


EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

January 27, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 4 www.larouche.com \$10.00

War Avoidance Efforts Grow, But Brits Push Conflict
No Competent Candidates But LaRouche Slate
The British Roots of Al-Jazeera's Media Empire

**Lyndon LaRouche Presents a
Vision for America's Future**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

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

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

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

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almaro

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: Hussein Askary

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.executiveintelligenceview.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., 709-A 8th St. SE,
Washington, D.C. 20003.
(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach
1611, D-65006 Wiesbaden, Germany;
Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650

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

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudekker

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, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio
de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240,
Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2012 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 Managing Editor

If you are about to tear your hair out, or find yourself gnashing your teeth, at least metaphorically, at the thought of having to choose among the so-far announced Presidential candidates, you are not alone. But there is hope, as you will discover by reading this week's *Feature*: Lyndon LaRouche's State of the Union address, in which he presents, in the absence of any responsible leadership today, either in the White House, or among the Republican candidates who wish to take up residence there, both the grave crises that now confront us, and their solutions. What he makes clear, is that, if we can move aside the obstacles—that means the Obama Presidency, and the threat of world war that he and his British string-pullers are hellbent on starting—there are inspiring and beautiful challenges before us.

Complementing this, is the dialogue among LaRouche and the six Congressional candidates—"No Competent Candidates for President But LaRouche Slate" (*National*), who will be the core leadership, as a "Presidential team," within a larger slate of LaRouche Democrats (and perhaps Republicans as well), running for office this year. There is still time, LaRouche said, that a "none of the above" candidate for President may emerge; in the meantime, we are concerned about policy, and winning the commitment of our fellow citizens to those policies that will rescue the nation. A prime example of what has to be defeated, is found in the exposé, "What Makes Gingrich Run?," which reveals what, and who is behind Newt's sudden "surge" to the top in the Presidential sweepstakes.

Our *International* section cuts a wide swath across the globe, beginning with coverage of the intense war avoidance efforts being carried out by top people in the Pentagon and State Department, particularly over the Strait of Hormuz; and also from Russia, notably that of Foreign Minister Lavrov. Then, Hussein Askary reveals the British/BBC origins of Al-Jazeera's media manipulations in North Africa and Southwest Asia; the breakout in Italy of the LaRouche movement, centered on the taxi drivers strike is next, followed by reports from Argentina and Germany.

Our *Economics* section leads with Helga Zepp-LaRouche's advice to "Listen to the Only Competent Economist: Lyndon LaRouche," followed by an interview with the Finance Minister of Austria.



Cover This Week

An artist's rendering of a nuclear thermal transfer vehicle on the way to Jupiter, refueling in Mars orbit.



NASA/JCS/Pat Rawlings

4 State of the Union: Lyndon LaRouche Presents a Vision for America's Future

In the absence of any qualified Presidential candidate in the United States today, LaRouche decided that the responsibility had fallen to him, to give the annual State of the Union address. His webcast speech was in four parts: 1) the present world crisis, including both the ongoing financial meltdown and the potential for thermonuclear war; 2) the Constitutional implications of the reforms that must be made; 3) the specific, physical-economic reforms required; and 4) "the subject of our new galactic destiny": "We're going to go to Mars!"

International

26 War Avoidance Efforts Grow; But Brits Push Conflict

Despite months of British and Israeli war propaganda about Iran's imminent nuclear weapon breakout, it is no longer credible to claim that Iran is months away from producing a nuclear bomb. So now, London and its Israeli satrapy have shifted their focus to provoking a military incident in the Strait of Hormuz, between the U.S. Navy and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

30 Al-Jazeera Demystified

From its inception in 1996 as the offspring of BBC Arabic Television, Al-Jazeera was one tool among many in the British intelligence and cultural warfare arsenal, as Hussein Askary reports.

35 LaRouche Movement in Italy: Movisol Takes Lead in Anti-Austerity Fight

37 'The Truth Is Indestructible': Italian Taxi Union Leader Puts LaRouche Economics in the Spotlight

40 Crazy London Steps Up Attacks on Argentina

42 Zepp-LaRouche to German President Wulff: Stay in Office, Reorganize the Bankrupt Financial System!

Economics

45 Listen to the Only Competent Economist: Lyndon LaRouche

By Helga Zepp-LaRouche.
Eurozone policymakers are clueless about what to do, she writes. "It would be better, when talking about solutions to the crisis, to listen to the person who correctly forecast that crisis."

47 'No' to Glass-Steagall: Austrian Minister on Shadow Banking Threat

An interview with Austrian Finance Minister Dr. Maria Fekter.

National

49 No Competent Candidates for President But LaRouche Slate

Given the utter incompetence and worse, of all the apparent candidates for President, Lyndon LaRouche told the slate of six LaRouche Congressional candidates that they must fill the political vacuum, by exercising leadership effectively as a Presidential team.

55 What Makes Gingrich Run?

The greatest danger comes from Las Vegas gambling czar Sheldon Adelson, the eighth-richest man in America, who has pledged to back Republican Presidential pre-candidate Newt Gingrich to the tune of \$20 million between December 2011 and the Republican convention.

Interviews

47 Dr. Maria Fekter

Dr. Fekter is the Austrian Finance Minister.

Editorial

57 *Sanctions Are War*

STATE OF THE UNION

Lyndon LaRouche Presents a Vision for America's Future

Lyndon LaRouche gave this address in a webcast aired live on LPAC-TV on Jan. 18. The two-hour program began with a keynote speech by LaRouche and was followed by a dialogue with members of the international audience, including high-level Russian personalities. In his introduction, moderator Matthew Ogden noted that LaRouche had decided that, in the absence of any qualified Presidential figure in the United States, today, "the responsibility has fallen to him, to give this nation's annual State of the Union address."

The program can be viewed at <http://www.larouchepac.com/sotu2012>.

This, I promise you, will be an exciting evening; but not because I'm exciting, but because the nature of the subject-matter is exciting.

Now, I'll take four sections of this, just for your identification. The first, I'm going to deal with identifying and discussing the present great world crisis of 2012, because that's what it is. It's a crisis which is tantamount in effect to two world wars, and probably much worse, potentially, than the two world wars of fame. And this will include the question of the financial crisis which is crucial in this, and we also have in progress, a high degree of potentiality for an early worldwide, thermonuclear war, which might leave very little of civilization alive. That potential now exists. It does not mean it can not be stopped, but it can

only be stopped by those who are qualified and able to stop it.

Because right now, amid all these other things, we're looking down the throat of a clear, early potentiality, for thermonuclear global war, in which the targeting will be primarily against the nations of Asia, or Eurasia, Russia, China, India, and so forth. And of course, these nations can shoot back with thermonuclear weapons, just as the United States is the greatest thermonuclear power on this planet, for this sort of thing. So there won't be much left of the planet if this war is actually allowed to occur. And therefore, this is a very serious business.

I shall also deal with, first of all, the Constitutional implications of what has to be done, in terms of Constitutional measures and reforms which are required as essential elements, if we are to succeed in preventing this war from occurring.

Then, I shall deal with the question of economic reforms, as such, physical-economic reforms, in particular.

And then, I shall take you, at the end of this presentation, to the subject of our new galactic destiny. If we can escape thermonuclear war in the meantime, mankind, and we on Earth in particular, have a galactic destiny before us, something greater, more beautiful, more satisfying, than anything you've ever dreamed of before.



LPAC-TV

Lyndon LaRouche, in his State of the Union address, outlined the dangers facing mankind today, from economic collapse, to thermonuclear war, and galactic challenges. He also put forward the remedies; and said, "We can not put mankind at risk: The way we avoid that, is by adopting common missions for mankind."

The Final Stage of a Breakdown Crisis

Now, what we're in right now, we're in the final stage of a general breakdown crisis of all of the nations in the trans-Atlantic community. We have, at the same time, a crucial kind of crisis developing in China, India, Russia, and so forth. But these nations of the Asian region, the major powers of the Asian region, are in a much better condition economically, than Europe or the Americas, to say nothing of poor Africa, which has continued to die under the influence of British slavery of the Africans in general. So that's the first thing to consider in this. Then we have to consider, actually, the details of what I mean by this thermonuclear war threat.

Now, we have been [in a breakdown crisis] since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and the later assassination of his brother, when his brother Robert was about to be designated by the Democratic Party as the Democratic Party's Presidential candidate. And he was eliminated by an assassination which brought us a series of disasters, including the Nixon Administration, which would not have occurred with-

out the assassination of Robert Kennedy.

This breakdown crisis which we're in now, has been going on for a long time, as I said. We made a downturn when Franklin Roosevelt died, and a British agent, virtually a British puppet, Harry Truman, succeeded to the Presidency. From that point on, the United States lost the drive that it had for a recovery program, a postwar recovery program, which had been in place under Franklin Roosevelt. There was a systemic and intentional destruction of the potential for growth by conversion of the war potential, that is, the economic potential for war-fighting, which we mobilized in the course of World War II. And at the end of that point, we had this vast apparatus. And what Truman did and the British did—and Truman did it under British orders, Churchill's first—what he did was actually shut down the greatest productive potential which had ever existed on this planet, which was the potential controlled, in a sense, by the United States, which was organizing other nations of the world around this

kind of program, which had been the greatest burst of progress for humanity we had ever heard of. But that was pretty much shut down.

We went on, through that. We were saved when Truman was dumped. This man was essentially a Wall Street asset. He came from the Midwest, Missouri, but he essentially was a Wall Street asset; he was very much a Wall Street man, taking orders on everything, first from Winston Churchill, and then from the British government in general.

Then we got Eisenhower—and the country was pretty sick of Truman after the few years he was President. He also got us into a long war, which was cut off. The long war—and all long wars—are bad! The intention is to drag down civilization by protracted wars. When a war must be fought—and I will say that wars of that type can no longer be considered, because the threat to humanity of conducting any of these long wars under modern conditions, would tend to destroy civilization. It might not eliminate the human race, but it would pretty much make a mess of it.



President Kennedy was murdered by the British imperial faction because he refused to be dragged into a long war in Indo-China. Further infuriating the empire was his commitment to great projects such as NAWAPA and the space program. He is shown here at the inauguration of the Frylingpan-Arkansas Reclamation Project in Pueblo, Colo., August 1962.

So, Eisenhower saved us. He did not succeed in reversing all of the effects which the Truman Administration, and Churchill and so forth, had combined to develop. But he did a very good job. For example, he slapped the British in the face, got the Prime Minister of Britain [Anthony Eden] to retire, and prevented a major war involving the Soviet Union in Egypt and so forth, at that time. He also cooperated with Charles de Gaulle, who was then the President of France, who was a great leader, whose program would have made France a great success, but unfortunately, the British, who controlled the opposition to de Gaulle, managed to frustrate him.

This came to a point where, now, Kennedy was President; his brother, Robert was an active part of that Presidency. They dealt with Khrushchov—and the British-created crisis, successfully. We escaped a major war, which would have been a nuclear war, at that stage! *But*, then Kennedy came in as part of this process, and for as long as he remained President, as long as he remained alive, not only did he continue the upturn in the United States, which Eisenhower had helped to foster, together with our dear friend in France, Charles de Gaulle, but he also introduced programs of recovery and expansion, including the space program. And his programs actually sent the United States soaring in the direction of a great recovery! It would not undo the entire damage that had been done by Truman, in shutting down the postwar potential we had then, but it was

a great job.

It was during this period, for example, that President Kennedy organized the Glass-Steagall-type of operation, but in the form of a program for developing our water system, and that was one of the great achievements. The other one was the space program: The space program was *entirely* the creation of John F. Kennedy. And also the development of NAWAPA was his creation. So, again.

JFK: ‘No’ to Long Wars

Now, at this point, the British as usual, and shall we say, the “Liberal people” in

our establishment, decided they wanted to have a *long war* in Indo-China. And President Kennedy said, “No. We’re not going to be involved in a long war in Indo-China.” Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was the chief advisor to Kennedy on preventing this long war; and General Eisenhower, the former President, had also supported that view.

How then, were the British and their lovers in the United States, going to defeat the most successful President of the United States since President Roosevelt himself? How were they going to defeat him, and get him to involve himself and the United States in a *long war* in Asia? They assassinated Kennedy! And then, later, when his brother Robert, who had been his collaborator while President, was going to take up the position of President, and was within days of receiving the nomination of the Democratic Party for the Presidential candidacy, he, too, was assassinated.

As a result of that, the United States was largely destroyed, by the *long war*. Which the British had intended, to run us down, and to take the Franklin Roosevelt out of us, if possible. The killing of Bobby Kennedy gave us Nixon, another disaster! And there were a number of disasters with Nixon. Well, we got through that mess.

Then we got another President [Ronald Reagan], and this President did something good: He supported my proposal for the Strategic Defense Initiative, what

has become, and still is, the founding program for any future of the United States. And it was my invention. I'd gotten people who were formerly in government, formerly leaders of our intelligence service, who voluntarily came over to me, and said, "Okay, you're right. We're going to support you." I had leaders in the military in France, leaders in the military in Germany, in Italy, and other countries, who supported me, and as we came to the eve of what was a great movement by this President, they shut it down, again, and some of the Democrats, again, did that. So they shut this down.

Now, what they did, whether they understood it fully or not, those who shut it down, including members of the Senate of the United States, together with British-controlled clowns such as Mikhail Gorbachov, a British agent! He's still floating around in the world, in Russia, but mostly in England, where he gets his advice from, and where he gets his soul from: from the British, again.

So, what happened was, we got to a point, where because of the defeat of the SDI, which was my baby, by these political forces, they pulled down and induced the Soviet Union to destroy itself.

But they also did something to destroy civilization more generally; and that was demonstrated by the fact that we're now on the verge of not only a series of wars, usually British-organized *long wars!*, like the long wars in Afghanistan by both the Soviet Union and the United States; *long wars* all over the place. A *long war* in Iraq that was totally unnecessary and fraudulent. So we got into long wars.

In the meantime, in the background, the great nations of the planet were building up thermonuclear capabilities, thermonuclear-warfare capabilities. These accumulated. The Soviet Union collapsed out of its folly, under Gorbachov, in particular, probably the greatest enemy Russia ever had, or at least qualified for something like that. This led to more long wars! More long war in Afghanistan. More long war in the Middle East! More long war in other places. We were being destroyed.

The Bailout: Economic Suicide

Now, we've come to the point that what has been done, also—again, the British! From the British Queen



Kenroy Ambris/Commonwealth Secretariat

The British royals and "the whole kit and caboodle of the British establishment" are determined to wipe out the greater part of humanity. Shown: Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip lordling it over their subjects in Trinidad and Tobago, November 2009.

herself. The British Queen thinks there are too many of you. She and her family, and the whole kit and caboodle of the leadership of the British establishment, has said, "We must, knowing now that we have 7 billion people living on this planet, human beings, we're going to reduce that, to 1, or less." And so, we have a policy of reducing the economy and the population of the planet, especially the trans-Atlantic region, reducing it to destruction.

And in the process, a final stage was put in: the bailout process! The bailout process was the economic suicide of the United States, and it was orchestrated from London, and by Wall Street clowns, who were actually London agents, not Americans, really. They may have American citizenship, but they're not American in spirit or morality. And they started the big bailout.

What happens now? They have successfully destroyed the economy of the United States, in a long wave of things which began, essentially, in the later period, but essentially, with the assassination of John F. Kennedy. That set into motion a long war in Indo-China, a destruction of our technological capability, a moral and intellectual destruction of our young people who were then coming out of junior high school and high school ages, who degenerated morally. And then produced children of morally degenerated parents. And the nation became more and more corrupted, self-corrupted.

And we got to the point, that the whole nation—all of Europe, the United States, the trans-Atlantic region generally—has gone into a *deep* economic collapse, such that we now have a situation where we could *not*, without a change from the current policies, we could not guarantee an adequate food supply *beginning this Spring* for the population of the United States, and for the populations of other nations. We've come to that point.

We're now at the point, with this bailout, which bankrupted the United States, in every way imaginable: *No one could ever pay that debt*. It could never be paid! And we're having this worthless debt piled on us, geometrically. It's killing us. And it can be stopped, as I shall get to that later.

But in the meantime, the British Empire, the British Queen, the ones who want to reduce the numbers of you, from 7 billion to 1, or less, has proceeded to organize a war, with the complicity of a British agent, who is currently the President of the United States. He's nothing but a British puppet. He has no mind of his own. He's actually *clinically insane*, but they keep him on as President, despite that.

So what happens? Now we have, in the meantime, Russia has come back to some degree—under the leadership of [Prime Minister Vladimir] Putin in particular, and [President Dmitri] Medvedev, and others—has come back, in programs which would actually successfully, not only rebuild Russia, the whole area of Russia, including the Siberian area, but would open up areas of development throughout the world, because Russia has certain technologies which are specific to them.

In the meantime, China now represents 1.4 billion people. India represents 1.1 billion. They may have been weakened by the international economic problem, but they have still maintained a certain factor of growth and progress. Japan is a vigorous, smaller nation, but a vigorous nation, as we see with the tsunami operation: No nation but Japan could have done as successful a rescue operation as Japan did, and the recovery operation! No one could have! So we have Japan, who wants to coop-



Libya's President Qaddafi was brutally murdered while in captivity—no trial, no due process—on orders from London and Washington. Why? So the empire and its puppet Obama could turn their guns on Syria and Iran, and thence to Russia and China. Shown: Qaddafi's living quarters in Tripoli burned, Aug. 24, 2011.

erate. We have an improvement in the situation in Korea, where North and South Korea are now going to more of a collaboration: This is an excellent development.

But, the British Empire, which is behind all this, which owns their clown called Obama, this psychotic clown, and they don't like that. So, they decided to start *a great, new war!* This time, a *thermonuclear war*, in which the United States would be a key force, under this President, Obama. Other nations—Britain is a somewhat downtrodden thermonuclear power; France is a thermonuclear power; other nations have some thermonuclear capabilities. China has a very important thermonuclear capability. Russia has a very important thermonuclear capability.

The Libya War

Now, what are these guys trying to do? Well, it happened when you had a law that was rammed through the Congress by a leading Senator's collaboration with the President. And that law set into motion and authorized an illegal action called the Libya War. The U.S. involvement in a war in Libya was a violation of the Constitution. It was a criminal act, by the President of the United States, an impeachable act.

What they did, then: You had Britain, France, and the United States, and some other collateral powers, who

were going ahead with this Libya War. And they succeeded in getting to the point, through President Obama, of bringing the country down.

Then you had the President of Libya, who was defeated, had agreed to admit that he'd been defeated by this force of powers—but then, the British were not satisfied, nor was the President of the United States satisfied. Because the problem, as they put it, in France and elsewhere, the problem was, that if he lived, and they held him as a captive, they would have to try him; if they put him through a trial, this would delay going to the next chosen target. So they had him killed, murdered!

Here's a man, who's captive. No evidence has been presented; the trial has not been established. But to avoid a trial of the accused, *they murdered him, Obama-style!* Which Obama's been doing to Americans and others, recently, on his way.

So now we come to the point: What's this all about? Why should this crazy idiot, our President—why should he want to make a war against a rather small nation, a weak nation, Libya? Why should he want to do that? Why should he want, as he did, together with the French government, together with the British government: They connived to assassinate a captive, who had been the head of state of a nation. Why would they do that? Well, they said so. They said, "We can not allow ourselves to be tied up with a long delay, bringing to conclusion, this Libya case. Why? Because, they said, we intend to start wars immediately against two West Asian nations: Syria and Iran.

Now, the purpose of doing this was not to conduct a war against Syria and Iran—that was not the purpose. That was the sideshow. What you had, if you looked at the map, and looked at the Eastern Mediterranean and the bay around Iran, you saw the greatest concentration of thermonuclear-warfare capabilities on this planet, represented by the forces of the United States, Britain, and other powers. Why would they have to have the thermonuclear capabilities of major powers and others combined, against two small nations—a relatively very small nation, Syria, and a medium-size small nation, shall we say, Iran: Why?

Because their target wasn't Syria, their target wasn't Iran. Their target was—as we know now, from the diplomatic scandals that have broken out in Washington



White House/Pete Souza

Sen. John Kerry collaborated with the President to authorize the unconstitutional Libya War. "It was a criminal act, by the President of the United States, an impeachable act."

and Europe—the target was Russia and China. What does that mean? Why should Britain and the United States, and other nations, wish to launch thermonuclear war, against two great thermonuclear powers, Russia and China? And you have a nuclear power, Pakistan; and India's also a thermonuclear power.

