

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

March 9, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 10

www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Empire Enters March with a Roar for Global War
Kelley: IAEA Should Investigate Lies in Iran Report
British Hedge-Fund Project: 'Americans Elect'

**Principle vs. Populism:
The U.S.A.'s Last Chance**



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: Ulf Sandmark

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

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.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.,

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

(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

When we look at the United States from space, its millions of lights sparkling like stars in the evening darkness, it looks beautiful and serene. And yet, we know things here on *terra firma* are anything but. How have we become so foolish and depraved as to allow the darkness of the threat of war, famine, and depopulation, to overtake, not just our republic, but the entire planet?

In his *Feature* article this week, “Principle vs. Populism: The U.S.A.’s last Chance,” Lyndon LaRouche provides a template for evaluating anyone who would seek to secure the highest office in the land, by contrasting treasonous Presidents such as Andrew Jackson, with the few exceptionally great Presidents—Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, and John F. Kennedy—all of whom were assassinated on orders of the Empire. LaRouche chides the people, who “sometimes seem like children in the manner you are so often, so readily taken in by cheap stage-magicians’ tricks in such cases of political sophistry!”

International leads with, “Empire Enters March with a Roar for Global War,” which spells out the war danger, immediately centered on the reaction of the British financial imperium to the Russian elections. “London Clearly States Its Intention To Wipe Out Sovereign Russia” outlines the Empire’s hatred of what it terms “Putinism.” Rounding out the section is our exclusive interview with former IAEA chief inspector Robert Kelley, who pointedly asks what, if anything, have we learned from our disastrous experience in Iraq?

In *Economics*, “Ritual Sacrifice Spreads from Greece to Spain,” reports on the latest victim to feel the edge of the Troika’s guillotine. We also cover LaRouchePAC’s intervention at a USDA forum, and the impact of extreme weather events on the U.S. food crop, as Obama looks the other way.

An exposé of ‘Americans Elect’—a British-run “regime-change” operation against the United States, leads the *National* section, followed by the text of a mass-distribution LPAC leaflet, “An Alternative: LaRouche Slate Offers ‘The Competent Candidate’”; and “Senators Demand Probe of Saudi-9/11 Ties.”

Finally, two speeches from the Feb. 25 Berlin Schiller Institute conference: Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s keynote, “Overcoming the Existential Threat of Thermonuclear War”; and Mohammed Mahfoud, “Truth vs. Propaganda: The Situation in Syria.”



Cover This Week

The U.S.A. at night, in a satellite photo.



NASA

4 Principle vs. Populism: The U.S.A.'s Last Chance

As the U.S.A. plunges into what is, so far, the 2012 election debacle, Lyndon LaRouche looks back at some of our earlier Presidents—some scoundrels, some sublime, and some who combined elements of both—and concludes that at no time in our history have we been confronted with such a daunting challenge in choosing a President. “The case of the misguided personal voter,” LaRouche writes, “is among the most crucial of those dangers to our republic which must be faced in the current approach to the coming U.S. general election of 2012.” The existential challenges we now face to the continued existence of humanity on this planet demand that the political parties and the voters reject populist sophistries, and adopt the fundamental principles that will guide us out of the looming catastrophe.

International

17 Empire Enters March with a Roar for Global War

EIR Editor Nancy Spannaus covers the “extraordinary anti-war mobilization” being carried out in the U.S. and Europe, and points beyond, by the extended LaRouche movement, which is bolstered by the outspoken resistance to war coming from high-level military and political circles.

20 London Clearly States Its Intention To Wipe Out Sovereign Russia

The British imperial crowd has its sights centered on Russia’s President-elect Putin: A Chatham House report confirms what we have been warning for sometime, i.e., that London is determined to destroy a sovereign Russia, and therefore has made Putin a target for the immediate period ahead.

22 Robert Kelley: IAEA Should Investigate November 2011 Report on Iran for Forgeries, Lies

The former chief inspector for the International Atomic Energy Agency in Iraq lambastes the fraudulent IAEA report on Iran’s nuclear program, and asks, have we learned nothing from the Iraqi experience?

