous, since they do not want to endanger the "activists."

With an EU whose Commissioner for Digital Agenda is so obviously involved in the destabilization of other sovereign states, and this in the context described above of financial collapse and world war danger, primarily against Russia and China, this is another, very urgent reason to leave this alliance—a possibility envisaged by the Lisbon Treaty and explicitly justified under international law anyway.

Germany must make a policy for its citizens, rather than in the interests of the banks and their imperial supranational apparatus. This EU not only has the oft-cited "democracy deficit," but democracy itself and Germany's Basic Law are at the greatest risk.

We therefore call for an immediate referendum on whether to stay with or leave the euro and the EU; on the recovery of sovereignty by means of a new D-mark; and on the question of whether Germany should participate in institutions whose policy amounts to a third world war.

Use the time between Christmas and New Year to think through what is wrong with the axiomatic assumptions of governments and parliamentarians, such that we could have reached this point. And join our mobilization for a real alternative!

2. The former German defense minister who resigned in a scandal in March 2011—ed.