So what you have, is that the entirety of that part of Asia is now under death threat *from this President!* Who is not fit to be in a cattle herd. And the suckers are letting this happen! This man, under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, is *clinically insane!* The terms are specific: *This man is clinically insane.*

And our leaders in the Congress—and some of them are people I like, and think they're otherwise nice people, or proper in their duties—but they're not acting that way! Just like Kerry, Senator Kerry, has acted in a *terrible* way. Nothing like we used to think of him: I once supported this man in his candidacy for President. I wouldn't do so today. He's changed: He's not the same man he was then! And if you know his record, that's striking.

So therefore, what's the point? The British now say, what's the purpose of this? They told you: The purpose is, as the Queen of England and others have insisted, their intention is to reduce the population of the planet, from 7 billion people to 1 *or less!* Their argument is the Green policy! And therefore, if you want to have a Green policy, and what that connotes, you can not tolerate Russia's existence; you can not tolerate 1.4 billion people in China; you can not tolerate 1.1 billion people in India, and other nations. Therefore, this is a British

operation, run under the Green policy of Her Majesty the Queen and her cohorts to change the character of the planet, in this way. In other words, *these guys make Hitler look like a piker!*

A Loss of Morals and Guts


And we in the United States have a President, who is the leading edge of that policy under British orders, the British monarchy's orders. That's why this is the big crisis. And that's why anyone in politics, who's running for President, or similar rank of office, and doesn't deal with this, *ain't fit to be elected anything*. There are some of these candidates, a couple of these Republican candidates who are sane; I would admit that. Some of them are not sane: I will also emphasize that. And we have a similar kind of situation among others.

We are a nation which has temporarily lost its guts, lost its morals and its guts. Because the evidence of this, is what it is.

Now, in fact, the only reason that I know of, that we're not already *in* that war, is because people in the Joint Chiefs and other institutions have said, "Don't go ahead." So it's only a *minority*, but an important minority in our government, which is an organized resistance against this thing, which is *far worse evil, far more evil*, than anything Adolf Hitler ever accomplished in his intention.

And that's where the problem lies. And therefore, we have to deal with it, accordingly. Anyone who's running for office, who does not say this President, Obama, must be immediately removed under Section 4 of the 25th Amendment, *is not fit to lead our government!* They haven't got the *guts* and the honesty, to do it. They can't be trusted, because they *refused* to respond to their responsibility, to the office for which they were elected, or which they have the prospect of being elected to. They are not fit to serve!

And therefore, look at the clown show we have going on, outside in this nation. Look at the Republican campaign, so far; it's a clown show! One of those guys in there, is a decent fellow; he's an intelligent, decent, probably under most circumstances, would do a good job; he was a former governor of a state. And I think he's intelligent enough to be that. But look at the rest of them: Who is standing up? Who is *fit* to run for Federal office? Who is fit to *choose* a candidate for Federal



CNN/SRLC

"Where's the sense in this whole election campaign that started last year?," LaRouche asked. "Where's the sanity? Where's the morality and intelligence of the citizens who would participate in this atrocity called an 'election campaign,' the Republican election campaign?" Left to right: Rick Santorum, Mitt Romney, Newt Gingrich, Rep. Ron Paul.

office, who does not recognize these implications? Where is someone who will stand up, who has the *guts* to be errand boy, let alone President? And that's where we are today.

And that's the first thing you have to consider: We are dealing with a regime of *evil*. The organizer of that evil, centrally, is the British monarchy. The most conspicuous tool of that evil is the current President of the United States and his accomplices. And that's what's wrong with our government. And anybody who wants to bring up any other issue, any different issue, contrary to what I've just said here, is not fit to vote, let alone be elected! Because the fate of humanity depends upon defeating what this British operation under the Queen, and what this President of the United States represent: They are unfit to be in public office in any major nation. And those who support them, are not fit to hold important office in any nation.

And yet, why do our people act like clowns? And vote for these Republicans, who've just been running?

Where's the sense in this whole election campaign that started last year? Where's the sanity? Where's the morality? Where's the morality and intelligence of the citizens who would participate in this atrocity called an "election campaign," the Republican election campaign? And what we have on the Democratic side: We have Obama, the more-than-Hitler of the United States. People will support *him*? What's wrong with their

minds and morals? They say they want to lead this nation, they want to determine the policies of this nation, when where they lead, is leading the world to a holocaust beyond belief?

No, this election campaign in the United States, so far, among the leading parties, *is a farce*. And the sooner you recognize that, and say so, and act so, the sooner we might get out of this mess.

Now, there are some other aspects here, to be dealt with. Assuming that we're going to avoid thermonuclear war, avoid this holocaust, what's next?

Constitutional Issues

Well, let's take the question of the U.S. Constitution. There are two actions which must be taken now, by any authorities who deserve to be called "authorities." The United States, like all of Western and Central Europe, is now *bankrupt*. It is, under its present statutes, its present Constitution, it is *hopelessly* bankrupt! There's no way, under these kinds of political leaders, with these policies, that the United States or Western or Central Europe, is going to survive. Not possible.

Well, where's the seriousness on this one? You want to pick somebody for President, you want to pick a party for President, with these kinds of clowns loose? Where's your guts? Where's your mentality? Where's your brains? Where's your morality?

The evidence is clear: We are bankrupt. Look, all that bailout money, between Europe and the United States, that has been put out so far, *will never be paid!* It's worthless! And worse than that, the worthlessness of that money is the fact that a slight *twitch*, right now, as we see this in Europe—in Greece, for example; threatened in Italy, for example; threatened in Spain, threatened in Portugal; threatened in other parts of Europe—we're on the verge of a general collapse! In other words, it's like 1923 Germany, but on a multinational level.

Well, what are we doing about that? Where's our economic policies? More bailout? The whole thing is totally bankrupt now. There's no value in it. All it takes is a twitch! And the whole system goes down. And the Queen gets closer to her ambition of reducing the world's population from 7 to 1 billion people. Because that type of catastrophe can have exactly that type of effect.

Well, where are the politicians that are saying something about that? Or doing something about that? You want to call them serious? Can you call yourself *sane* if you consider voting for one of these clowns? Can't we find some Americans who are not clowns? Who have

the guts to tell the truth about the situation? The United States now, in its present condition, is *hopelessly bankrupt and on the verge of going the same way that Greece is going right now!* What are you going to do about it? Where's your morals? Where's your brains?

The Remedy

Now, there's a remedy for this. And it's not a remedy that London and Wall Street like—I have to concede that. They won't like it at all.

What are we going to do? Well, the two things we have to do, which are Constitutional in their character: First of all, they're Constitutional against the background of our Constitution. Also, people don't understand economics. The leading economists generally in the United States are distinguished by the fact of their total ignorance of economics. They have these myths: Anyone who could believe that the bailout is a help to the world economy, when it's nothing but complete bankruptcy of every part of the world that's in on it? Of course, the British have a view on this thing, the British monarchy: They're going to kill a lot of people—that's good as far as they're concerned. They say so, repeatedly.

But the other side is, they don't intend to play by the rules. They intend to see the world collapse around them, and they intend to have a survival group, which is going to come up with a completely new system to replace—they hope!—the bankrupt system, that they made bankrupt.

So therefore, there are two things that we have to do, but the two things are under one idea, one principle. The principle is: As far as we know from direct evidence, in European civilization and beyond, nations have been governed by a system which is called a "monetarist system." Now, the peculiarity of this monetarist system, which virtually no economist in the United States understands, and very few in Europe: We used to understand this, when we had the Massachusetts colony, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, we understood what the difference is between a monetarist system and a credit system.

The United States government, the Constitution, was based on the concept of a *credit system*. But Andy Jackson, who was not exactly a patriot of the United States, worked under a whore, a British whore, who followed him as President [Martin Van Buren]. And they shut down the essential institution of banking of the United States.

Our system, which we got in the period coming out

of the victory in the Revolutionary War, in the process of creating our Constitution, went to the precedent of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, to create a *credit system*—in other words, not a money system, but a credit system—where the Massachusetts Bay Colony created credit. Not currency, not a monetary system. And the credit was simply, credit by the government, or the collectivity of the government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, to allow certain scrip to be uttered, to allow for the production of goods and the means of production.

Under this policy, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was way ahead of the British Kingdom, in terms of technology, and in terms of economic growth. It only lost that growth, after it was suppressed by the head of what was called the New Venetian Party, which led into the establishment of the British Empire.

Now, what happened with Andrew Jackson, that whore Jackson—and I say it advisedly—he was a Democratic whore. They say he’s a Democrat, but he’s a whore, so therefore, he must be a Democratic whore! What he did was to induce, with his boss, who was later President, the Great Crash of 1837. This destroyed the credit system of the United States, by that operation by Andrew Jackson, under the orders of his boss, who gave us the 1837 Crash.

We’ve had recoveries from that kind of effect, since that time. One, in fighting the Civil War: In the case of the Civil War, we went to greenbacks. Now, the greenback system was a *credit system*, and it was a credit system that is specified *in our Constitution!* It’s one of the strongest features of *intent* in the U.S. Federal Constitution: that the United States currency is based on a credit system, not a monetary system. And everything we’ve been ruined in, in economy in the United States, has generally been a result of a return to this kind of monetarist system, some kind of monetarist system, as opposed to our Constitutional system, which is a credit system.

Now, I’ll explain what this means: We’re now bankrupt. The whole country is bankrupt. The situation of our people is generally hopeless, for most people, right now! How do we cure that? Well, we have two things we can do which will get us out of this mess: One is called Glass-Steagall. Now, Glass-Steagall, which is a law crafted under Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President—this *saved* the United States, and made us the greatest power, again, in world history at that time, and defeated Hitler. Without Glass-Steagall, Hitler would be ruling the world, today! Or something like him.

So therefore, this system, which we keep going back

to every time we want to have an American-style recovery, is going back to the concept of a credit system, which is built into the design of our Federal Constitution. Now, a lot of jerks don’t understand this; that’s why they’re called jerks. Because anyone who’s trying to run the United States, who doesn’t know the principle which makes the United States function effectively, is not qualified to be advising anybody on how to run the United States.

A Broken-Down Economy

All right, so now, we have a broken-down economy. The economy was broken down beforehand, before 2008, but, the breakdown was aggravated by the bailout. The bailout, as in Europe, the interchange between the U.S. banking system, the Wall Street-type of system, *taking over* the U.S. banks, not only those banks which are Wall Street-type of banks, but also the commercial banks. So our *entire* banking system, and the looting of our mortgage system, was engineered by this mechanism, of the monetarist system. And now, the actual debt of the United States, the debt of Europe, *far exceeds anything that could ever be paid!*

Well, I say, number one: Use Glass-Steagall. Roosevelt created it. It’s in the tradition of the United States, in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in the Pine Tree Shilling system. And what we did with the idea of the paper currency, by Benjamin Franklin—it was his proposal—then, under Franklin’s influence, it became the policy of our Secretary of the Treasury [Alexander Hamilton]; and that became a Constitutional principle. And every success we’ve had in the United States, since that time, has been based on those periods when we went back to that principle of the credit system. Abraham Lincoln—the credit system—that saved the United States from destruction.

Roosevelt saved the United States from destruction by the credit system, which is his idea of the Glass-Steagall law. He did not go all the way, but he went far enough to enable us to recover, to become again a powerful nation of the world, and to win World War II. And that was only destroyed under the influence of Harry S Truman.

But that’s not adequate, because we have a broken-down economy. There’s no chance of any full recovery. The hopes of most people out there—they have no real basis for hope! Not under this system. Even Glass-Steagall, while it is necessary to get rid of the real garbage, which is what it does: Glass-Steagall puts the garbage



LPAC-TV

The economy was broken down before 2008, but, the breakdown was aggravated by the bailout, which allowed the Wall Street monetarist system to take over and wreck the entire U.S. banking system. Here, LaRouchePAC organizers campaign with Congressional candidate Keshia Rogers, in the Martin Luther King Day parade in Houston, Jan. 16.

in the garbage pail, and leaves what is not garbage to be used. But the problem is, the system has been so rotted out by the looting, by this monetarist looting, that even Glass-Steagall will not be sufficient to cause an actual recovery of the U.S. economy, physically. But, however, these systems, which are based on that kind of monetary system, even of any improved type, will not allow the nation to come back to life.

So therefore, we have to go to what's called a pure credit system. And do the same thing all over again.

Now, the only way we can do that, is by the entire United States system, banking system, and so forth, on a credit system. Why? Because, in the kind of money you would get in the banking system from Glass-Steagall, you will not get enough money, as credit in the system, to organize an effective recovery of the United States from the slide into Hell, where it's going right now!

However, under a credit system, we can utter credit, legally and properly, based on the amount of good we intend to do. In other words, we just say, "We, the Federal government, as we did in bailing out from the debt of the United States, coming out of the victory over the British in the Revolutionary War, we utter credit, by the Federal government—no other authority—in order to cover the loans needed to finance the recovery we need." Under Glass-Steagall, you can't do that, because

you're limited to the amount of funds you're able to salvage from the bailout.

If you want to have a recovery of the United States, you must *dump* the monetarist system, and go to a credit system, which is what the United States did in coming out of the Revolutionary War as an indebted nation. It's exactly what Lincoln did, to win the war against the British in the Civil War. It's what Roosevelt did, in his own intention, but he had the resources available, under that intention, to save the United States and save the world from Hitler.

So, that's where we are, again, and that's what we have to do. That's the Constitutional thing: This is a Constitutional principle, not an ordinary piece

of legislation. Glass-Steagall was passed as a legislation, but the principle of credit is a principle, not an ordinary law. And it's the return, by agreement, to that principle, which is the way we can save this nation from a collapse which is now about to hit it. Without that method, there *is* no recovery from collapse.

This has another aspect to it. Why is it that the United States developed a credit system, when no other system in the world, at least in European systems, actually ever developed a credit system—except for Charlemagne. He's dead, of course, and not able to do that any more. But so therefore, what we have to do, essentially, is extend the idea of a credit system to our partners in various parts of the world: All they have to do, is do the same thing we do. They now will clean up their mess, take all this cheap money, this phony money, put it in the garbage pail, and we go with the credit system, which is based on the kind of investment we need to make and implement, in order to save the United States, and in order to save our partners from other nations. The same thing.

So that's where we stand on that. That should be our policy. It should be our policy we propose to our partners.

For example, the intention of Russia, in particular, now, under Medvedev and Putin, is a serious attempt to

set up close cooperation between Russia and the United States, among other nations. And such an agreement between the United States and Russia—which means removing Obama from office, of course—would actually be the basis for organizing a group, a large group, of major and other nations together, to save the economy of the world. There is the technology available. We can catch up.

One of the things we have to do, apart from Glass-Steagall, is NAWAPA. It's a typical program: NAWAPA was a creation of President John F. Kennedy: He was the one who authored this thing, and put the backing in. And it was killed because he was killed, as part of the process.

So therefore, we have, under our law, under our system, a perfectly rational, clearly understandable method for dealing with these problems. And the fact that these are the aspirations of Russia, under the present government; that we have a similar attitude on the part of China, 1.4 billion people. A similar attitude now coming out of Korea; a similar attitude in Japan, and other nations. So, what are we waiting for? The greatest part of the population of the planet, will come to join us in this process, if we reach the agreement among two or three of the major parties in this thing.

So that's our operation.

The 'Gods' of Olympus

The problem is this: There's a theory behind this crime. Monetarism is a crime against humanity, but what is the theory behind it? It goes back a long ways—it goes back in European Mediterranean history in a particular way. That you had a class of people, who called themselves "gods." They were actually called "gods": The use of the word "god," or its translation of the same meaning, meant that there are certain people who ruled over the planet. They were the real human beings; the other human beings were not really human, they were treated as animals, like cattle. And that was the system. So the word "gods," as translated from various languages and used in the Greek, for example, was exactly that: There are some people who rule the world because they're gods.

Now, how do they do this? Well, first of all, they keep the majority of people stupid, and not too plentiful. You don't allow scientific and technological progress, the Promethean principle—you don't allow *fire*, don't allow mankind to learn how to use fire—or nuclear power, for example, which is a form of fire! And therefore, you keep the population of the human species

down to a limit, which you decide to tolerate: Don't let them have technology—keep them dumb and barefoot! And that's called the monetary system.

How does it work? The "gods," or the gods of various nations, like with the Wall Street "gods"—and you know what filth they are!—the gods of various nations decide, "We're going to keep control of this system. We're going to keep the people not too plentiful, and dumb. Stupid. We can not allow them to have fire!" Because mankind is the only species that can use fire. The only species that is willing to use fire is mankind, no other species. That's the difference between a monkey and a human being. And obviously, some people are monkeys, by that rule.

So the monetarist system is the value represented by an oligarchy, like the Wall Street conception. An oligarchy takes a monopoly on all money and declares that only *money* in that form can be used as credit.

Now, the other side of the fact is that the human species can't tolerate that, really. Because without scientific and technological progress, and without the increase of the human population in size and numbers, we can not maintain the human species as existing. Because we're living under conditions in which, gradually, the old ways of life—like take the dinosaurs for example; what happened to the dinosaurs? They stuck to the old ways of behaving, and nature took care of them—they're gone!

So therefore, the issue is, that the idea of a monetary system is a way of imposing a *dictatorship* over the masses of populations; whereas, a credit system has the opposite effect.

And this is the difference, the fundamental difference between the United States and the Europeans. It's not that the Europeans like this stuff, but they're taught that they have to accept the law. The law under which they're ruled, as under the Roman Empire and its successors, is that system. And therefore, in the United States, we have gone back, we reinvented it again, reinvented the credit system, as in Massachusetts and later, in our Constitution. The Europeans *stuck* to some version of a monetarist system. And that's how the Empire ruled in Europe.

Therefore, we are going to a credit system, in which the only money that is allowed to be uttered in the name of the United States government is a credit system. And thus, that credit system now becomes the means for organizing employment.

What do you have now, like in the farm belt? The



American Farm Bureau Federation, Texas

“The agricultural system of the world is being starved by illegal methods!,” LaRouche charged. “Like Monsanto. What Monsanto is doing is rape of the United States and other nations. It’s illegal! It’s unconstitutional. It shouldn’t happen.” Shown, effects of the drought in Texas, 2011.

agricultural system of the world is being starved by illegal methods. Like Monsanto! What Monsanto is doing is rape of the United States and other nations! It’s illegal! It’s unconstitutional! It shouldn’t happen! But therefore, we now have the means, by control of the monetary system, to starve whom we wish to starve—by channeling money, by asserting its value in other terms. So we control what is perceived as the “value” of money, we control what is considered in monetary terms the “value” of various kinds of products and services. Therefore, *we are under that kind of dictatorship.*

And we, in the United States, who have been *unique* in leading this kind of revolution, which is why we came here in the first place: Because Nicholas of Cusa recognized that the European system was not salvageable; that we had to go across the waters, and bring our culture to other parts of the planet, and to develop a system which would meet the needs of the people, and then go back to the old European system and tell them, “Good news, we’ve got the solution for your mistakes.” And that’s what we have to stand for.

So therefore, we need that kind of thing. The United States presently *will not continue to exist*—with or without a thermonuclear war—will not continue to exist, without going to a credit system in place of a monetarist system: What has been done in terms of the bailout, has reached such enormity, that even Glass-Steagall could not save the United States, *unless* we applied to Glass-Steagall the standard of a credit system. And without

that, we’re not going to survive. Those who wish to survive, will agree with me. Those who don’t agree with me, do not wish to survive—because they will not survive, if they rule.

We’re Going to Mars

Okay, now: Those are the only Constitutional principles that I am pushing at this time. I have other notions of Constitutional principles, which *should be* incorporated in the law of the United States as part of the Constitution, or interpretations of the Constitution. But, I didn’t want to do that now, because I didn’t want to open the gates for a flood of wild-eyed, cock-eyed ideas, like from the Austrian school of finances, or some ghoul like that. These nuts will call *that*, that, so therefore, I did not want to open the gates to allow this kind of fraud, like the Austrian school of fraud, which I think Mitt Romney is part of, or he’s close to people who believe in that. And therefore, he can’t be President of the United States. That can not be allowed, unless he has a complete conversion to something more sane. But that’s typical of the problem.