31 International Intelligence

Economics

32 **Ritual Sacrifice Spreads from Greece to Spain**

Fresh from the murder of Greece, with its 11 million people, the Euro-gods are now demanding a similar sacrifice from the nation of Spain, with its 46 million population, on behalf of the British imperial bankers.

34 **The 25th Amendment Is the First Step in Doubling Food Production**

A look at the USDA's Agricultural Outlook Forum 2012, where LaRouche organizers challenged the attendees: "Will we Americans have the guts to chuck Barack Obama from the Presidency, and create the conditions for doubling food production?"

38 **Tornados Show Killer Obama Food Policy**

Extreme weather events, such as last week's devastating tornados that ripped through the central states, are hitting a farm sector already reeling from the ongoing financial blowout. Mass starvation is threatened.

National

40 **British Hedge-Fund Project: The 'Americans Elect' Hoax**

In the name of creating a "third pathway" for choosing a Presidential candidate, an outfit calling itself "Americans Elect," the brainchild of the British-owned hedge-fund speculator Peter Ackerman, has already secured ballot status in 17 states for its as yet undetermined "non-partisan ticket."

43 **An Alternative: LaRouche Slate Offers 'The Competent Candidate'**

LaRouchePAC issued this leaflet, titled, "The Competent Candidate for the Presidency Is the LaRouche Federal Slate," on Feb. 18.

44 **Senators Demand Probe of Saudi-9/11 Ties**

Two former U.S. Senators who had access to top-secret information on the 9/11 attacks are asking a Federal judge to allow a full investigation of evidence that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia played a direct role in those attacks.

Conference Report

46 **Overcoming the Existential Threat of Thermonuclear War**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's keynote speech to the Berlin conference of the Schiller Institute on Feb. 25. Only by realizing our true nature as creative humanity in a self-developing universe will we be able to confront and defeat the British empire's policies of war and genocide.

57 **Mohammad Mahfoud: Truth vs. Propaganda: The Situation in Syria**

The president of the Danish-Syrian Friendship Society presents an eye-witness account to the Schiller Institute conference in Berlin Feb. 25.

Interview

22 **Robert Kelley: IAEA Should Investigate November 2011 Report on Iran for Forgeries, Lies**

The former IAEA chief weapons inspector is interviewed by Michele Steinberg.

Editorial

59 **One Year After Japan's Mega-Quake**

PRINCIPLE VS. POPULISM:

The U.S.A.'s Last Chance

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

February 23, 2012

On Essential Background

The urgent lesson for this report, is, that, remarkably, some actually great U.S. Presidents have lived out the term of office for which they had been elected, often despite the British empire's customarily vigilant assassins within and beyond our shores. I include among such latter wretches such as those associated with the Bank of Manhattan's Aaron Burr (1756-1836).¹

Not strangely, on the opposing side, our nation's native scoundrels, especially the treasonous sort, have

1. Actually, there are considerations from the British side, such as the desire to avoid elevating a dangerous foe of the British empire to the rank of likely "martyrdom," when the empire might prudently refrain up to a certain point. Such was the instance of the 1804 assassination of Alexander Hamilton by British intelligence agent (and U.S. Vice-President under President Thomas Jefferson) Aaron Burr, the latter also known as the 1799 founder of the Bank of Manhattan. Hence, the development of what was to become the present-day band of merchant-bank swindlers known as the British intelligence agency with which Wall Street is still presently associated, still to the present day, under the British monarchy's current U.S. puppet-President and international mass-murderer, President Barack Obama. Burr lived to play out the role of a leading swindler in the Manhattan-based circles of Wall Street swindlers which have included that Burr crony Martin Van Buren, the Van Buren who had orchestrated the great Panic of 1837.

sometimes appeared to be the more fortunate party in the roulette of our nation's elections. The most notable cases of the effects of treasonous policies of practice, are instances of the assassinations of our great Presidents who had been then still in active service at the time they were murdered, such as Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, or John F. Kennedy: those assassinations had often resulted in the replacement of what had been a great President's program, then being ruined by a successor from among those whose simple weaknesses, or base corruption, or even savagely treasonous policies, such as those of President Barack Obama, were thus unleashed, when and where appropriate outlooks and policies had been essential requirements.