What are we going to do? We’ve discussed money, we’ve discussed the politics of money, things like that: What are we going to do with this poor world? Well, one thing we’re going to do, and we have to do, is, we’re going to have, as some people know, here in the room and elsewhere, we’re going to go to Mars. Now, we’re not going to pack our bags, and go to Mars—that’s not the way this thing works. But what we’re going to do, is we’re going to take a technology which we now have, but which needs a little perfecting. We’re going to take those tunnels in the Moon—we will probably send people directly to Mars, but they’d be sacrificing their lives in doing so, at this time. Their lives would be shortened considerably. But we’re not going to chug-chug-chug-chug-chug-along to Mars, either.

We’re going to have to go to a method of power which will enable us to reach Mars within a week, from Earth. Now, this is going to change man’s understanding of mankind. And it’s something which we will be working on now. There are several principles which I’m working on right now: First of all, we realize that the thermonuclear-fusion driver, for travel between Earth and Mars, is necessary. We also recognize that to go efficiently to Mars, we have to make a little intervention, which was understood by some German scientists,

back in the 1920s: We have to go to the Moon, first.

And therefore, we aim at the Moon, where we build up resources, which we then shoot, at longer distances, and thermonuclear-fusion-driven rates. In other words, acceleration out, deceleration down, and we can do that in about a week. That's what our prospect is.

That changes everything! It changes man's relationship to the Solar System. It changes, implicitly, our relationship to the universe. And these are things which we can not realize overnight, but we can set into process the motion which will enable these things to happen. We will then no longer be poor human beings, sitting vulnerably on this poor planet of ours, waiting for our extermination. Humanity will be moving throughout the Solar System, and finding ways to live and develop in the Solar System. We'll be invading the galaxy, at least in some part of the galaxy; we'll be developing things and the future of mankind. They will happen *long* after I'm dead, but they will happen, and that's what's important.

So we have a number of things that go into this. First of all, that's the big one. Right now, the big one is that: Mars travel, with the development of the tunnels of the Moon as the way in which we build up the capabilities logistically of supporting the Mars operation and going further. We're going to go out there, to save mankind—what Obama would not allow! We're going to prevent asteroids from crashing into Earth, and killing human beings. That can be done. We have to develop the capability of doing it. Russia and China are working on that kind of problem themselves.

So we're going to go out there, and we're going to do a lot of useful things. But at the same time, we're going to do the Mars mission, we're going to do some other things: We now have a situation, where there's a melting of the Arctic. Now, the Greenies would think that's terrible. Well, let them freeze their what-off, if you know what I mean. We are going to enjoy this thing, because we're going to go with the right stuff, and all these kinds of things. We're not going to have our *** frozen off.

NAWAPA and Beyond

So therefore, we have NAWAPA: When you put together the space program and NAWAPA and some other programs, which are of the same nature, where you are developing the ability of the Earth to defend and sustain human life on Earth *and beyond*, then you've created a real economy.

And more than that, you know, we human beings, we live a certain amount of time. The British think I've lived too long, for example. But we human beings, the problem we have, is we think that when we die, which comes along to us, sooner or later, we think that means that life is over, or the meaning of life is over. Well, life is over, but the meaning of life is not over. When you think about traveling the distance from Earth to Mars in a week, and think what that means on a larger scale: That means that mankind is now connected to generations ahead, by these kinds of improved means. That the meaning of life has changed for mankind, from what most people think it is now. They see the true connection between scientific progress, the discovery of the increased power of mankind in the universe. We understand what that means in terms of what we discover today, which is realized down the line today, several generations down the line. But that several generations down the line today, when you think about flight from the Earth to the Moon, you realize that we've changed the relationship among successive generations.


And, that is where we have to go, and where we have to think: We have to redefine what most people think is human life, and the purpose of human life. We've got to change that! We've got to realize that you may be dying in the morning, but before you die, you will have unleashed something into the future, which means your life *means something for a long time to come!* And that's the difference in the way mankind thinks about man, which we have to realize today.

So this defines, essentially, to some, a galactic option. We are now, as mankind—and we who are working, in the Basement Team and so forth, our Basement Team—are thinking in exactly these terms. You're going to see some things coming out in our publications in the coming period, which is more and more of this: We've really got the bit in our mouth on this one. I'm not particularly urgent about getting to Mars myself, personally. But I'm very much concerned about the success of those who will take that journey. Their life, their success, and the fruits of their influence.

So that's where we are. And when we want to think about the United States, we have to think, not about a nation, how you “manage a nation,” like some grocery store or something. You have to think about what a nation is. It's the repository of a continuing process, of development of powers of mankind in the universe, to accomplish things that mankind *can* do, or will be able to do, under this kind of program. And when we talk



LaRouche Offers Pathway to Economic Recovery

To build our way out of the existential crisis that faces mankind today, Lyndon LaRouche outlined three exciting economic/scientific challenges which will take us, and the generations who follow, far into the future: the great water and terraforming project NAWAPA (the North American Water and Power Alliance); development of the Arctic; and a Moon-Mars-oriented space program. These great projects will prepare us to confront our “galactic destiny” and create “something greater, more beautiful, more satisfying, than anything you’ve ever dreamed of before.”



NAWAPA

“When you put together the space program and NAWAPA and some other programs, which are of the same nature, where you are developing the ability of the Earth to defend and sustain human life on Earth *and beyond*, then you’ve created a real economy.”



about the purpose of life, we talk about the meaning of life for our children and grandchildren, *that's* what we should understand. Not some futile cry, "Oh, you're dead, you're gone, I can't reach you any more! My life doesn't mean anything any more!" No! It should mean something! If you're contributing something to the future of mankind, across future generations, and help to make that leap by this kind of technology, this kind of science, your immortality is not to be doubted. Because what you can do while you're alive, *here*, or some other part of the system, what you can do will reach across generations, directly, from what you are.

And it's that sense of your own value, in that kind of role in life, which must be the mission, which we, and Russia, and China, and so forth, must share in common.

The Common Aims of Mankind

Now, one final note on this thing: We've reached the point where it's been demonstrated, and it was already true in the 1920s, even then; but now, in the 1970s and beyond: The development of methods of warfare, such as nuclear warfare, and thermonuclear warfare, and other systems, which are now coming online, means

that it's not possible, as the present case before us, the question of the British intention, together with Obama, to slaughter most of the human race in Asia, *right now*; that we can no longer have war, in that sense, in that way. Because we can not put the existence of the human species at risk, when it is the essence of our existence! We can not destroy the essence of a human existence, as a species! Particularly, since our species is a creative species, explicitly so.

Therefore, mankind is too precious to be killed. That does not mean we can't have quarrels. That does not mean we shouldn't have sovereignty of nations. Yes, we should, because only with the sovereignty of nations can you actually develop the mind of the people of nations. This idea that's going on in Europe, of so-called "governance": Do you realize that most of Western and Central Europe, *those people have no government? They have no sovereignty.* They're not allowed to have sovereignty!

I'm concerned to get the British out, and give the people in Europe their sovereignty back: The Greeks are about to take it, out of desperation. Italy's ready to take it, not out of desperation, but out of rage and anger.

So therefore, there is a meaning of life, there's a meaning of human life. We can not put mankind at risk: The way we avoid that, is by adopting *common missions* for mankind. There was an old curmudgeon, who was a sort of funny friend of mine [Edward Teller], back in the late 1970s and early 1980s—he's now deceased. But there was a conference which was held on behalf of the SDI policy, on this, talking about "the common aims of mankind." There is such a principle as the "common aims of mankind."

And under the common aims of mankind, such things as an alliance between Russia and the United States, which is now available: Get rid of Obama, do some of the things we want to do; with China, it's there; with Japan, it's there. There is such a thing as the common aims of mankind, among different, respectively sovereign nations.

And it's that principle of law, the higher principle of law, the higher principle of sovereignty, which must rule. We can no longer risk the kind of wars, that that babbling idiot, that rageball Obama, and the Queen, are pushing. That is the ultimate crime! Because, by implication, as well as by direct cause, they are committing a *crime against humanity, per se*. And they must be removed from office and from power! Because we can not allow these clowns to control the fate of nations, any more.

NAWAPA 1964

PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 14, 1964

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary "NAWAPA 1964" is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early '70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it

... until now.

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

Dialogue with LaRouche

Matthew Ogden: We have about one-hour open to us for questions and answers. We've already received a number of questions from across the planet, and I'm going to give priority to a number of very high-level questions that have come in from Russia.

The first is from a well-known strategic analyst, Prof. Igor Panarin, who's a doctor of political sciences at the Diplomatic Academy of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Professor Panarin starts with some short comments. He says:

"I appreciate what Lyndon LaRouche and his close collaborators do, because many people in the world, including in Russia, are beginning to recognize reality. Like Lyndon, I also believe that the main threat to both the U.S.A. and Russia, and to the whole world, is a group of private individuals in London, who, for hundreds of years, have been organizing bloody wars all over the world for their own gain. These London bankers organized the world narcotics trade, which is killing hundreds of thousands of people every year. I think that all clear-headed intellectuals worldwide, from different countries, should unite their efforts to save the world from the chaos into which the London financiers are taking it."

Now, Professor Panarin has two questions:

First, "What measures should be taken immediately to prevent the destabilization of Russia? I consider Gorbachov responsible for the demise of the U.S.S.R. and I think that he always championed British interests. And now he is being used to actively break up Russia."

And his second question: "How can the situation in the United States be changed, so that people would come to power who realize that the British bankers have been secretly running America for a long time?" And he asks, is there any possibility that Ron Paul could win? He's demanding the elimination of the Federal Reserve System, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan and Germany. Thank you in advance."

LaRouche: Well, first of all, I'm not recommending Ron Paul for anything. I know the gentleman very well, and he's of the Austrian School, and that's not the kind of thing we want to spread around this planet. Let Ron do what he wants to do, but don't make him President, or anything foolish like that. He does not understand anything about economy; he does not *wish* to under-



Igor Panarin gives a press conference in 2009 under the auspices of the newspaper "Izvestia."

stand anything about economy. We're in an economic crisis; we don't need his advice!

On the more optimistic part, we can do it now! As the professor knows, there are people in relevant institutional positions in the United States, who agree with me on this thing: We are not going to have a war! We're not going to have a war in Syria, we're not going to have a war in Iran, we're not going to allow it! We're going to hold back those damned fools who want to play with this kind of stuff. Because the only result they can create—remember, the weapons capability exists, and people in Russia are among those who understand that. You can not have that situation. You can't! Because it would mean the extinction, or virtual extinction, of the human species.

And therefore, anybody who wants to go to that war, including Obama, who is a lunatic already—he's insane! I diagnosed him back in April of 2009, and everything I said about him has been true. He is a modern reincarnation of the Emperor Nero. That's his mentality! His behavior is that. He's not fit for human company: Let him have a basketball and play someplace on a court, and let him bounce his balls forever! But just keep him out of our government.

So, the issue here, is we *do* have the need, for the safety of the people of this planet, not to have a thermonuclear war; if we allow a thermonuclear war, humanity is in danger of extinction. Anybody like Obama, with a Nero-like mentality? Bah! Don't give him that power! Don't give it to him: *Get him out of there now. He's nuts. He's nuts!* And there's no excuse for tolerating him in office any longer. The only

excuse is the lack of guts of people to do something about it.

Under those conditions, given the great poverty which is striking the world today, given what nations such as Russia, China, India, and so forth, as important powers, can do, the need for cooperation in economic progress of the type I've indicated today, here—that direction of progress is what *all nations need*. The Russians I know, because I know what their attitudes are, in part. They understand that. China is coming to a richer understanding of that. India will understand that in its own terms. Japan recognizes that in its own terms; Korea is now coming to the same thing.

So why should we be at odds with each other, in a military way? We can resolve our problems, by keeping the subject-matter on what *we need in progress*. We don't have to quarrel about taking something away from somebody else. What we have to worry about is the need, that *we* participate in assuring peace, by helping the creation of those means, by which the needs of mankind are assured.

And I agree with his position totally; naturally, there's no secret about that.

Ogden: I want to read another question which is rather short, and then pose a third from Russia.

The first is from another gentleman whom you know, Mr. Alexander Nagorny, who is the deputy editor of the *Zavtra* weekly newspaper, which is based out of Moscow. He asks questions which have implicitly been answered by what you've said. His first is: "My first question is a future-oriented one: What are the prerequisites for far-reaching U.S.-Russian political, economic, and financial cooperation?"

His second question is: "Is there any possibility that a future administration will take strategic steps such as ending the power of the Federal Reserve and returning it to the Congress, along with a return to the Glass-Steagall law?"

A Foul Ball in Moscow

Now, the next question contains some important strategic intelligence which pertains to Professor Panarin's question about the destabilization of Russia.

This question comes from a longtime Russian political and human rights activist. He says:

"Mr. LaRouche, decades ago, you warned of the current world financial crisis, and you demonstrated that free-market liberalism is a dead end, imposed by an anti-human, parasitical, transnational, so-called elite. Now this crisis threatens to become a global catastrophe. And when that elite can't get what they want by force, blackmail, and agentry, they attack national sovereignty under the cover of demagoguery about democracy, freedom, and human rights.

"Our country has been attacked using all of those methods at once.

"Now we have a shameful farce, where some members of the ruling caste, liberals like former Minister of Finance [Alexei] Kudrin, former Governor Boris Nemtsov, the oligarch Mikhail Prokhorov, and the Yale University-trained blogger Alexei Navalny, are parading around as the would-be leaders of citizens (who actually do have good reason to protest). In this situation, my concern is that the current Russian leadership will either voluntarily capitulate to this opposition circus, or will be forced out after attempting to carry out something like Gorbachov's perestroika policy. Russia could disintegrate during such a process, with ethnic conflicts and separatism.

"As you know we have a Presidential campaign under way, from which representatives of the patriotic opposition, like Gen. [L.G.] Ivashov, have been excluded.

"Not long before the campaign started, the Obama Administration named Michael McFaul as Ambassador to Russia. He is not a career diplomat; he is a Russian studies specialist, who for many years has been tied to the 'liberal reformers.' People whom I know were told by McFaul personally, that when he came to the Soviet Union in the late 1980s and early 1990s on various 'democratization' projects, he was never interested in achieving 'democracy' as such, but rather in the collapse of the Soviet Union.

"On Monday of this week, McFaul presented his credentials. On Tuesday, he met with representatives of the liberal opposition to the Kremlin.

"My questions are:

"What political circles does McFaul represent? What are their goals in appointing McFaul as Ambassador to Russia at such a moment of tension? Has Michael McFaul been sent here with the same intention of breaking up Russia, as he had toward the Soviet



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis
Alexander Nagorny



Michael McFaul, the new U.S. Ambassador to Russia: “A totally British pedigree,” said LaRouche.

Union over 20 years ago?”

LaRouche: Exactly. And McFaul is not really an American. His pedigree, his political pedigree is totally British, and of course, [U.S. Ambassador to the UN] Susan Rice is his sidekick. So we know exactly what this is: This is a foul ball, put into office as a diplomat now, by a foul ball called the President of the United States, and Susan Rice. And if you know what Susan Rice is—

Now, I’m perfectly free to say the truth about these people, because what they have done against me, and against Russians, at the same time, is a known fact. These guys are foul balls who don’t belong in office in any nation. And the sooner we understand that, the better off, the safer we’ll all be.

The British and the Malvinas

Ogden: Now, switching from Russia to the Southern Hemisphere, this question comes from Argentina, from Rosina Castillo, and she asks: “Recently, in Argentina, we’ve had a series of mysterious deaths of public officials, and also our President, Cristina Kirchner, has had a serious illness, because of which she had surgery. We are still operating under our Vice President, to this day, due to that illness.

“We can not see these developments as separated from the context of the real world history, as you have defined it. We’re at the verge of thermonuclear World War III, and the British will do whatever, to unleash chaos in the world. Until now, we thought that given the recent moves from the Russians to stop the Southwest

Asia ‘new Balkans’ from getting into a war, maybe now the British will look into other places, like Argentina, to start a war.

“As you know very well, the conflict about the Malvinas Islands is escalating, and today, the British Prime Minister accused Argentina of being ‘colonialist,’ and said their [Britain’s] Security Council will meet to straighten the security of the islands, given that the 30th anniversary of the Malvinas War is very close. So, we want your comments on the strategic situation in Argentina, and help the political circles here take the strategic perspective.”

LaRouche: I’m very well aware of the Malvinas’s history. The Malvinas was stolen from Argentina by the British, at a time of weakness in the United States. The British never had a legal claim to the Malvinas: They just *stole* them. It played a crucial part in the history of the administration of Ronald Reagan, because you had people in the Reagan Administration, including the Secretary of State and others, who were nothing but British agents. And so, the problem was, Reagan backed off on this thing; there was hesitation on his part at a certain point, and that was a point that I was rather close to the inside of certain of these circles of the Reagan Administration—not as a part of the administration, but as, shall we say, a friendly advisor, on SDI and so forth.

So the point is, the British have no decent, legal claim to the Malvinas. But they do intend to crush every part of the world that has sovereignty. Look at Africa, for example: *There is no sovereignty in Africa—none!* There’s only one worse tyranny than another. And it’s British. Now, you’ve got people in Europe, forces in Europe, which are also in charge of Africa, but they’re all agents of the British interests, the British colonial interests.

So the thing we have to do, one thing, which is to an unpleasant group of people, the British oligarchy: The British oligarchy has to be removed from power throughout the world. Let the people of the United Kingdom—or of Wales and Scotland and England; but especially Ireland and Scotland, and so forth, and England—let them each have their sovereignty, and we shall do just fine. We don’t have to torture people for the pleasure of the Queen of England and similar kinds of people. And this is exactly that.

We have some foul balls, who are more British, than they are Americans, in high positions in the United States: I think we ought to swap. I think we ought to



Presidency of Argentina

Argentine President Cristina Fernández pays tribute to those who fought in the 1982 Malvinas War against Britain.

take some British fellows, who are nice people and know how to behave themselves, and invite them to the United States, and give the British agents inside the United States the option of living in Britain, which we would more than strongly encourage them to do!

Getting the Snakes Out of Ireland

Ogden: Well, on that note, I think I'll take a question from Ireland. This is from our friend Gene Douglas, who's watching from Armagh, Ireland, currently, and he wants to ask you about the British Empire's Green fascism. He says:

"Our developing organization in Ireland has adopted you as our founding father, since you have returned to us our famous bold imagination, and given focus to our historic fighting spirit. You have reminded us that just because Ireland is a small island, doesn't mean we have to be small-minded. So thank you for your ongoing encouragement, as we lay plans to get Ireland back on its feet through the real republican concepts of physical development and credit system economics.

"And thank you, too, for the frequent kick in the arse, when you set us to scratching our heads, such as now, as we wrestle with the idea that we can overthrow the accepted notions of fixed space and time, and instead, bend them to our free will.

"When you laid out a conceptual map, outlining the new frontiers of the Arctic as the key to a world economic recovery, we eagerly accepted the challenge, and began to consider how Ireland could play its part. We undertook a study of shipbuilding, with the intention of building real, working ships, cargo ship and icebreakers for the work ahead. In so doing, we intend to override the oppressive sectarian legacy of the Belfast shipyard, whose first ship, the *Venetian*, was followed by warships for the British Navy, and of course, the ill-fated *Titanic*.

"Now we intend to unite our nation around a new flagship, an icebreaker called *The Gael*, and I assure you, it will not be wind-powered, but nuclear. And we hope the concept of this mission, even before a rivet is fastened, can inspire our island-nation."

Now, here's the question: "Just because Ireland is known as the 'Emerald Isle,' doesn't mean we should be putting up with the most vicious form of British Liberalism, the Greenies. So, let me ask you this question, Lyndon: Wouldn't the crushing of the Greenie movement, representing, as it does, the very worst of genocidal thinking, be a very effective and necessary step in restoring to the world, the power of reason?

"Thank you, Gene."

LaRouche: Well, as I say in the same tone that he has sent the message, that there are several points to be made here. First of all, that the *Venetian* was named for a leading figure of the Venetian Party, who became the King of England [William III]. And this was a very evil force, who went into Ireland and did a general slaughter of the Irish. So, the point is, I think we ought to recognize that William of Orange, and his descendants, should take a very modest posture in matters of world affairs: Keep their mouths *shut* most of the time, and don't scheme while they're keeping their mouths shut. Because this thing can not be tolerated.

This is the oldest evil, that we from the trans-Atlantic community know, this thing that led to the Roman Empire, which led to, again, other forms, which led into the Venetian system, which led into the collapse of civilization, and which launched the whole damned operation of the long, religious warfare, from 1492 to 1648.



King William III (1650-1702), who imposed the rule of the “Venetian Party” on England, Scotland, and Ireland.

That whole warfare was organized by what was called the “New Venetian Party,” and William of Orange was an official of the New Venetian Party, who had conducted, earlier, the wars against France. And this was all a process of rebuilding the Roman Empire, around a New Venetian model. That New Venetian model *is* the British Empire, it’s the soul and other parts of the organs of the British monarchy, today.

And therefore, one ought to understand that. These guys have had too much time on this planet. Let them take a more modest position, a more humble position, when they can learn what it feels like to be under tyranny.

‘The Point Is To Change the Subject’

Ogden: Okay, we have one more question that came in from Europe. And this is from a gentleman named Claudio Giudici, who’s becoming very well known right now. He’s the leader of a taxi union in Florence, Italy, and he’s also an activist with the MoviSol, our organization in Italy. And he’s currently leading a national strike against the financial dictator Mario Monti, and his policies of liberalization and austerity. Giudici,

as people might know, if you’ve been watching this website, has grabbed national headlines. He’s been interviewed on several national television networks, and he’s currently escalating his fight with prominent calls for Glass-Steagall and the policies of Mr. LaRouche (see interview, this issue).

So, here’s his question: “Dear Mr. LaRouche, one of the false myths pushed by economists is competition. Using linear approaches which are easily understood by many, we can say that competition is not the only issue to be addressed, but only one among several issues, including, for instance, protection and promotion of quality; labor rights, like minimum wage; protections introduced by civilized society for workers, efficiency, and others.”

He refers to an Encyclical by Pope Pius XI: “The social doctrine of the Church deals with the question of the failure of approaches that are centered around competition only. In paragraph 108 of *Quadragesimo Anno*, Pope Pius XI describes hyper-competition as a sort of virus, that first leads to the creation of oligopolies, then to domination of economic powers over politics, and ultimately to conflict among states.

“These descriptions are important because they help to understand the processes as a sequence. However, I wonder if the issue could be dealt with from a higher standpoint, not just a sequence, but a unity, an *unicum*, not so much like a Gothic church, but rather, like the Florence Cathedral. Thank you, Claudio Giudici.”

LaRouche: Well, the point is to change the subject entirely. That the question is the progress of mankind, the ability of mankind to survive. Now, the beacon today for that is Mars: that mankind must be developed, so that mankind has the power to reach Mars, and to develop it, and to develop larger parts of the Solar System. That’s *it*. So it’s that kind of purpose, not some kind of thing of some individual with his little scheme someplace—and they usually cheat a lot. And somebody who buys these things usually thinks so.

So that’s the point: It’s the increase of the productive power of labor, through the development of the intellectual powers of the mind, which is the vital interest. And it’s *that* which must be the test of what is right and what is wrong. That which promotes an improvement in the productive powers of labor, to do human good, *that’s* the Good. And whether something is more liked or disliked or so forth, *is irrelevant*. *It’s garbage!* And mostly, it usually involves cheating. And you find a lot of the people in the Republican Party are very good at

that. The Democrats don't like to admit it, they're also a little bit sloppy at it, but they do it too. And we can do without that stuff.

On Mitt Romney

Ogden: On that note, I have two questions that have come in from people who are watching the webcast, here in the United States. The first is from Jim, a retired pilot, a long-term supporter of the LaRouche movement. He says, "It seems to me that there's several comments which liken Mitt Romney to Obama. Do you see a Soros factor operating behind the scenes, i.e., with Obama nose-diving, the empire shifts popular attention to his fascist, nominal opposite?"

LaRouche: Right on the mark! Exactly on the mark! Every bit, every fact is exactly on the mark. It's exactly that. That's the story on Mitt Romney. And we've got a study on his operations and how they were run: That's *exactly* what it is. Enough said.

Ogden: We're pulling together some background intelligence on this case, right now.

But, on a similar question, now, people are worried

obviously, because you have a bunch of clowns who are supposedly the opposition to Obama. So, Natalia, who's also a LaRouchePAC supporter in the Midwest, says, "Mr. LaRouche, I would like to know, how can we find, finance, and positively get elected a new FDR, and is it too late in the election year to able to do that?"

LaRouche: It's never too late to win a war, when you consider the alternative. And this is a war. It's a war against oligarchism. And we're trying to get people to get the guts—.

What 'Democracy' Should Mean

Now, you know, people make a mistake on "democracy." Democracy's often a badly used word. Because people don't understand what it *should* mean, as opposed to what they think it means. The essential thing is that mankind must progress. For man to progress, that means that mankind must develop. That development is partly physical powers, but it's primarily intellectual powers, it's a development of the intellect of the human individual, which is the essence of this question of proper power.

LPAC-TV Weekly Report



Each Wednesday afternoon, Lyndon LaRouche sits down with LPAC-TV Weekly Report host John Hoefle and two guests from the "Basement" scientific team and/or the LaRouchePAC editorial staff, for an in-depth discussion of the most important issues of the week, be they political, economic, strategic, or scientific.

www.larouchepac.com



JPL/NASA

“The beacon today is Mars: that mankind must be developed, so that mankind has the power to reach Mars, and to develop it. . . .” Shown, an artist’s representation of the Mars Reconnaissance Orbiter.

Now, therefore, some people will say, the number of people who vote for something means the law. It shouldn’t! It shouldn’t. Now, you don’t do that by decree, but you do it by scaring the shame out of anybody who’s on the wrong side on that question. As I did today: These people, these members of Congress, some of whom I have a liking for personally, but they’re acting like asses. They’re cowardly asses! And you know, you say to them, “Let us bray,” and that’s what—. The point is, you can ridicule, or whatever you have to do to get these people to stop being stupid! And the people do not have a right to be stupid. They shouldn’t wish to be stupid! And therefore, you’re not oppressing them when you tell them not to be stupid.

But what we have is, people are being stupid; they’re being corrupted. They like something, they want the sense of pleasure. They get a little more money than the next person—it’s pleasure; they get something they think is fancier than somebody else is wearing—they think it’s pleasure. And they don’t think about the fact that real pleasure is something that comes to you when you know you’re about to die: It’s the pleasure of knowing that you lived a good life, and

you’ve made a contribution to the future of humanity. And those thoughts—that’s what must be taught in schools. That’s what must be taught in politics!

I’ve often seen, in my own experience, in management consulting and so forth, that the greatest pleasure, in this sort of thing, is to take somebody who’s confused, but they want to accomplish something, and to be able to assist them in accomplishing something which they can claim is their own. You may have inspired them to do it. You may have helped to teach them to do it, but it’s *their* right, it’s *their* accomplishment: It belongs to them! And you want people to grab for what really belongs to them and should belong to them, their

own sense of their achievement in life. And they’ve got to have a sense that what they’re doing, *also*, is going to be reflected in what the people down the line are going to benefit from.

And therefore, the idea of doing good: Sometimes the phrase “to do good,” which was often used in the United States—that’s the term—it’s often made silly. But to do good, is what Benjamin Franklin did, in actually creating the United States, with his leadership, from having left the Boston area and gone into Pennsylvania, and been the spark, internationally, that made the United States possible, resting on what had happened in the previous century. And that’s goodness. That’s a good product. And the good product is a human being who makes the world after him or her, better.

Ogden: I think Franklin said, at the end of his life, to his son, or his grandson: If you think that what I have done has been useful to the world, you can thank Cotton Mather, because when I read his *Essays To Do Good* when I was a young child, that’s what shaped my entire life.

LaRouche: Good.

War Avoidance Efforts Grow; But Brits Push Conflict

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Jan. 20—A highly placed U.S. intelligence official has emphasized in discussions over the past 24 hours that the U.S. military, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, has gone to extraordinary lengths to avoid the eruption of a global war over the Strait of Hormuz. Despite months of British and Israeli war propaganda about Iran's imminent nuclear weapon breakout, it is no longer credible to claim that Iran is months away from producing a nuclear bomb. So now, London and its Israeli satrapy have shifted their focus to provoking a military incident in the Strait of Hormuz, between the U.S. Navy and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC).

According to the source, the Pentagon has ordered all U.S. naval assets in the region to pull back from chokepoints where any kind of incident at sea might occur. While there is a tremendous buildup of U.S. carrier-centered naval forces in the area, those forces have been largely pulled back into the Arabian Sea, where the danger of a brush-fire incident with IRGC speed boats is at a minimum. U.S. Navy ship commanders have been told that the standing authorization to fire on menacing vessels within a certain range is frozen, to further minimize the risk that a minor incident might flare up into a larger war.

The great fear, the source said, is that Israel will stage either a full-scale attack on Iran's nuclear facilities at Natanz and/or Bushehr, or a more limited sabo-

tage incident, aimed at blocking any talks between Washington and Tehran on the range of security issues. The source stated that the U.S. is *already* engaged in the preliminary phases of direct talks with Iran, through three channels, including Turkey and the Swiss ambassador, that reach directly to the Supreme Leader (and ultimate decision-maker) Ayatollah Khamenei. It is expected, barring some major sabotage, that the talks will begin in Turkey in mid-February or soon after, under the UN Security Council P5+1 framework.

No U.S. Role in Roshan Killing

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Defense Secretary Panetta both responded forcefully and immediately, after the assassination of Iranian scientist Mostafa Roshan, denying any American involvement. It was believed that the assassination was directly aimed at blocking the talks from going forward. The cancellation of the joint U.S.-Israeli "Austere Challenge" missile defense maneuvers, scheduled for April, was a direct U.S. retaliation for the assassination.

The greatest fear, according to the intelligence source, and a second source involved with the U.S. Central Command (Centcom), is that Israel will launch an attack on Iran following a minor incident at sea involving the IRGC and U.S. Navy. Such an attack would



U.S. Navy/Mass Communication Specialist 3rd Class Joshua Keim

Defense Secretary Panetta and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, joined by Hillary Clinton's State Department, are fully committed to avoiding the outbreak of war over the Strait of Hormuz. Shown: Navy personnel man a machine gun aboard the guided-missile destroyer USS Dewey, as it transits through the Strait of Hormuz, November 2011.

force the United States into an all-out war with Iran, and the consequences could be global war, including thermonuclear war. Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is in Israel today, delivering the toughest warning ever to Israel against any action against Iran.

The intelligence source concluded by emphasizing that “the fact that the war avoidance has succeeded over the past 45 days is a monumental achievement. But,” he added, “this was a very, very short-term success, and the challenges will continue.” He explained that the United States is taking a risk, attempting to resume direct negotiations with Iran (via the P5+1), while also proceeding with very strong sanctions. He added that, based on the past five years’ experience with the Iranians, it is believed that pressure must be applied to get Khamenei to reach a final agreement and abide by it.

At the same time, such harsh sanctions drive the situation towards confrontation. “It is a very delicate balance,” the source admitted. He noted that, between the radical elements within the Revolutionary Guard

and British control over the Netanyahu government in Israel and Obama in the United States, the British believe, for the moment, that the momentum is towards war. Therefore, they do not have to overplay their hand. If the prospects of a peace deal with Iran improve, then the British will intervene, using every tool at their disposal, to sabotage the process.

Lyndon LaRouche commented on the source’s evaluation: The British will never cooperate on any peace deal. The only option is to defeat the British, and that is where we must continue to build up the clout to block the war drive. This makes it all the more obvious why Obama has to be removed from office. LaRouche added that the United States and Russia, working in cooperation, can strike a deal with


Iran that would benefit all parties.

Russia Weighs In

At a widely publicized news conference on Jan. 18, Russia’s Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov made clear that Russia will never again allow the UN Security Council to be whipsawed into giving support to a NATO regime-change war, as happened in Libya. Summarizing the major foreign policy events of 2011, Lavrov said that 2012 would see the continuation of the “Arab Awakening,” and related events pose serious challenges. He warned against international powers meddling in the internal affairs of sovereign nations. “Nations should be free to choose what path of development they wish to follow and the international community should accept their choice. Foreign countries should refrain from interfering, let alone the use of force. What is happening in one country has nothing to do with what goes on in others. Other countries should focus on their own business and abide by the principle of ‘Do No Harm.’”

A repetition of the Libya scenario has to be avoided

FIGURE 1
The Strait of Hormuz



at all costs, Lavrov cautioned. Unfortunately, some Western countries attempted to pursue a similar scenario by offering their so-called assistance for resolving the crisis in Syria, he said. He made clear that Russia intends to obstruct a UN Security Council resolution on military intervention for Syria. Moscow has proposed a draft resolution which stipulates non-interference and non-use of force, and China supported this wording, Lavrov said. As for the Western partners, they disagree on these two points, and this cannot but cause concern.

On the issue of Iran, Lavrov was explicit:

“New unilateral sanctions against Iran are designed to stifle the Iranian economy and sow discontent among the Iranian people. Russia is confident that the chances for the talks between the six mediator countries and Iran to resume are quite good.”

Even though Tehran is not easy to deal with, it is willing to embark on a dialogue with the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) and to allow inspections

of its nuclear facilities. But the West itself isn’t always helpful at promoting such a dialogue. For example, the U.S. and Iran have had no diplomatic relations for 30 years, as Washington continues to insist that Iran is posing a major threat to global security.

Lavrov also was adamant that Russia will use all the resources at its disposal, including its nuclear capabilities, to thwart any efforts to alter the nuclear balance in Eurasia. Referring to the Obama Administration’s abrupt shut-off of long-running negotiations with Russia on joint deployment of a missile defense shield for Europe’s southern tier, he told journalists: “The logic behind Russia’s stance is crystal clear. Russia will respond in an appropriate way if someone dares to deploy weapons which pose a threat to its national security near its borders. As for our U.S. partners, their motives are hard to grasp. On the one hand, they are saying that their missile defense plans are not aimed at breaking the nuclear balance. They argue that the missile defense shield is needed to guarantee them protection against missiles which could appear in countries outside Europe. On the other hand, they reject our offer to create a joint missile defense system which would pursue these very purposes.”

Looking to the P5+1

The timing of Lavrov’s annual review was noteworthy. The very next day, he met with Ali Baqeri, the deputy secretary of the Iranian Supreme National Security Council, to discuss the Russian and Iranian positions going into the anticipated P5+1 talks, expected to resume within a month in Turkey. The Iranian Supreme National Security Council reports directly to Khamenei and will be the deliberative body through which Iran will decide how to handle the P5+1 negotiations. Immediately after his consultations in Moscow, Baqeri flew to Beijing for similar consultations with the Chinese leadership.

According to a senior U.S. intelligence source familiar with the Russia-Iran talks, the Russians made several points clear to the visitor from Tehran. First, Russia is adamantly opposed to any military action against Iran,



CCTV News

At a Jan. 18 news conference, Russia's Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov strongly defended the principle of national sovereignty: "Foreign countries should refrain from interfering, let alone the use of force.... Other countries should ... abide by the principle of 'Do No Harm.'"

and will veto any Security Council resolution aimed at giving authorization for any kind of military action. Second, however, Russia is equally opposed to Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon. Russia will fully support Iran's development of nuclear power, but shares "80%" of the legitimate American and European concerns about a nuclear arms race in the Persian Gulf. In the talks, according to the source, Lavrov went out of his way to make clear to the Iranians that, under no circumstances was Russia interested in being dragged into a war in the Persian Gulf, and he strongly warned the Iranians against allowing any provocations to trigger such a conflict.

LaRouche expressed confidence that, if the United States and Russia were to work in a coordinated fashion, a viable agreement could be reached. However, with Obama in the White House, any such prospects of cooperative diplomacy were illusive. The deployment of Project Democracy fanatic Michael McFaul to Moscow as the new U.S. ambassador was the latest reminder that Obama is a British pawn, and will do everything possible to sabotage any U.S.-Russia-China war avoidance collaboration. According to sources inside the Obama Administration, McFaul was sent to Moscow with orders to report directly to President Obama, bypassing Secretary of State Clinton, who had successfully cultivated cooperative relations both with Lavrov and with Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin.

Strong Russian Warnings

In the absence of this vital Russian-American war avoidance collaboration, Russia has been forced to continue to stress the danger of a thermonuclear showdown in the event of any eruption of conflict in the volatile Persian Gulf or Eastern Mediterranean. Sergei Konovalov, military correspondent of the daily *Nezavisimaya Gazeta*, on Jan. 16, continued his series of articles on Russian military alertness to a threatened U.S. and/or Israeli attack on Iran. In a Dec. 15 article, Konovalov had warned, "One could assume Iran's reaction will not be delayed. A full-scale war is possible, and its consequences could be unpredictable." LaRouche commented on that earlier article, that the psychological warfare aspect of Konovalov's undoubtedly truthful report about Russian military planning should be taken into account, along with its literal implications.

Konovalov's Jan. 16 article likewise has both elements: He writes about "large-scale staff exercises being planned by the Russian General Staff, based on a possible U.S.-Israeli attack on Iran"—which exercises are scheduled for September. At the same time, putting the report out now dramatizes the danger of a global showdown far sooner, especially insofar as Konovalov notes that the Russian Strategic Missile Forces will be involved.

Konovalov reports that the General Staff is preparing the script for the Caucasus-2012 maneuvers, which, he writes, "will differ from last year's exercises in this series, by being larger-scale and more closely approximating actual current military and political conditions." They will be held in southern Russia, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Armenia. Konovalov states that the scenario of the exercises will include "a possible war by the U.S.A. and several other countries against Iran, as well as other possible conflicts in the Caspian and Southern Caucasus region."

"We should note," he adds, "that this year, the exercises will be not merely tactical/operational, but strategic in nature." Konovalov explains that that means the participation of staffs from all branches of the Russian armed forces—including the Strategic Missile Corps and Aerospace Defense Forces. Those are the forces that would be engaged in a nuclear war with the United States.

Al-Jazeera Demystified

EIR's Stockholm Bureau chief Hussein Askary pulls back the curtain on the British origins of the Arabic news service.

While BBC Arabic Television itself may be dead, its editorial spirit, its style and even its programmes, albeit under different names, live on—transmitted from the tiny Gulf State of Qatar. Al-Jazeera (the Peninsula) Satellite Television went on air at the beginning of last November [1996], staffed chiefly by ex-members of BBC Arabic Television, and headed by Chief Editor, Sami Haddad, a skilled broadcaster and former Current Affairs Editor with BBC Arabic Radio at Bush House for many years.

—Ian Richardson, *Al-Quds Al-Arabi*,
April 21, 1997

Jan. 16—Any discussion of Al-Jazeera TV's sinister role in the current developments in North Africa and Southwest Asia, and the role of the State of Qatar, should be seen in light of the above words by Ian Richardson, published London-based Arabic daily *Al-Quds Al-Arabi*. Although not telling the whole truth, he gave a useful account of the shutting down of BBC Arabic on April 21, 1996, and the birth of Al-Jazeera a few months later. The Saudis were behind the shutdown of the BBC Arabic service because they were the financiers of the operation, and when they collided with the British Empire's "permanent interests" which know no "permanent allies," they closed the money spigot and shut off the satellite supply from the Saudi-owned Orbit Communication Corporation which was providing the transmission for BBC Arabic.

Richardson was the managing editor and creator of BBC Arabic Television News. According to his own biography, he had previously held such sensitive "news"/intelligence collector functions for the British Foreign Office-run news agency as: editor, BBC World Service Newsgathering; BBC World Service field co-ordinator for the Gorbachov-Reagan-Bush summits; and BBC World Service field co-ordinator

for the Tienanmen Square uprising, Beijing (<http://www.richardsonmedia.co.uk/>).

From its inception, Al-Jazeera TV was one tool among many, of British intelligence and cultural warfare (disinformation war), born out of a crisis created by the British themselves, involving Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other actors. The aim of the British was to order the affairs of the region and the world, at a time that London was preparing the permanent "war on terror" and crisis management and dictatorship rule, currently in process in the United States, the EU, and other parts of the world.

The period Richardson was referring to, when the transmutation of BBC Arabic into Al-Jazeera Satellite

THE FAILED DREAM THAT LED TO AL-JAZEERA
Ian Richardson on Britain's role in the birth of the Arabic channel...



Sunday, 21 April, 1996, is a date that will forever be burnt into my memory and the memories of the 150 or so former staff of BBC Arabic Television. It was the day that I killed off, at just over an hour's notice, my baby: a television service launched with high hopes and, given a fair wind, one that could have brought about sweeping changes in the media in the Arab world - not just in the Middle East and North Africa, but also in Europe and the US; indeed any country that had a substantial Arab community.

Ian Richardson's website: The photo shows the Arabic BBC crew which later became Al-Jazeera. Although not telling the whole truth, Richardson's article gives a useful account of the shutting down of BBC Arabic in 1996, and the birth of Al-Jazeera a few months later.

TV occurred, was a turbulent one, which started when the current Emir of Qatar, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani (a British Sandhurst Military Academy graduate) carried out a palace coup against his father Khalifa bin Hamad Al-Thani in June 1995. Hamad was assisted by his cousin, the current Foreign Minister Hamad bin Jasim Al-Thani. The elder Khalifa, who was abroad at the time of the coup, sought help from Saudi Arabia and Egypt, the two most powerful Arab countries, in a counter-coup which failed in February 1996.

A massive diplomatic crisis took place, involving Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt. Nineteen Saudis were implicated in the failed counter-coup, many of whom were later sentenced to death (but execution was suspended) or life imprisonment. Unconfirmed reports allege that the young Sheikh Hamad was assisted by foreign powers to stay in power, in spite of the fact that major regional powers and part of the ruling family were against him. What is known, however, is that the Queen of England and her government were the first to acknowledge the new ruler of Qatar.

Meanwhile, in Saudi Arabia

Simultaneous with these developments, Saudi Arabia was being targeted by an operation run from London to destabilize the Al-Saud dynasty, ironically the most important ally of the British Empire and its largest weapons importer. What was involved is partially a succession fight inside the Al-Saud family (due to King Fahad bin Abdul-Aziz's failing health, caused by a stroke in 1995), which the British wanted to steer to preserve the special relationship between the Kingdom and Britain. But what was more important strategically, was to shape the relationship between Saudi Arabia and the United States of America.

As has been extensively documented by *EIR*, the British policy vis-à-vis the U.S. republic since the death of President Franklin Roosevelt has been to involve the U.S. in permanent wars in Asia, and prevent any strategic-economic alliance among the U.S., Russia, and China. British foreign and intelligence policy manages that by playing the special friend and ally with the U.S. in imperial wars and adventures around the world. Smaller nations, such as the Arab governments in the Middle East are treated like useful tools, that can be treated harshly when they do not fall in line with the British schemes, and nicely, if they do.

King Fahad, under whom the British-Saudi Al-Yamamah weapons contract was consolidated, and the Afghan War financed, had become unpopular because

he had invited the U.S. military forces to the Muslim Holy Land of "Al-Haramain" (Saudi Arabia) in 1990 to help expel Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait after the Iraqi invasion. The U.S. established a permanent air base near Al-Khobar, which gradually became the target of fanatic sections in the Wahhabi clergy and factions of the Al-Saud family.

One Osama bin Laden, a former CIA-MI6-backed asset in the Afghan War against the Soviets, established an office in London for an advocacy group called the Committee for the Defense of Legitimate Rights (CDLR). In 1994, the CDLR started lobbying for support and signatures targeting the Saudi-American cooperation and King Fahad. While the office of the CDLR was manned by Western-clothed political activists Saad Al-Fagih and Mohammad Al-Masaari—two political refugees granted asylum and protection in Britain—along with bin Laden's close friend Khalid Al-Fawwaz, the manifestos and press releases calling for the overthrow of the King, forcing the U.S. armed forces out of the Holy Land, and establishing a true Wahhabi state, were all signed by bin Laden.

All Saudi attempts to convince the British government to shut down the CDLR offices or expel its members from Britain failed. At the time, Britain was fighting legal charges from dozens of countries in Asia and North Africa for hosting all types of terrorist groups which were actively planning, recruiting for, and funding massacres and terror-bombings throughout Asia and North Africa. The British government and Parliament's official defense line against these charges was that the British Empire's laws allow such activities on British soil as long as these terror activities do not harm British interests!

On Nov. 13, 1995, a car bomb killed five U.S. and two Indian citizens at the offices of the Saudi National Guard in Riyadh. This car bombing led the U.S. forces stationed at Khobar Towers to raise the threat condition alert.

In spite of that pre-warning and state of alert, a massive truck-bomb attack on the U.S. Air Force base on June 25, 1996, killed 19 U.S. servicemen. This led many intelligence analysts to suspect that a faction in the Saudi family, specifically active in the National Guard under Crown Prince Abdullah, was behind the attack, or at least facilitated it. The Saudis misled the U.S. into believing that the Iranian-backed Hezbollah in Lebanon was behind the attack, allegedly managing to smuggle a truckload of explosives across the borders of four countries with tight security, from Lebanon to Saudi Arabia!

It was revealed later in FBI chief Louis Freeh's memoir, *My FBI*, that it was Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi ambassador to the United States, who suggested that Iran and Hezbollah be investigated as the possible culprits. Bandar made this the leading issue in the mind of Freeh in a private meeting in Bandar's residence the day after the attack. Then Bandar personally, along with Saudi intelligence, constructed a long trail of false evidence to lead Freeh and FBI to the conclusion that Iran was behind the attack.

Interestingly, President Bill Clinton and Attorney General Janet Reno did not buy this story pushed by the Saudis. It was not until George W. Bush was in the White House that an indictment against a group of allegedly Hezbollah-affiliated Saudi-Shia citizens and a Lebanese, was issued on June 21, 2001, by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Freeh went on later to become Prince Bandar's lawyer to help whitewash him of charges related to the Al-Yamamah corruption and bribery case in the U.S. As documented thoroughly by *EIR*,¹ Al-Yamamah was the Anglo-Saudi arms deal which created the slush funds to finance the mujahideen fighters around the world, and even the 9/11 hijackers, by Bandar and his wife, personally.

Suicide attacks against U.S. targets in Saudi Arabia continued all through the 1990s, up to the most bloody attack on the Vinnell Company compound in Riyadh in May 2003, in which 35 civilians were killed and 200 wounded.

Eventually, and conveniently, the U.S. air base was moved to the tiny and protected state of Qatar, where the As Sayliyah Army Base served as the air operations center for the next American war against Iraq, in March 2003.

Bin Laden, who, in 1994-96, was not known inter-



Osama bin Laden, pictured in an Al-Jazeera report on Nov. 3, 2010. Bin Laden, in the mid-1990s, was advised by Saudi intelligence to move from Sudan to Afghanistan and enjoy the protection of the Saudi-assets, the Mujahideen, and later, the Taliban.



These two anti-Saudi press releases were sent by bin Laden from London in 1994-95, where he established an office for the Advise and Reform Committee (ARC), later, the Committee for the Defense of Legitimate Rights (CDLR). Bin Laden's signature appears above the group's address in London.(below)



1. Jeffrey Steinberg, "Scandal of the Century Rocks British Crown and the City," *EIR*, June 22, 2007.

nationally, struck a deal with the Al-Saud family (reportedly through Prince Turki bin Faisal, the director of Saudi Intelligence at the time) to prevent him from being extradited from Sudan, where he resided until 1996, to either Saudi Arabia or the United States. The Sudanese government was willing to cooperate with the U.S., but was told to let bin Laden leave, to travel to Afghanistan. He was advised by Saudi intelligence to go there and enjoy the protection of the Saudi assets, the mujahideen, and later, the Taliban.

In the meantime, bin Laden changed the nature of his operations to target only U.S. interests instead of the Al-Saud regime. This was inaugurated with the twin car bombings of the U.S. embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, in August 1998, and the official announcement of the creation of al-Qaeda. This paved the way for the next British move, forcing the United States into “a permanent war against terrorism,” rather than dealing with other urgent issues, such as the collapsing financial and economic system.

At the same time, the British brought the Saudis more into line with their policies, succession fights aside, after giving them a lesson in who is the master who can pull the strings of the different players. Terrorism and media control were two essential instruments in the game.

Back to BBC Arabic

Following the first terrorist attacks in Riyadh in 1995, the BBC Arabic began, in early 1996, to broadcast regular interviews with bin Laden’s CDLR office managers Al-Fagih and Al-Masaari, as “experts” on Saudi affairs, giving them ample freedom to attack the Al-Saud family, and to give marching orders to the opposition inside the country. This enraged the Saudi royal family, who themselves were financing BBC Arabic. The British government and the BBC waived the station’s “independent editorial policy” in the face of the Saudi objections. So, instead of presenting obsolete legal arguments, the Saudis simply turned off the switches at the Orbit satellite service provider of BBC Arabic on April 21, 1996.

It is not clear yet how the decision to move BBC Arabic to Qatar to create Al-Jazeera was made, and which British and Qatari officials were involved in the deal. But one thing is clear: The British helped the new Qatari Emir, who was in a propaganda war against the Saudis and Egyptians, to stay in power and to boost his ego. The propaganda from Al-Jazeera was targeting

Saudi Arabia and Egypt specifically, and therefore, it had to bring the most viral opponents of these regimes on air. This meant bin Laden and his sympathizers, and the Egyptian Islamists.

But in order to acquire popularity in the eyes of the large Arab population in the Middle East and North Africa, Al-Jazeera started criticizing the government and leaders of these regions. This was taboo in these countries, where the mass media was totally controlled by the regimes. Of course, the only government which was not criticized was the Qatari government itself, which was investing enormous amounts of financial resources in the Al-Jazeera satellite TV.

However, the largest boost in popularity for Al-Jazeera was due to its anti-American and anti-Israeli propaganda. While it is clear that the U.S. and Israel have had a terrible, and often criminal record of abuses against the Arab nations, especially the Palestinians and Iraqis, little attention was paid to the British origins of the political crises in the region. Al-Jazeera’s mission seemed to be to paint a world dominated by American imperialists who are controlled by the Zionist Lobby.

As long as the U.S. behaves as a dumb giant who tramples on everyone and everything in its way, and not as the republic the U.S. Founding Fathers meant it to be, the British will always come out on top. The CIA cannot run the world; it cannot even defend the soil of the U.S., as was evident in the 9/11 events. To be good at killing large numbers of people (the majority of whom turn out to be innocent civilians) does not make a great intelligence agency.

Missing is the legendary “human intelligence” which relies on understanding history, culture, and science. British intelligence is a master of this, but only the dark side of the matter, and therefore, the world will not be rid of this plague as long as the U.S. is led by either Republicans or Democrats with a weakness for monarchist-oligarchical systems. British intelligence is like the Venetian Iago Shakespeare and Verdi warned us of. “*Credo in un Dio crudel,*” says Iago in Verdi’s *Otello*: “I believe in a cruel God.” The Qataris, Saudis, and Americans are merely the Othellos, Cassiuses, and Desdemonas, who are being manipulated by the false friend Iago.

It is often the ironies and paradoxes which reveal the truth. While Qatar-owned Al-Jazeera was sympathizing with and propagating the ideology of bin Laden and al-Qaeda, and overtly supporting the Saddam Hussein regime, American bombers were taking off from Qatar’s As Sayliya base to bomb Iraq and Afghanistan.

While Al-Jazeera was defending the Palestinians, Qatari leaders were playing the peace-makers and friends of the Israeli government, who were killing the Palestinians in Jenin and Gaza.

Now that the British drive for a world war assumes the highest priority, all assets have to be directed towards the same goal. Therefore, Al-Jazeera, and Qatar behind it, have been mending their relations with the Saudis. The 19 Saudis who were waiting for death sentences or life imprisonment in Qatar were pardoned and released in 2011, and Emir Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani reaffirmed his state's commitment to the teachings of the extreme Wahhabi sect when he inaugurated the Imam Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wahhab Mosque in Doha in December 2011, as a gesture of good faith towards the Saudis.

Exploiting the 'Arab Spring'

Now the Saudi and Qatari media machines have joined their efforts, exploiting the Arab Spring revolts to help in the violent regime-change operations of the British and NATO. Qatari foreign policy, and its military and financial resources, are fanatically geared

toward this operation, as was evident in the war in Libya, and now in Syria. Qatar is currently in a hysterical drive to assert itself as a military and economic "superpower." The hubristic leaders of Qatar may not realize that they are being prompted to play that role for the moment, but in the event of a regional or global war, this tiny state can be trampled by the real superpowers. The financial resources, and previously excellent diplomatic position and initiatives the Qatari state was undertaking, have been exchanged for a luxurious suite on the sinking *Titanic* of the British Empire.

Further such expansion of this war policy to target Iran, which is not in the interest of Qatar or the Arab nations, will lead to the destruction of the whole region. This is a tragedy for everyone, but which can actually be prevented, if real "intelligence" replaces the weird notions of what intelligence policy consists of, and what the aim of intelligence operations is.

Executive Intelligence Review and its founder Lyndon LaRouche have laid out the foundations of such an intelligence function within the republican form of society, as opposed to the oligarchical principle of Empire and its hatred of beauty and human creativity.

EIR SPECIAL REPORT

The True Story Behind The Fall of the House of Windsor

Reprints of EIR's 1994-1997 groundbreaking exposés

What political battles lie behind the assassination of Princess Diana?
Why do 22 out of 30 top terrorist groups have their headquarters in London?
EIR's series on the House of Windsor is indispensable for understanding today's news.

The Coming Fall of the House of Windsor
(Oct. 28, 1994)

The Sun Never Sets on the New British Empire
(May 24, 1996)

Britain's "Invisible" Empire Unleashes the Dogs of War
(Aug. 22, 1997)

Epilogue: Can the House of Windsor Survive Diana's Death?
(Sept. 12, 1997)



EIR News Service <http://www.larouchepub.com>
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390 Order number EIR 97-004 \$50

Movisol Takes Lead in Anti-Austerity Fight

by Nancy Spannaus

Jan. 20—Tuscany taxi union leader and Movisol representative Claudio Giudici is becoming well-known throughout Italy, after numerous TV and radio shows interviewed “the taxi driver who wrote to the *Financial Times*” (see interview, below). Giudici is turning the spotlight on the solutions to the existential financial crisis facing Italy and the trans-Atlantic financial system: those laid out for decades by Lyndon LaRouche.

Giudici’s most prominent intervention was on the Jan. 12 political TV talk show Servizio Pubblico, where he was interviewed by journalist Michele Santoro. In a discussion viewed by an estimated 1.7 million people, Giudici exposed the government’s intention to liberalize (deregulate) businesses including taxi drivers, pharmacists, news vendors, etc., as “a weapon of mass distraction,” to avoid addressing the real economic problems. He also called for a Glass-Steagall-like banking separation, and invited the host to interview LaRouche.

In the immediate aftermath of this appearance came two significant developments. First, Prime Minister Mario Monti’s office agreed to a meeting with the national taxi union, Uritaxi, on Jan. 17, prior to the time the government was scheduled to implement the measures that represent an attack on their standard of living. Second, there was a further explosion of media coverage, including the re-airing of an April 25, 2003 Italian TV interview with LaRouche, which showed him, in the words of the TV host, to have been a “prophet” on the economic crisis.

Taking on Monti

Monti’s attacks “aim at exploiting the lower instincts of the population to create a real war among the poor,” Giudici said in his Servizio Pubblico interview. Monti presents workers, such as taxi drivers, as privileged. The real problem, he continued, is that in 1993, the Draghi Act “abolished the Glass-Steagall standard. That is the principle of separation between investment banks and commercial banks. Commercial banks are those banks that use our money, give it to business, to families; investment banks are those banks that speculate. . . . Today, we should be speaking about reforming the banking system. We must go back to Franklin Roosevelt. Unfortunately, they push Adam Smith!”

Giudici’s polemics were well-received by the overwhelmingly young audience, both those in the studio as well as the viewers at home. Soon after his intervention (see <http://www.movisol.org/audioupdate.htm>), hundreds of comments were posted on Facebook, mostly of this sort:

- “Think about that: a taxi driver knows more than an economist, professor, senator for life, Chairman of the Council of ministers, former university dean and friend of the State president.”
- “I would propose this taxi driver as minister for Finance and Reforms and maybe even interim Prime Minister. Great!”
- “A genius. The reference to epistemology is sensational.”

Giudici also appeared on the Raiuno “Uno Mattina” morning program, and the national radio show Radio24,



Italian taxi strikers, Jan. 13, Milan: The sign, addressed to the prime minister, says, “Mario Monti Back Off!”

among others, and was interviewed by *Il Foglio* on Jan. 14. Meanwhile, taxi drivers staged spontaneous protest actions in large cities, and in some cases suspended their service.

Then, LaRouche

Clearly, Giudici's message, as well as the long-term intervention of the LaRouche movement in top Italian political circles, resonated far beyond the taxi union "issue." On Jan. 17, Raidue announced that it would feature LaRouche on its evening program. Veteran journalist Giovanni Minoli produced a documentary on the financial crisis, starting off with an interview given in 2003, with LaRouche, in which he forecast the coming collapse of the financial system.

The 40-minute program started with a video clip from that interview, with a close shot of LaRouche saying: "The entire financial and monetary system is close to a collapse."

It then shifted to Minoli in studio, who said: "These words were spoken in May 2003; I repeat, May 2003, by a prominent American economist, Lyndon LaRouche."

Again the 2003 video, with the introduction: "LaRouche is an economist who sounds like a preacher, with a record of prophecies that would make Nostradamus jealous: From the fall of the Berlin Wall to the collapse of the Internet bubble." It then reports what LaRouche's detractors say, and what his admirers say. "The Mighty Ones want to shut him up; the Vatican, Russians, and Chinese receive him with honor."

Then LaRouche is shown explaining his "Triple Curve" (http://www.larouchepub.com/lar/2002/2903trip_curve.html), explaining at length why the system is going to collapse.

Then, Minoli in 2012: "In substance, we have, above, the financial curve: paper without production. And below, the production curve. The two curves are increasingly distant. But when did this rush start?"

Again a clip from the 2003 interview, with LaRouche saying: "In 1964, along with the Indo-China war, there was a shift from a producer economy to a consumer economy. The United States and Great Britain started to loot Third World economies. Great Britain wanted to build a new Empire based on the model of the Roman Empire. People have not yet realized it, but we have destroyed our productive sector, industry and agriculture. The very support of the financial economies was destroyed."

LaRouche then explains the difference between a conjunctural crisis and a collapse crisis.

Next, Minoli says: "And the collapse has come, at least this is the perception among people today."

Following the section with LaRouche, which lasts about five minutes, the program reconstructs the "counterposition between financial and real economy," from 1929 to the present day. The reconstruction is biased with the prominent (and wrong) role attributed to John Maynard Keynes, and other approximations, but it shows nevertheless how the phase of prosperity inaugurated by President Franklin Roosevelt and revived by President Kennedy came to an end, first with Thatcher, then with Reagan. The fall of Communism was the victory of free-market ideology and the triumph of Von Hayek, but the outbreak of the global financial crisis showed that free-market ideology has failed, it stated.

It concluded with a patchwork of previous programs but, according to *EIR* sources, was aimed exclusively at boosting LaRouche. Indeed, the video posted now on the Raidue replay site does not have the original headline ("Krisi"), but is simply headlined "Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche."

The Next Step

The fight to defend the living standards of the population against the push for radical free-market reforms will now likely expand. The Monti government has an EU mandate to use executive decrees to liberalize and privatize, in the name of "saving the euro."

For the first time in recent memory in Italy, though, protest actions are being undertaken by numerous sectors of the population without being constrained to a single political position; it's not simply the left against a right-wing government, or vice versa. The vast majority of the political class has chosen to go along with the blackmail coming from the financial markets, and thus the population increasingly finds itself fighting against the political and economic institutions as a whole.

Clearly, the spread of this ferment represents both a great opportunity, and a significant danger, if the unrest were to be manipulated and cross the line into violence. The only solution is for key individuals and groupings in society to take prompt action to bury the bankrupt global financial system and begin a shift towards policies that promote the general welfare.

*Claudio Celani and Andrew Spannaus
contributed to this article.*

Italian Taxi Union Leader Puts LaRouche Economics in the Spotlight

Claudio Giudici, the head of the Italian taxi union (Uri-taxi) in Florence, has rocked the euro-bosses back on their heels with his fearless leadership of the resistance to the austerity measures recently imposed by Italy's technocratic government.

Giudici is an activist with Movisol, the LaRouche political movement in Italy; his name is becoming a household word after numerous TV and radio shows interviewed "the taxi driver who wrote to the Financial Times." Giudici's most prominent intervention was on the Jan. 12 popular TV political talk show Servizio Pubblico, conducted by former RAI journalist Michele Santoro. Giudici exposed the government's intention to liberalize professions such as taxi drivers, pharmacists, news vendors, and others as "a weapon of mass distraction," to avoid addressing the real problems. He also called for a Glass-Steagall-like banking separation and invited the host to interview LaRouche.

His interview on Italian TV can be viewed at <http://www.movisol.org/audioupdate.htm>. Coverage can also be found at <http://www.larouchepac.com/node/21168>.

Giudici was interviewed on the weekly Internet radio program, The LaRouche Show (www.larouche.com/pub.com/radio), by host Harley Schlanger, on Jan. 14.

Harley Schlanger: I'd like to welcome to the program a man who is taking on the British Empire, a leader of the taxi union in Florence, Italy, and a political activist, who is challenging the coup against his nation, which is run by agents of the British Empire in the form of Mario Draghi, the new head of the European Central Bank, and [Prime Minister] Mario Monti, who was imposed as a financial dictator of Italy by the City of London.

Claudio Giudici is joining us from Florence, and we will have a translation from [Movisol Secretary] Andrew Spannaus, who is in Milan. So, Claudio, welcome to the program.

Claudio Giudici: Thank you very much. Nice to meet you.

The Monti Government Has Been Blocked

Schlanger: You have become a very famous man in the last weeks, a recognized figure for opposing the euro coup against Italy, with major coverage in the press, including a television clip which I think we're making available on our website. You were on a program watched by well over one and a half million people.

But why don't you begin by telling our listeners what has happened since you and your union of taxi drivers decided to organize opposition to the privatization of your work?

Giudici: The Monti government has essentially been blocked. They're in a situation, at an impasse, for all of their attempts at privatizing and liberalizing, that is, deregulating, various sectors of the Italian economy.

So we are currently in a phase of escalation of our protest. Whereas it started out with leaflets, with working through social networks, with one-to-one communication, now we've gone to a different level in the media, which began with the *Financial Times* in London publishing a letter that I wrote.

So after the *Financial Times* published this letter, then it went to another level, because this had a great deal of resonance in Italy, and the leading media in Italy, have been contacting me, and involved me in both the print media and on television. And now we'll see what happens next.

Schlanger: Claudio, how did you define the issue that caused the response that you got?

Giudici: The response came in particular because what we did is, we denounced, we pointed out the higher level that people have to think on when you consider what's happened, what the Monti government is trying to do. That is, that any attempts at deregulation



Servizio Pubblico
Italian taxi-driver union leader Claudio Giudici (inset), appearing on the TV program Servizio Pubblico (above) Jan. 12. Giudici and his union are successfully challenging the power of the “sharks of global finance” to destroy the nation of Italy.

collapse of the international banking system, financial system, and the attempt to continue with free-market policies—that is, with Adam Smith-style policies—instead of Franklin Roosevelt-style policies, and those of Lyndon LaRouche today.

Schlanger: Now, I saw the interview with you where you brought up the connection of Mario Draghi to the *Britannia*.¹ Are people getting the idea that this is being imposed on Italy from the outside?

Giudici: I don't think that people understand the full process. I think they have an inkling of it, as time goes by. At the beginning, it was very much a gut response to the attacks on the labor force, but each day that goes by, I think people's minds are opening up to the higher level of what's going on.

and privatization of various sectors of the economy—we defined this as strategic for the economy as a whole, and for the entire labor workforce. We compared this, for example, with the fight between [former British Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher and the miners in the United Kingdom; or between [former U.S. President Ronald] Reagan and the air-traffic controllers in the United States.

And then there are two other things that we pointed out. One, we called this an operation of mass distraction. And secondly, we said that this is a way of giving entire sectors of the economy over to what we call the sharks of global finance, people who would come into these sectors and buy them up.

So, this led to a situation where Thursday [Jan. 12], just two days ago, I was on this national TV show which you mentioned, and what I said is that people are being distracted from the real problem: the

‘The Power of Reason’

Schlanger: I saw also that the government has agreed to a meeting with the taxi union, but that you're planning on going ahead with a major demonstration in Rome later this month. Could you tell us about that?

Giudici: On Tuesday [Jan. 17], the government will meet with a delegation of the taxi drivers. However, I think that the government is now in a difficult situation, because what I was able to say in front of millions of viewers on television the other night, has had a very big impact. To speak about Glass-Steagall, Franklin Roos-

1. *Britannia* refers to the British royal yacht by that name, on which deals were made, on June 2, 1992, between City of London bankers and pro-British Italian businessmen, financiers, and civil servants, including the Director General of the Italian Treasury Mario Draghi. The program being implemented in Italy now by Monti has been described as “*Britannia II*” by many commentators.

evelt, and Lyndon LaRouche, and to go after Monti and Draghi the way I did—I think that this has triggered a process that is going to create great problems for this government.

So the strength of these ideas, the power of reason, as LaRouche has called it, is demonstrated by this: that public opinion generally has had a very negative view of taxi drivers. They're seen as dishonest, not having a positive role in society; but the ability to go on to television and speak about these ideas, important ideas in this manner, has started to clean up this image, and get this idea out of people's minds. And it's not me. It's not that I did something great. It's that there are powerful ideas which I was able to talk about, which has brought people's thinking to a different level.

Schlanger: Claudio, this is very important, because this is one of the key points Mr. LaRouche has been making: that you have a bankrupt financial system that can only continue because of the fear of the population to speak of these things. For example, when you speak of Mario Draghi and the *Britannia*—this is something which they tried to keep out of the public discussion, and yet, it's a fact. So, are people now responding on these ideas on a higher level?

Giudici: Yes, it definitely helps people to concentrate on what's really important. It seems that certain ideas are almost magical, in the sense that it helps people get out of the cage, the mental cage that blocks their creative processes, in their everyday life. And now, being able to speak about this higher level, people are freed from this cage, and become more effective in the way that they look at things.

Schlanger: I have another question for you, which I know a lot of Americans are wondering about: How do you get the courage to stand up and say things that other people have been afraid to say?

Giudici: I must say that I haven't thought about this, thought about it in that way. I realize that what I was able to do on Thursday was important, that I was not overwhelmed by the situation, that I was able to



Wikimedia Commons

Mario Monti's attacks "aim at exploiting the lower instincts of the population to create a real war among the poor," Giudici said in his Servizio Pubblico interview.

bring out important ideas in that situation for millions of people. I don't want to disappoint you, but I must say that I haven't really reflected on this interior aspect of how I was able to do it, but more about the fact that I was able to do it.

We Have Nothing To Lose

Schlanger: Well, I think also the fact that somebody *has* to do it. That seems to be one of the problems: that people are waiting for someone else to do it.

Giudici: One thing that I have done, and that I recognize, is that Lyndon LaRouche has been able to see things, and he's been telling us about these processes, ahead of time.

That he's been seeing them from the beginning, and how they developed, and where they're going. So, I listened to what LaRouche has been telling us, and I realized that we do not have a lot of time. And therefore, in a certain sense, we have nothing to lose. We have to have the courage to challenge, and change our own habits about what we're doing in order to fight, and to fight against injustice.

Amelia Boynton Robinson² has said often that either we fight evil, or we become a part of it. And I think that listening to these people, and following these ideas—that's what has helped me do this.

Another aspect that I just thought of right now, during our discussion, is a sense of being part of a team, a team that helps you, that protects you, that encourages you. For example, all the other people who I work with and discuss things with—such as Andrew Spannaus, Claudio Celani, Liliana Gorini, Flavio Tabanelli, Aureliano Ferri—the people in Italy—these are all people in Italy involved in Movisol, in the organization, in the movement here in Italy. I feel a debt to these people, and therefore, when I have the opportunity, I have to be able to transmit ideas, and do things in an effective way. Otherwise, I would have been unable to do what we

2. Amelia Boynton Robinson is an icon of the American Civil Rights Movement, who fought alongside Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, Ala. Mrs. Robinson is well-known in Italy from her many visits there as vice president of the Schiller Institute. She turned 100 years old in 2011.

discussed among ourselves, in public, for the population, which is what I really want to do.

Schlanger: You mentioned Mr. LaRouche’s forecasting. One of the things he has been emphasizing is that the euro system, as part of the trans-Atlantic system, is dead. Last night, the report came out that Standard & Poor’s had just downgraded the debt of France and Austria, among others, and so now we’re seeing a spread of the collapse of the euro. To what extent are you involved in discussing the post-euro system, going back to the lira, national sovereignty, as opposed to this imperial demand for deregulation and austerity?

Giudici: We discuss this often. On radio shows, or talking to other people, and actually, already, two or three years ago, we talked about the ontological failure of the euro system, of the euro, because it does not represent a culture. It does not represent a community of people. So this is an issue we have been working on, and I think that now actually is a time that is very open—the population is very open to being able to understand at this point.

So today, in fact, there’s a leader of a major political party, [former Prime Minister Silvio] Berlusconi’s party actually, surprisingly—and this is to point out that there is a change going on in the population, and even in this case, in the political institutions—a leader of this party named [former Justice Minister Angelino] Alfano—he actually came out today and made a public statement about how the euro, the European Union, are not positive for Italy. So this is a big change, and this is what I mean when I say that the time is ripe for people to understand the problem.

No One Is Too Powerful To Challenge

Schlanger: Claudio, I’d like to thank you very much for joining us, and we’ll make sure that your activity is covered on the LaRouchePAC website. I know it will be on Movisol. Do you have anything to say to the Americans who think that Obama may be too powerful to challenge?

Giudici: There is something I do want to say to the Americans: that *no one* is too powerful. No one is too powerful, if we base our operations, our actions, on truth. Because the truth is powerful, and it’s more powerful than any person. No one can defeat the truth with lies, or in any other way that goes against the truth. Because the truth is actually indestructible. It may take some time, but in the long term, natural law will always win.

Crazed London Steps Up Attacks on Argentina

by Cynthia R. Rush

Jan. 21—London’s repeated provocations and wild accusations that Argentina is preparing an attack against the Malvinas Islands, which the British call the Falklands, suggest that the British Empire could unleash military conflict in yet another region of the planet to serve its global strategic goals.

In a Jan. 18 speech before the British Parliament, Prime Minister David Cameron bellowed that he had convened his National Security Council, which includes the top military brass, in order to send “a clear message” that *Argentina* should stop acting like a “colonial aggressor”!

As Prince William will be deployed as part of the British military presence on the Malvinas for six weeks beginning in February, on the eve of the 30th anniversary of Britain’s 1982 colonial war against Argentina, Cameron announced menacingly that he had ordered the Islands’ military forces to be beefed up, and prepared contingency plans to send a rapid deployment force to the South Atlantic, in the event that Argentina attempted a military attack.

The Prime Minister’s deranged message, which brought immediate denunciations from voices around Ibero-America, is the latest in a series of provocations directed at Argentina over the past several months, causing tensions to intensify. What is driving London’s belligerence?

It’s not just that Argentina continues to claim sovereignty over the Malvinas—even though the British *did* steal the islands outright from Argentina in 1833, in blatant violation of the U.S.’s Monroe Doctrine.

Rather, at the moment that the British Empire’s bankrupt monetary system is breaking apart, Argentina stands as an “in your face” example of a country that successfully defied the City of London, and repudiated those criminal monetarist policies which brought it to its knees in the late 1990s, and led to the largest debt default in history, in December of 2001.

Then-President Néstor Kirchner, who took office in the midst of a catastrophic crisis in 2003, and then his wife and successor, President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, insisted that their nation had the *sovereign* right to economic, scientific, and technological development—that is, a future for their people. They put human

beings' welfare first, ahead of honoring debt paper. The 75% write-down Argentina achieved in its 2005 debt restructuring earned it London's eternal hatred.

In 1982, as Britain pursued its savage colonial war against Argentina for daring to retake the Malvinas in April of that year, Lyndon LaRouche identified that war as a precedent for NATO out-of-area deployments to collect debt. Similarly today, the British are determined to unleash wars and smash the *principle of sovereignty* everywhere, to defend their dying system. The City of London knows that, were the crisis-wracked nations of Europe to follow the Argentine model, by wiping out their speculative debt, this would mean the Empire's demise.

Hence the crazed shrieks of "Greece is *not* Argentina" heard in London over the past period, whenever an analyst suggested that Greece should reject austerity and restructure its debt the way Néstor Kirchner did.

'Britain Synonymous with Colonialism'

Since the current occupant of the White House is unlikely to respond to the Empire's provocative behavior by invoking the Monroe Doctrine, it has been left to Argentina and other Ibero-American governments to say what British tool Barack Obama won't.

"Great Britain is synonymous with colonialism," Argentine Foreign Minister Héctor Timerman pointed out in a Jan. 18 response to Cameron's ravings. He added the next day that the best response to the Prime Minister's accusation would be "to send him a history book as a gift," as Cameron had clearly never studied British history. "It makes no sense that the country that was the symbol of colonialism in the 17th, 18th, 19th, and even the 20th Century, would accuse a country that has been the victim of that colonialism. People are laughing at this." The only option for Britain now, is to enter "into direct negotiations with Argentina" over the Malvinas.

Bolivia, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Peru, and several Central American nations all quickly issued statements supporting Argentina's claim to sovereignty over



Fernando Gens/Telam/cf

Argentine President Cristina Fernández is hated by the British for defending her nation's sovereignty.

the Malvinas, naming Britain as the colonial aggressor.

Britain is out for more than "defending" its colonial enclave in the region, however. Foreign Secretary William Hague has been blunt in recent weeks, saying that Britain intends to reestablish the direct domination it "enjoyed" over Ibero-America as a whole in the 19th Century.

The imperial offensive includes securing Brazil once again as Britain's key strategic asset in the region, the colonial role relegated to Brazil since the Portuguese royal family was carried to Brazilian shores on British warships in 1807 to set up a would-be Brazilian "empire." During his two-day visit there Jan. 18-19, Hague trumpeted during a speech that "the days of Britain's retreat from Latin America are over... We have begun Britain's most ambitious effort to strengthen ties

with Latin America in 200 years."

A few days before his trip, Hague had told the *Daily Telegraph* that Britain is especially interested in Brazil, and bragged of the Cameron government's "trebling, quadrupling of our effort ... into the relationship with Brazil." His trip was the opening of a "U.K.-Brazil strategic dialogue," with the Malvinas, Iran, and Syria, high on the agenda.

But given the breathtaking collapse of the trans-Atlantic financial system, Brazil may not find a strategic alliance with the decaying British Empire to be to its advantage.

During the joint Jan. 18 press conference held by Hague and his Brazilian counterpart Antonio Patriota, the latter did not join Britain's anti-Argentina crusade, pointedly stating that "Hague knows that Brazil, UNASUR [the Union of South American Nations], and I would say, the whole Latin American community and the Caribbean ... support Argentina's sovereignty over the Malvinas, and we support the UN resolutions which urge the British and Argentine governments to dialogue on this issue." Clearly not pleased, Hague could only sputter nonsense about "self-determination of the people of the Falkland Islands."

Stay in Office, Reorganize the Bankrupt Financial System!

Jan. 22—The first weeks of the new year in Germany have witnessed a media witchhunt against President Christian Wulff, over relatively petty suspected financial “irregularities” surrounding a low-interest home loan that he received in 2008 from the wife of a wealthy businessman, while he was the governor of the state of Lower Saxony. Leading the charge are the mass-circulation daily *Bild*, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, and the *Financial Times Deutschland*.

Writing in the weekly *Neue Solidarität* on Jan. 18, Helga Zepp-LaRouche defended Wulff and identified the real issues for which the financial press (especially) is demanding his resignation. These reasons date back to his speech on Aug. 24, 2011 to the Conference of Nobel Prize Laureates in Economics, in Lindau, Germany.

“The issue,” she said, “is not whether Christian Wulff is a great President, or whether he behaved ineptly: The point is that the international financial circles have doubts about whether, given the views expressed in his Lindau speech, he will be willing to sign on to the ‘permanent ESM’ [European Stability Mechanism]. If anyone has damaged the Office of the President, it is not Mr. Wulff, but the media representatives who are running a vicious smear campaign against him, using ‘salami tactics’ for character defamation. These financial circles see the short-term implementation of the (hyperinflationary) ESM as the last chance to stave off the complete collapse of the totally bankrupt trans-Atlantic financial system, at least in the short term.”

She wrote that the same media are to blame for keeping the public in the dark about the fact that the world is on the brink of World War III. Describing the military buildup in the Persian Gulf and Eastern Mediterranean, she emphasized that the origin of the war

danger is the British financier oligarchy—with President Obama as its puppet—and the real targets are Russia and China.

Wulff’s Lindau Speech

Wulff spoke in Lindau on Lake Constance before 17 Nobel Prize Laureates in Economics, 370 young economists from around the world, and the international press. First he gave an overview of the policies of the G20 governments and the continued bailouts. Then he said: “At the German Banking Congress, I warned the financial sector that we’ve neither dealt with the causes of the crisis nor can we say today that we’ve recognized the risks and done everything to eliminate them. In fact, we’re faced with a development which resembles a game of dominoes: First, individual banks rescued other banks; and then, states rescued their banks; and now, the international community is rescuing individual states. But the question that should be asked is: Who will rescue the rescuers?”

Wulff also attacked the European Central Bank (ECB) for its purchases of government bonds, which he described as “legally questionable” and “far beyond its mandate.” Many governments have not yet recognized the seriousness of the situation, he said. “It makes me wonder, when governments wait until the very last minute before showing any willingness to give up benefits and privileges and introduce necessary reforms.” Nations are under pressure, he said, because they let their wretched finances slide for so long. The politicians are letting the banks, rating agencies, and the media “lead them around the circus by a nose ring.” The parliaments are scarcely even involved in the decisions, he said, adding that the burdens will be borne by future generations.

If you take a look at the world map, Zepp-LaRouche



Office of the President

German President Christian Wulff addressing the Lindau Meeting of Nobel Prize Laureates in Economics, Aug. 24, 2011. The British-centered financial oligarchy was not amused by his attack on the euro bailout policy, and has launched a campaign of character assassination against him.

continued, “it is clear that character assassination and regime change are always on the agenda when someone somewhere does something to oppose the interests of the financial oligarchy. When Bill Clinton, in September 1998, called for a reform of the global financial architecture, in a speech before the New York Council on Foreign Relations, the Monica Lewinsky affair was set in motion against him.

A foreign-exchange transaction by the wife of the head of the Swiss National Bank, Philipp Hildebrand, who had campaigned for re-regulation of the banking sector, was played up publicly, and led to his resignation. Regime change is on the agenda for the Hungarian government, which tried to resist the stranglehold of EU dictates.

“And so are we really to believe that the totally disproportionate media campaign against President Wulff just has something to do with his less than complete statements to the Lower Saxony state parliament?

“President Wulff should go on the offensive and bring the statements in his Lindau speech up to date, because the collapse of EU policy is so obvious that it cries out to Heaven. Nowhere is this clearer than in the beleaguered Greece, where thousands of families have had to give up their children because they can no longer feed them; or in Ireland, where the suicide rate

has risen massively. The EU austerity, which corresponds 100% to the interests of the financial oligarchy, is criminal, and is directed 100% against the general welfare. If Wulff were to find the courage to do so, he could turn the tables, and would surely win the thanks of all European peoples and future generations.”

“There is only one way that the danger of war can be averted,” she concluded: “that the underlying dynamic of systemic financial collapse has to be overcome. The only way to do this is to put an end to the failed euro experiment. Only an immediate return to sovereignty over our own currency—that is, a new D-Mark—in conjunction with the immediate introduction of a two-tier banking system in the tradition of the Glass-Steagall Act of Franklin D. Roosevelt, can solve the problem.

“President Wulff still has the chance to make his Presidency a brilliant one, if he would campaign for this alternative.”

Documentation

More from President Wulff’s Lindau [speech](#) (in English):

When the crisis broke out, consensus was quickly reached at global level. Stimulus packages on an unprecedented scale were adopted. There was a rush to aid the financial sector and banks—with taxpayers’ money, state guarantees, and massive monetary transfusions by the central banks. In 2008, the aim was to do everything possible to prevent a collapse and to stabilize the global economy. I would like to point out that all of this was done with the aim of treating the patient, the world economy, as quickly as possible. Today, however, the banking sector is still fragile, public debts in the major economies are at record levels, and in many cases the fundamental problems hindering growth and competitiveness are as present as ever. More time was gained than was actually used to treat

the patient. . . .

At the German Banking Congress, I warned the financial sector that we've neither dealt with the causes of the crisis, nor can we say today that we've recognized the risks and done everything to eliminate them. In fact, we're faced with a development which resembles a game of dominoes. First individual banks rescued other banks and then states rescued their banks, and now the international community is rescuing individual states. But the question that should be asked is: Who will rescue the rescuers? When will the accumulated deficits be distributed among them, and who will shoulder them?

It makes me wonder when governments wait until the very last minute before showing any willingness to give up benefits and privileges and introduce necessary reforms. Especially when the supreme guardians of the currency go way beyond the bounds of their mandate and buy up government bonds on a massive scale—currently more than EU110 billion. In the long term, this cannot and will not be good, and therefore it can be tolerated at best for a short period. The guardians of the currency, too, must quickly find their way back to the agreed principles.

I say this circumspectly: I regard the huge buy-up of government bonds of individual states by the European Central Bank as politically and legally questionable. Article 123 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union prohibits the ECB from directly purchasing debt instruments, in order to safeguard its independence. This prohibition only makes sense if those responsible do not get around it by making substantial purchases on the secondary market. By the way, the indirect purchase of government bonds is even more expensive than direct purchase. Again, actors on the financial markets earn commissions without themselves incurring any risk at all.

One of the fundamental principles of the market economy is this: Risk and liability go hand in hand. Those who take risks might fail. This principle must also apply to the financial sector, to small investors as well as to big institutions. There is an urgent need here to make up for our failings, going far beyond the measures already initiated in the G20. In the end, it is a matter of us all working together to ensure that the financial sector once again takes on a service role and contributes to sustainable global development. We need well-functioning, efficient global capital markets which help to manage risks rather than to create

them. And which bring together capital and ideas—ideas on how to solve the huge tasks facing the world today. . . .

From Wulff's speech to the IG Metall trade union congress in Karlsruhe, Oct. 9, 2011:

The crisis has shown that the industrial core of our economy is priceless! It is a good thing that Germany has not bid farewell to its industry, as others, including neighboring countries of Germany, have done deliberately. All of you here work in industry. You are not building castles in the air; you are not producing bubbles, which then burst if there is no real value behind them. You are producing tangible products that are used worldwide: machinery, equipment, cars, airplanes, ships, power plants. After the Internet bubble in 2000, after the housing bubble in 2007, after the subprime and derivatives bubbles and others things, I appreciate that all the more. . . .

The success of an economically advanced nation depends ultimately on the people. On their confidence, their motivation, their skills. We thrive in the long term if everyone does their part for their own livelihood as well as for the general welfare. . . . These days we are thinking a lot about the future of our Europe. You—the employers, the entrepreneurs, the workers—you earned the money that is now being used extensively to support ailing states and banks, in order to stabilize the euro and the European Union. . . .

Measure and reason must remain our premise, because otherwise there will be gigantic threats to the world economy, the current economic conjuncture, and also to Germany. These threats come mainly from the unresolved problems of the financial sector and banks. The banking sector must be reorganized and restructured—thoroughly and expeditiously. A framework must be set for the actors in the global financial markets that is comprehensive and effective.

Yes, liberalization and deregulation went too far and were abused during the past two decades. But the fact that the IG Metall was praised the week before last in a business magazine; that the interview with a leading German manager was headlined with the quote “We Need More Regulation,” shows the paradigm-shift in our country! We must not sacrifice our grounding in the social market economy and democracy to nervous financial markets, where individual players ignore the general welfare. . . .

Listen to the Only Competent Economist: Lyndon LaRouche

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Jan. 21—In spite of innumerable diplomatic efforts at war avoidance in the context of the situation around Iran and Syria, the world is inching its way toward a third, this time thermonuclear, world war. The trans-Atlantic financial system finds itself once again in a crisis which has all the symptoms of the situation before the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008—only this time the governments and central banks have already used up all the instruments that they used then for a short-term intervention. The euro could break apart within days or weeks; the European Central Bank (ECB) has become a “money-printing machine” (*Handelsblatt*), and popular resistance to the brutal austerity policies of the European Union, which are threatening to thrust all of Europe into depression, is growing in most member states.

Reflecting upon this brief summary of the strategic situation, you would really think that governments would be feverishly working to find solutions for these existential questions. Instead, they are clinging to the same flawed axioms which were responsible for the creation of the systemic crisis in the first place.

The World Bank warned, in its report for the first half year of 2012, in the understatement of the century, that the world financial system could be thrown this year into a crisis just as great or greater than the one in 2008-09, and the capital markets could freeze up. Exactly this has already happened: Inter-bank lending has practically come to a standstill; the European banks

have parked more than half a trillion euros overnight in the ECB, thus more than the EU500 billion that the ECB has placed at the disposal of the banks for the next three years.

The head of the International Monetary Fund, Christine Lagarde, is demanding an additional EU500-600 billion rescue package for the Eurozone, from countries including the United States, China, and Japan. The U.S. has refused this request, due to strong resistance in Congress; but insiders suspect that the swap arrangement between the Fed and the ECB is being used unofficially to put the required liquidity at the disposal of distressed financial institutions that have been affected by “deleveraging” due to the downgrading by Standard & Poor’s. This would be a “reverse leverage” by which the very same mechanisms that were applied to boost speculation, now intensify the collapse of speculation. The amounts that have been pumped at shorter and shorter intervals into the financial system, are accumulating in the capital markets in the form of “asset inflation,” whose true scope is still masking the developing hyperinflation. Nonetheless, inflation has already begun to eat up the real income of the population.

The relentless austerity policy of the Troika—the EU Commission, the ECB, and the IMF—has sent especially Europe’s southern states into a deep depression. Nowhere is the inhumanity of this policy, which has been developed only for the benefit of the bankers, seen more clearly than in Greece, where parents must

give up their children because they can no longer feed them; where hospitals can no longer care for patients because the pharmaceutical companies are no longer providing medicines; and where the suicide rate is rising. The young and the well-educated are fleeing their country, because they see absolutely no prospect of a future. Mass strikes are developing in protest against this insanity, which threatens to throw all Europe into the deepest depression—in Greece, Italy (in Sicily, there is the “pitchfork revolt”), Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Ireland, and surely soon in other countries.

The War Threat

It has become obvious that the British Empire’s financial oligarchy, threatened by a systemic collapse, is only ostensibly going after Syria and Iran. With the murder of the fourth Iranian nuclear scientist, Prof. Mustafa Ahmadi Roshan, and the war of words over the Strait of Hormuz, the situation has escalated to the point that the U.S. has postponed for six months the greatest-ever maneuvers planned for Israel, which were to include participation of American, British, and Israeli forces (see article in *International*). But this didn’t stop the American ambassadors in Moscow and in Beijing from signaling a policy of “regime change” toward those nations.

Russian TV reacted severely to the provocative activities of the new U.S. Ambassador, Michael McFaul, who, as his first official act, met with the U.S.- and British-sponsored opposition which is propagandizing for a “White,” or “Snow Revolution,” against the expected Putin Presidency. McFaul’s counterpart in Beijing, Gary Locke, gave a provocative interview to the American National Public Radio, in which he speculated on the collapse of the government of the country to which he has been accredited as ambassador. The Chinese population is very dissatisfied with their government, whose political situation is very delicate, Locke said. He then expressed his concern about corruption, lack of transparency, etc. Unfortunately, he said, calls for a Jasmine Revolution had not succeeded, and apparently something specifically tailored to the Chinese internal situation would be necessary.

Such provocative behavior from the Obama Administration against Russia and China can only be understood against the background of the Anglo-American relationship and regression into the darkest realm of geopolitics, just like the dynamic before the First World

War: The British Empire fears the economic development of the Eurasian countries, the so-called “Eurasian heartland,” which threatens the alleged interests of the “Atlantic Rim countries.”

European governments and media are making themselves complicit with this policy, by not taking a position against it. Especially scandalous is their silence about the numerous attacks on the American Constitution of which Obama is guilty, including his National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), with its license for unlimited incarceration of people from all countries, including Americans; denial of due process; lists for targeted killings; conducting war without the approval of Congress; drone-warfare with massive “collateral damage” among civilians, etc.

In an article in the Jan. 17 *Atlantic*, Conor Friedersdorf wrote, after enumerating the long list of these offenses: “I submit that had Palin or Cheney or Rumsfeld or Rice or Jeb Bush or John Bolton or Rudy Giuliani or Mitt Romney proposed doing *even half* of those things in 2008, you’d have declared them unfit for the presidency and expressed alarm at the prospect of America doubling down on the excesses of the post-September 11 era... Yet President Obama has done *all* of the aforementioned things... Obama has transgressed against what is arguably Congress’ most essential check on executive power—its status as the decider of when America goes to war—and he has codified indefinite detention into law, something that hasn’t been done since Japanese Americans were detained during World War II. ‘But at least he doesn’t torture people!’ How low we’ve set the bar.”

Wrong Axioms

What lies at the foundation of all this is a continuous transformation of values in the past 45 years. The orientation has shifted away from production, in favor of speculation, and thereby away from a scientific conception of physical economy, in favor of monetarism and maximizing profit for the not-so-free market. So-called economic science has hardened into a dogma that would cause all the dictators of human history to go green with envy.

An article in the engineering publication *VDI-Nachrichten*, titled “Monoculture of Thinking Hinders Progress,” describes this problem. The crisis of the real economy has been with us for a long time, it says, but economics courses continue to teach their old formulas as though nothing had happened. That is why students

everywhere are beginning to resist the way economics is taught. Markedly divorced from reality, it is intellectually dry and shuts out alternative directions of thought; moreover, the courses don't include the history of the theories; hardly any time is spent on method; it subliminally treats human beings as calculable cogs in the gears of the economy; it reduces humans to "utility machines," thereby excluding all creative and unpredictable human abilities. Milton Friedman, the article states, defined the usefulness of theories as their capacity to make correct prognoses. So the current economic "turbulence" shows that the dominant monetarist theory stands "before the rubble of a reality-divorced and simultaneously useless theoretical structure."

This returns us to the problem posed at the beginning: As long as governments and leading institutions are not prepared to recognize their false axioms correct them, there will be no solutions for the existential problems we face, and these institutions will be swept away by the onrushing devastation. Only if we rectify the errors of the paradigm-shift of the past 45 years, and return to the kind of scientific thinking that characterizes physical science and Classical art, will we be able to correctly analyze the causes of the current systemic crisis.

The Italian TV channel RAIdue made the first step, by recently broadcasting excerpts of an interview conducted with Lyndon LaRouche in 2003, in which he precisely forecast the then-oncoming systemic crisis. LaRouche is on record as the only economist who correctly forecast the consequences of every incorrect decision made in economic policy, since 1971. It is therefore more than appropriate that the scientific method be investigated, which made him capable of doing so. And maybe it would be better, when talking about solutions to the crisis, to listen to the person who correctly forecast that crisis.

Only the combination of a return to sovereignty over national currencies, the reintroduction of a separation of banking, in the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt's Glass-Steagall law, fixed exchange rates, and the introduction of a credit system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton—as the preconditions for a global recovery program—can show the way forward.

Ironically, it is precisely the Milton Friedman quoted above, who has confirmed the usefulness of the theory of Lyndon LaRouche!

This article was translated from German.

'No' to Glass-Steagall

Austrian Minister on Shadow Banking Threat

by Harley Schlanger

Jan. 17—In a written interview with *EIR*, the Austrian Finance Minister, Dr. Maria Fekter, said that her government has "no intention to promote a *Trennbankensystem* [two-tier banking system] at the European level," and has concluded that Austria will "stick to the universal banking system" which it currently maintains.

The interview was arranged following a presentation given by Fekter at a financial conference in Alpbach, Austria on Aug. 30, 2011, where she responded to a question from this author about the need for a Glass-Steagall bankruptcy reorganization to deal with the escalating crisis in the Eurozone. She conceded that "Glass Steagall has some good points," which she then elaborated to the audience.

Since then, the debate over a return to a true Franklin Roosevelt Glass-Steagall banking regulation policy has continued throughout Europe, with parliamentary action in Switzerland—where a Glass-Steagall bill was defeated—although discussion is ongoing. While the City of London is pushing, through Lord Vickers, a phony proposal called "ring fencing," the debate has continued, especially as it is generally acknowledged that the only other option on the table—repeated, unlimited bailouts—will lead to a hyperinflationary blow-out of the whole system.

The debate has heated up in Austria, as bankers and industrial circles are reeling from the effects of the economic collapse of the Eurozone as a whole, and the deepening crisis in Austria's eastern European trade partners. The Jan. 13 announcement by Standard and Poor's that it has downgraded Austria's debt, along with that of eight other European nations, compounds the urgency of the crisis.

While Fekter rejected banking separation in the interview, she did speak out against a major aspect of the present system, which had been highlighted in an official report to the U.S. Congress by the Angelides



Government of Austria

Dr. Maria Fekter, Finance Minister of Austria, declined to endorse Glass-Steagall, but echoes the Angelides Commission on the danger of “shadow banking.”

Commission, as “shadow banking,” which the Commission identified as a significant factor in the creation and uncontrolled growth of the so-called subprime real estate bubble. Echoing the Angelides report, Fekter said that the “origins of the crisis can be traced back to business types which ... could also be provided by non-supervised institutions. Therefore,” she added, “it is our strong interest to avoid all types of shadow banking, consequently we support all initiatives in this direction.”

As Lyndon LaRouche, who accurately forecast the present existential crisis in a July 25, 2007 webcast, has emphasized, the only way to deal with “shadow banking,” which is associated primarily with the City of London and its unregulated, imperial monetary system, is by implementing Glass-Steagall in its full,

original form. This would remove the trillions of dollars of worthless obligations currently on the books of the banks, built up by wild speculation and reckless leveraging, through a bankruptcy reorganization, forcing the speculators to eat their own debts, while protecting the legitimate side of the commercial banks, so that new Federal credit could be channeled through the banks for investments in projects in the real, physical economy.

This could not be done in Europe today without a repeal of Maastricht and the other treaties and agreements, which have driven the Eurozone to the brink of a total crash.

Opposition to Eurobonds

There are two other useful points made by Fekter, in spite of her continued support for the present banking arrangement. First, she sides with German Chancellor Angela Merkel in opposing the scam called “Eurobonds,” stating, “I am against Eurobonds. Currently, they would only shift risks to others without allowing containing the source of the risk.” Secondly, she responded to a question about U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner’s insistence that the EU go with a U.S. Federal Reserve-style policy of leveraging, by saying this is the “wrong starting point for the debate,” as “no matter how much money we would put into the system we would not be able to solve the problems.”

The result would be, she continues, that the “amounts [of bailout funds] will become untenable and most of the risks will shift from the private sector to the public sector and to other countries and this cannot be in our interest.”

By rejecting Glass-Steagall and a return to a national credit system for new credit to productive industry, however, she is left supporting the present EU game-plan—a brutal austerity regime, run by a financial dictatorship of EU “technocrats” in Brussels, run over the heads of elected governments.

Although she stated in the interview that she is “a great proponent of national parliaments and their sovereignty,” she has been highly critical of the Greek government for its lack of “fiscal responsibility,” and has not protested the stripping of sovereignty from the Greeks. Now that Standard and Poor’s has downgraded Austria, will Dr. Fekter have the courage to rethink her support of the present system, and adopt Glass Steagall?

No Competent Candidates for President But LaRouche Slate

by Nancy Spannaus

Jan. 23—With rampant incompetence and virtual insanity dominating the so-called Presidential race in both parties, Lyndon LaRouche and the initial slate of six Congressional candidates took to the LaRouchePAC airwaves yesterday for their third discussion of economic policy and political strategy. In the course of an hour-plus dialogue, LaRouche, Rachel Brown (Mass.), Dave Christie (Wash.), Bill Roberts (Mich.), Kesha Rogers (Texas), Diane Sare (N.J.), and Summer Shields (Calif.) discussed their insights into the state of the U.S. population at this crucial juncture, and what immediately must be done.

Having defined the precise policy perspective required to bring the United States, and the world, out of the current disaster, during his Jan. 18 State of the Union address (see *Feature*), LaRouche devoted his remarks to two major points: first, the fact that the slate itself must fill the political vacuum, by exercising leadership effectively as a Presidential team; and two, that this leadership must be presented in such a way as to force through a *compelling commitment* to action from the American population itself—the kind of thing we saw when Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941.

While I can provide the highlights of the course of the discussion here, readers are encouraged to watch it in full at www.larouchepac.com.

Creating an American Presidency

In his opening remarks, LaRouche laid out the challenge for the candidate slate:

“We’re looking for a development, which will create the possibility of ‘none of the above’ emerging as one or two candidates somewhere along the line toward the Presidential election.

“In the meantime, what we’re concerned about, should be concerned about, is policy. I laid out, this past week, exactly what the policy options are that I know that exist, and I haven’t seen anything else replace that. So don’t worry about the usual thing, so-called, about ‘who’s going to win the election,’ or ‘who you should vote for’; none of this means anything right now. You have nobody to elect. No one to elect now.

“And the reactions of the public, day by day, forget it! That’s not the issue. When you get a reaction which is meaningful, you’ll know you’ve got it. But don’t stab at somebody, who maybe looks like something, who might be a good candidate, or might be valuable in some other way. They’re fickle! They don’t know what they’re voting for, they’re totally unstable in their opinions, and so don’t get involved!”

In his response to LaRouche, **Dave Christie** pointed to past examples of exemplary leadership:

“Well, Lyn, we had had some discussion earlier, in terms of the American Presidency, and those Presidents who have stepped forward in a time of crisis, such as Lincoln, [Franklin] Roosevelt, and so on, Kennedy—that what made them, was the strength of their soul to represent the policy that they stood for, which was always the fight against the British imperial policy. And it wasn’t this demagogue business, which is largely



LPAC-TV

Washington State Congressional candidate Dave Christie: *What made Presidents such as Lincoln, FDR, and Kennedy great, “was the strength . . . to fight against the British imperial policy.”*

how Obama came on the scene. Everybody said, ‘Oh, what a great talker, what a great . . .’ although he didn’t say anything, of course, but just was a ‘great talker’; and now we see that what he actually stands for, which is, we’re on the verge of World War III, the economy is falling off the cliff. . . . And the real American Presidency has been somebody who steps forward in a time of crisis, who actually has a policy, and is willing to back up their policy, and that’s what people move on.

Kesha Rogers reflected on the fact that, as she’s found in her campaigning, people know both the Democrats and Republicans have no ideas relevant to the crisis, that the “campaign” is a zero:

“They know that there’s nobody out there that’s fighting for their interests, and that is competent to lead this nation. And it’s true. You

know, you go out—we’re out in the field every day, we’re talking to people, and everybody comes up and they say, ‘My God! What’re we going to do? The Democratic Party is insane.’ And you have Democrats who say, ‘I’m a Democrat, but this President is destroying the nation.’ But you have the Republicans on the other side, and it’s just a complete mess with the Republican candidates.

“And so the population knows that they’ve been thrown on the scrap heap here; they’ve been put in second-class citizenship, and the problem is, that they accept it. And this is what we’re talking about: why the survival of this nation, and mankind overall, means that there can be no more talk about ‘issues.’”

LaRouche responded by raising the historical example of Benjamin Franklin in defining a positive conception of how leadership can be provided in this period by a team:

“So what you need, really, is you need a team,” he said. “Now, you had something like that in the formation of the Presidency of the United States in the first place. You had a bunch of people who came in, there were problems that arose, over money and things like that. But you had a team, for a moment—under Washington, and under the influence of Franklin, and particularly, Franklin—you had a team of people who functioned as a Presidency of the United States. And solved the problems,



LPAC-TV

Kesha Rogers, running for Congress in Texas: *“The population knows that they’ve been thrown on the scrap heap; they’ve been put in second-class citizenship; and the problem is, that they accept it.”*

and *created the Constitution!*

“You don’t have any candidates for President in recent times, who have the qualification, that the Presidency *had* at the time Franklin was shaping it. You don’t have anything like that. You don’t have a competent Presidency from any source right now! I said I could do the job . . . what has to be done. But we don’t *have* anybody, who is running for President, and we have damned few people who are running for other offices, in Congressional office, who really have the qualifications, even a group of them, to really be a President. They don’t have it. You have people who have qualifications, excellent qualifications on this point, that point, this point! Provided you have a Presidency to make it tick!

“But the problem is, you’ve got to think of yourself as a collective President, because you have to, really, together, represent the campaign, for the whole package which we’ve laid out. All the other things are less important. It’s the package we have laid out, which I discussed essentially, this past Wednesday. That’s your program: That’s the Presidential program! And the six of you have to be the spearhead, of a campaign on behalf of that program.”

We Need ‘Super-Candidates’

Rachel Brown then contrasted the excited response people exhibit when a real solution is presented, as against the endless bank bailout policy of both parties:

“People are very frustrated that we keep bailing this crap out, when they know that there’s no solution in sight with that. So, they’re frustrated. But if we bring up these notions of scientific principles of economy, such as energy-flux density, and what a Mars mission will do for the rest of the economy, then they can understand it. And then they get excited, because they see a tangible light at the end of the tunnel.

LaRouche replied: “But, they’re looking for commitment. What they’re really looking for, is commitment and competence, two things. The first thing, is commitment. If you’re committed, they’re going to be interested. Look, the problem is, there’s no one that I could, in good conscience, vote for, for President now. There may be somebody hidden out there. But what’s



LPAC-TV

Rachel Brown, candidate for Congress in Massachusetts: If people see what scientific principles, such as a Mars mission, will do for the economy, “they get excited, because they see a tangible light at the end of the tunnel.”

on the slate, nothing is qualified to be President; as a matter of fact, electing any of them would be a menace to the United States! We already have a menace to the United States, in terms of the current President. These guys could be almost as bad. Right?

“So therefore, we need a Presidency, which means a Presidential candidate, or a President and a group of people around that President as a national leadership, which is going to ram this program through! We’re not going to flinch because somebody says, ‘I have some money invested in Wall Street, and I have a right to have my money.’

“‘You don’t have a right to have your money: *You already stole it, you damned fool!* You made a gambling bet, you bet in a gambling house—and you *lost*. Nobody owes you anything, buddy!’

“And when you get that across—I’m suggesting that you have to be, not candidates, you have to be super-candidates. Delivering the super-candidate message. And I will do my job on this case, to make sure that you have the information and the approach to deal with this thing, as a candidacy. But the six of you, plus whatever we drag into this thing, beyond, is going to be presented—and everybody’s going to know it: that these guys you’re dealing options for are no damned good! They’re no good for your health. They swindled you already too much, didn’t they? They either swin-

dled you, or they didn't do anything to save you from the swindlers! They all backed down to the swindlers! And you're trying to say you can represent something? Well, you can't be trusted! We gave you a chance, year after year after year ... and what did you do? Year after

We need a Presidency, which means a Presidential candidate, or a President, and a group of people around that President as a national leadership, which is going to ram this program through. We're not going to flinch because somebody says, 'I have some money invested in Wall Street, and I have a right to have my money.'

Lyndon LaRouche

year, you made everything worse! Especially at the beginning of the past decade.”

Diane Sare buttressed LaRouche's point by reporting on developments in her own campaign:

“Well, they're obviously terrified of our potential, which has yet to be fully realized, but just the threat of the slate, with your leadership; because, for example, in my district, they tried to pay Congressman [Steve] Rothman [D] \$2 million to run in that district against Scott Garrett [R] and he didn't want to. So he's not. Then, I've announced; now, they're threatening to run a linebacker from the Giants football team against me in the Democratic primaries, and ... the same thing with Dave, and Summer: They literally are going to have *legions* of Democrats, who are nothing but Obama Democrats, to run against us in these campaigns, to try and confuse the voters. And I think we can have a lot of fun with this.

LaRouche drew a laugh in response: “Obama Democrats are not a marketable product!”

Bill Roberts reported on the same process in his Michigan area:

“I was actually at a Democratic Club event earlier this week, where they were recruiting candidates to be running for local positions for the Democratic Party. And I said exactly that—that we have a slate of candidates, because there are no qualified Presidential candidates. And this

was a group of people who were basically supposed to run the local Obama campaign, and they just went silent. They had no response. And I just signed in and quietly went in. And one by one, the candidates approached me, and said, ‘Well, I don't agree 100% with you, but, let's stay in touch, because I'm interested in your policies.’

“So, I think the acknowledgment of that, is more known than people are willing to admit at this point.”

LaRouche responded: “The problem is that we've got to take charge. These guys who are being pulled in, don't really know anything about the problems. They know the existence of problems, but they don't know what the solutions are. They don't understand what the solutions are. They are capable of judging whether the result that you're promising is going to be worth something, or not. That they can judge. That's a practical question for them, and they have some insights on some things. But the idea of going up against the national leadership is where they don't have it. And that's where we've got to come across.

The NAWAPA Driver

The discussion then turned to the programmatic perspective being generated by the Basement Scientific Team. LaRouche led it off:

“What you guys have to do, I'm emphasizing this:



LPAC-TV

New Jersey candidate for Congress Diane Sare: “They literally are going to have legions of Obama Democrats run against us in these campaigns, to try and confuse the voters. And I think we can have a lot of fun with this.”



LPAC-TV

Michigan Congressional candidate Bill Roberts: At a recent Democratic Club meeting, "one by one, the candidates approached me, and said, 'Well, I don't agree 100% with you, but let's stay in touch, because I'm interested in your policies.'"

We could generate, largely out of the Basement crowd, for example, we have NAWAPA. Now, we're on top of the NAWAPA project from a scientific and other standpoint, because we're looking at it, not just as NAWAPA—a full NAWAPA, yes!—but we're also looking at the Arctic, and you can not really deal with this problem, without taking account the Arctic. You've got to deal with the fact of Russia.

"Now, we have an implicit offer of an alliance with Russia. I mean, this is what we're dealing with. We're talking with leaders in Russia about policies, and this is like a pre-cooperation kind of thing. If we can get cooperation, we'll have it automatically. Things will begin to happen right away. We have things in other parts of the world like that, particularly on the Asian side, the Asian Pacific side, things are wide open.

"We have a situation, where in

Europe, you see our little Italian campaign which is not so little, in terms of its impact. Greece is blowing out! Spain and Portugal are about to blow out. The French situation is impossible.

"We have a world situation, we have a map—and a lot of it is centered actually in the Basement operation—we have a map of things that cohere, that need to be done: What we really need is the funds, essentially, to produce the kinds of video material which we can take around with us everywhere we go, with a full program—we need to develop that right now. And we've got to find the funds to do it! We've got to produce some material which is the *full package of the program*. We've been rebuilding it, haven't we? Piece by piece. Now, we've got to go to a new phase. You guys are ready to do it now."

Summer Shields elaborated on LaRouche's point:

"One thing of note, on what you're bringing up here, I think, is that from what you laid out in your State of the Union address, this three-generation collapse of the U.S. culture, and how to turn that around: The only way you could really do that, to rip up the entire cultural degeneration



LPAC-TV

Summer Shields, candidate for Congress in California: A Mars mission is the only way to reverse "the entire cultural degeneration . . . and the collapse of optimism in the U.S."

of the United States, and the collapse of optimism in the U.S., would be a Mars mission. And I think that, when you look at the grand scheme of things, what you're bringing up here, with what the Basement's working on, the scientific research they're looking at, when you start to look at the vastness of the galaxy and the universe, a trip from the Moon to Mars is a short trip, compared to the vast galaxy we're looking at. . . .

"And I think when we come at it, in our own minds from that standpoint, then as you start to look at conveying this to the American people, it's very easy. Because they want something bigger than what's being presented to them by all these candidates. There's nothing being presented to them. They want to get some sense of a return to a John F. Kennedy mission. And that rings true with people.

"They have to understand, I think, that we already have things in the making, that Russia has already proposed the Bering Strait project: Roscosmos, the space organization in Russia, has already said, 'Let's go to the Moon. Let's go to Mars,' as we just talked about. These projects are ready to go, now. But as you said, you have to go to Russia, you have to go to China to get the news: none of this is getting out to the American people.

"And sometimes, we can take for granted the fact that we know this, but then the people out there, have to do it. So, I think there does have to be kind of a one-two punch in all of this: On the one hand, we have to go out with the courage, and we have to say, 'Hey! Obama's got to go! We're going straight up against the Democratic Party. I'm running as a Democrat, but that doesn't mean I'm going to kiss the butt of the Democratic Party.' But then, on the other hand, you say, 'Here's what we're going with, here's the positive mission.' People respond to that, and they go, 'Okay, I just got smacked twice, not just once.' And they respond to that kind of courageous activity.

"I think that's where we have to go."

The Pearl Harbor Effect

After again referencing the generations of degeneration in American culture, LaRouche returned to a discussion of the organizing process:

"The key thing on this, you've got to get a program where people are committed *to doing something*, not just talking about, or approving of something; not giving a guy a chance to see if he can do something. . . .

"You've got to get these guys, hit them hard with a concept, because they all are so discouraged, they have

no real mustering factor. And this is as bad as what Roosevelt faced, when he knew that there was going to be an attack on the United States; and there was actually a planned air attack on the United States, from Germany in that period. . . .

"And what you have to do, is get the intention to win on the part of the people, not try to coax them into accepting the idea of the project. You've got to convince them on a mass scale that this is exactly what we need! When you talk about jobs, talk about solving problems of other kinds, you need that kind of spirit of mobilization in the population. And to win this election in the way we have to win it, to create a new Presidency which can save this nation, we've got to go *all the way!* Not with suggestions, not with outlined proposals. But with motivating people to see, *this is the only thing that can be tolerated!* As was the case on Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7: a sudden change. And we have to *induce* a sudden change in the temperament of the American people; a commitment to victory that won't quit. And even with this shot-down and worn-out American population, we can do it again.

"And that's what you have to do. And that's what we have to do. You have to save this nation from what is imminently, right now, *right now*—if we don't do anything, the United States, is going to be destroyed, and the people in it, too."

To accomplish this, LaRouche again defined the role of the candidate slate:

"The point is—look, we've got a situation, there are six of you. There will be more. *But!* Is that going to be enough to do the job? Is the propaganda to go with that going to be enough?

"No! You've got to go and break out, a real break-out: And you're ready to start doing it. I've been watching this over the past three weeks. You're ready to do it, start it; we've just got to get some more people activated, and to stop playing tiddly-winks with great politics. Don't make promises; you can make a nice suggestion you can hope somebody can follow—no. We're going to say, '*We are going to insist, that you live up to your obligation to save this nation.*'"

"And we can do it. Here's how we can do it. And we have access to the people who know the technology, and we know some ourselves, something about the basic technology, which will do this. We know why this has to be done: So we're going to take all the way—we're not going to make a polite suggestion; we're going to kick-ass all the way to the Moon."

What Makes Gingrich Run?

by Michele Steinberg

Jan. 24—Just weeks after Newt Gingrich’s Presidential campaign tanked in Iowa and New Hampshire, the low-life former Speaker of the House made a miraculous comeback, winning the primary in South Carolina, putting himself back in the race. According to a well-placed Washington analyst on U.S. Presidential campaigns, Gingrich’s success has nothing to do with a grass-roots conservative upsurge, but rather, to a flood of money from billionaire contributors to the Republican Party, which is deeply split over whether to support Mitt Romney. The mega-funding is intended to provide Gingrich with what he needs to be the pitbull who will block Romney’s early sweep of delegates.

The reality is that the GOP’s miasma stems from the fact that the party, thoroughly corrupted from the Bush-Cheney years, has stubbornly blocked what would be the crucial action for the survival of the United States—the removal of Barack Obama from office.

Instead, the entire field of Republicans is hopelessly incompetent to the lead the United States, and that fact makes Gingrich all the more dangerous. While most people think that Gingrich’s unfitness is related to his personal depravity, e.g., his marital perversions and financial dealings, the greatest danger comes from one of his top financial backers—the notorious Las Vegas gambling czar Sheldon Adelson, owner of the Sands and Venetian casinos. Adelson is described as the eighth-richest man in America, and backer of Gingrich to the tune of a promised \$20 million between December 2011 and the Republican convention. With a personal fortune estimated to be greater than \$20 billion, Adelson can give even more than \$20 million if he wants to, as long as it is funneled through the independent Su-

per-PACs supporting Gingrich. In the last two weeks, \$5 million of Adelson’s promise was delivered, financing the attack-dog ads against Romney in the run-up to the South Carolina primary.

The Adelson money flow began in December, when, in an exclusive interview with The Jewish Channel, a U.S.-based cable TV network, Gingrich declared that the Palestinians were an “invented people,” and had no historic existence. “They were part of the Ottoman Empire,” like the vast majority of Arabs, Gingrich declared. This piece of historical fiction was typical Newt Gingrich. More than any other Republican Party Presidential candidate, Gingrich never misses an opportunity to declare his unswerving loyalty to the right-wing war-mongering of Benjamin Netanyahu’s Israel. In his speech following the Iowa Republican caucuses, where he came in a distant fourth place, behind Romney, Rick Santorum, and Ron Paul, Gingrich took the occasion to declare that U.S. national security is identical to Israeli national security, a patently false notion, which is likely to provoke a general war.

Undying Loyalty to Israel

Every Republican Presidential candidate, with the glaring exception of Rep. Ron Paul (Tex.), has repeatedly declared his or her undying loyalty to Israel. But Gingrich stands out from the crowd, in his never-fail professions of loyalty to Israel as a Jewish state, and



Wikipedia Commons

Sheldon Adelson, the Las Vegas gambling king, is the mega-moneybags behind the Gingrich “surge.”

specifically, the Israel of fascist Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Defense Minister Ehud Barak, and Foreign Affairs Minister Avigdor Lieberman. The ruling regime in Israel is threatening preemptive war against Iran—without prior warning to its ally the United States—knowing that the U.S. will bear the brunt of retaliation and the sacrifice in blood and money.

This is exactly the agenda of Sheldon Adelson, one of Netanyahu and the Likud Party's biggest funders.

On Dec 15, the *Las Vegas Sun*, the newspaper of America's casino capital, ran a headline report, "Sheldon Adelson commits \$20 million to pro-Newt Gingrich group." Adelson is one of the wealthiest men in the world, according to *Forbes* magazine, and one of the closest friends and financial backers of Netanyahu.

His control over the Republican Party is enhanced by his financing of the Republican Jewish Caucus (RJC), the venue in which the 2012 Republican candidates, with the exception of Ron Paul, tried to outdo each other calling for war against Iran. Adelson's relationship to the RJC is so close that he has used his private jets to provide free transportation for Republican lawmakers in events sponsored by the Caucus. (Adelson says that collecting airplanes is his weakness, and he has one of the largest private fleets in the world, with about 100 aircraft, a virtual political Air Force.)

In 2007, Adelson launched a free Hebrew-language daily newspaper in Israel, called *Israel Hayom* (*Israel Today*). From its first day in print, it was the largest circulating newspaper in the Jewish state, and it remains so to this day. *Israel Hayom* supports the continued expansion of settlements and full integration of the Yesha settlements (all of "Judea and Samaria") into Israel. He is also a major donor to Birthright Israel, an organization founded by Michael Steinhardt, another leading American Zionist financier. The group sends thousands of young American Jews to Israel each year, free of charge, for sophisticated profiling and recruitment as, at least, political capital in support of the Jewish state, or as the future dual citizens of Israel and the United States.

Through his Adelson Family Foundation, Adelson bankrolls a right-wing think tank in Jerusalem, the Adelson Institute for Strategic Studies, whose chairman is Israel's Deputy Prime Minister Natan Sharansky, the Soviet-era refugee, who has been a key Netanyahu ally. Sharansky also heads an organization called One Jerusalem, which is dedicated to securing Jerusa-

lem as the undivided capital of the Jewish state. The group has been investigated for laundering American Christian Zionist funds into the Likud Party.

Adelson played a crucial role in ensuring that the negotiations with the Palestinians sought by former Sen. George Mitchell would be dead on arrival (Mitchell resigned the post as envoy to the talks in May 2011). When Netanyahu agreed, early in the Obama Presidency, to a temporary halt in settlement construction in the West Bank, Adelson flew to Israel to convince the prime minister to reverse his decision. It was Adelson, together with American financier and California bingo gambling king, Irving Moscowitz, who ensured that the expansion of Jewish settlements would sabotage any possibility of good-faith negotiations. As Adelson was conspiring with Netanyahu on how to manipulate the U.S. political landscape on the Middle East, Moscowitz was ordering the demolition of historic Palestinian properties in East Jerusalem: The result was the end of any Israel-Palestinian talks in September 2010.

Casino Dollars

Adelson made his big money in the gambling casino business. His Las Vegas Sands Corporation owns a string of high-end gambling casinos in Las Vegas, Macao, and Singapore. According to Connie Bruck, in her June 30, 2008 *New Yorker* profile of Adelson, his Asian operations have been investigated for bribery, connections to organized crime, and other suspected financial crimes. Bruck's *New Yorker* piece raised serious questions about his business practices and his efforts to use his billions of dollars in personal wealth to influence political decisions in Israel and the United States.

That was 2008. Now, with the danger of Gingrich's Winning Our Future Super-PAC being financed with a promised \$20 million (or more) from Adelson, the questions raised by the *New Yorker* article about the Vegas czar's methods and operations may be a more important issue for the security of the nation. There is no doubt that Gingrich has profited from Warbucks Adelson's largesse: Adelson kicked in the initial \$1 million to get the predecessor to Gingrich's PAC off the ground, and contributed a total of nearly \$8 million to the Gingrich cause before his current Presidential run. Gingrich's Presidential hopes may fade into the desert sunset, but Adelson's power to buy a U.S. political party, and use it for a foreign agenda, remains a serious danger.

Sanctions Are War

Think sanctions are a civilized alternative to war? Think again. In fact, the application of the economic strangulation known as sanctions is nothing but siege warfare, a bestial feudal tactic for punishing, even exterminating an entire people, a process that leads inexorably to perpetual war.

Qualified historians know this from the history of warfare. Think back to the sieges of ancient cities, such as Troy (ca. 12th Century B.C.), all the way up to the Thirty Years War (1618-48 A.D.) and beyond, to get an image of the alleged humaneness of sanctions and economic boycotts. It was this grisly reality which former Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammad invoked in 1994 when he excoriated the sanctions against Iraq, saying:

“This is not ancient days where you lay siege around the city until they feed on mice. This is modern times; we don’t do such things.

“The sanctions on food and medical supplies have been imposed for four years, and I have been informed that about 1 million children and aged people died due to insufficient food and medical treatment.” He demanded that this inhumanity be stopped.

Of course, the sanctions policy, led by British imperial puppets such as Tony Blair, continued, and did not stop war—although it did decimate one of the most advanced economies in the Middle East, and kill a lot of people—a British imperial goal.

The sanctions threatened against Iran today have a precedent: the oil embargo put into effect by the U.S. government against Japan in the run-up to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Some veterans today have referenced these sanctions, arguing that their application actually provoked the Japanese attack, and that following that

path against Iran, as currently proposed, would do the same with Iran today.

President Franklin Roosevelt, according to one of his biographers, was reluctant to shut the oil tourniquet on Japan, because he thought this would drive that nation to take more aggressive action in the South Pacific, and beyond. Japan was 80% dependent upon the U.S. for oil, and FDR feared that shutting it off would have the opposite of a deterrent effect, making war in the Pacific inevitable.

No simple comparisons can be drawn between Japan then and Iran today, or the strategic crisis then and now. What is clear is that the British hawks pushing sanctions today want to ensure a war.

Some may argue that sanctions are indeed “sanctioned” by the United Nations, but that proves nothing about morality, or war avoidance. As noted legal expert Hans Köchler of the International Progress Organization said in 1994: “Comprehensive economic sanctions ... have the ethical quality of terror bombings: the civilian population is explicitly taken hostage in the framework of a security strategy of power politics.”


The oil boycott decided by the EU against Iran on Jan. 23 flows directly from such a British strategy, as do the actions in the same direction by the British puppet Obama Administration. The idea is to *provoke* hotheads in Iran to provide a pretext for launching the war that the British monarchy desires—a war whose actual target is the Eurasian nations of Russia and China, not Iran.

The Russians understand this, and have made their views clear, while working feverishly for war avoidance. It is still not too late for the U.S. to join them—as soon as we strip Obama of his power to put us on the road to World War III.

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.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

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

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

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

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

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____