There were other cases, in which the British wished, as since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, to induce a downward plunge of our republic, and, for that motive, had preferred the assassination of a great U.S. President on that occasion. Such devices have been included with the intent of fostering an accelerating rate of downward plunge of the real (i.e.) physical U.S. economy under such among President William J. Clinton's adversaries-successors. Such have been the devices which include the damnable roles of George W. Bush, Jr., and that of the present virtual re-incarnation of the echo of the rabidly insane Emperor Nero, Barack Obama, each similar to, but of the same list of such cases also worse than the other.



Library of Congress



John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum/Abbie Rowe

“The most notable cases of the effects of treasonous policies of practice, are instances of the assassinations of our great Presidents who had been then still in active service at the time they were murdered, such as Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, or John F. Kennedy...” (Left to right: McKinley, Lincoln, Kennedy.)

The Case of Andrew Jackson’s Treason

One leading model for the case of the abortive measures used by our republic’s enemies’ effort to abort the succession from a great President, John Quincy Adams, had been supplied by a particularly infamous trio of scoundrels, the traitor Aaron Burr; and Burr accomplices Andrew Jackson, and his Wall Street paymaster and controller, Burr accomplice Martin Van Buren. The latter pair, apparently, did not require an actual assassination of President John Quincy Adams, one of the truly greatest of our Presidents in actual nation-building achievements; Wall Street money represented by the ever-treacherous Aaron Burr and his Wall Street understudy Martin Van Buren, sufficed in that case. Thus, the blocking of Adams’ re-election sufficed: the desired sort of damnable result was orchestrated, thus, from “the British outside.”

So matters went, from imperial Britain’s choice of successors, to those from among such British agents and U.S. traitors-in-plain-fact, as the set of the succession of Aaron Burr and his accomplices Martin Van Buren and Andrew Jackson. It was Aaron Burr’s successor on Wall Street, Van Buren, who had orchestrated Burr protégé Andrew Jackson’s crucial, implicitly treasonous role in creating the great Panic of 1837, which was orchestrated by Van Buren puppet Jackson’s shutting down, and despoiling of the Second National Bank of the United States.

Then, might we not ask: What about the hullabaloo

of the damned, foolish Jefferson-Jackson dinners?

Then consider the two most flagrant cases of actually treasonous roles of those once-incumbent Presidents who were puppets of London’s Wall Street: the President “Teddy” Roosevelt who put the “Bully” in bull-shit, and the Woodrow Wilson who relaunched his family’s Ku Klux Klan organization, on a greatly enlarged scale, from within what that treasonously-connected British puppet, Teddy Roosevelt had renamed “the White House,”² or a worse enemy of our Federal Constitution than even “Teddy,” the lying and treasonous British monarchy’s stooge, the Barack Obama of today.

For example, Harry S Truman earned the status of a treasonously bent scoundrel (e.g., “Wall Street maven”) who was to be seen as just that by the eyes of thoughtful veterans of “World War II.” Contrast the case of the practically treasonous (British-agent style) Truman with the Presidents who knew their duties at that time, such as future President Dwight Eisenhower who had replied succinctly, briefly and affirmatively, from Columbia University, to my very brief letter of that time. “Ike” did much in his time to save the United States and our nation’s global mission, as in both war and peace.

2. Theodore Roosevelt had been trained by his uncle James D. Bulloch, the leading U.S. traitor and British agent and spy for the time of Confederacy, even during and beyond the time his loving nephew Theodore had become President.

THE COMMITTEE TO RE-ELECT BARACK OBAMA



LPAC/Chance McGee

“Of the presently four leading Republican candidates in sight, three are outright scoundrels, and, the fourth [is] a deviant populist infected with an Austrian-school variety of the British imperialist school....”

The collaboration of General Douglas MacArthur with President Kennedy, in resisting the plainly treasonous, British-promoted scheme for a prolonged war in Southeast Asia, still echoes, even today,³ the actual London motives (both economic and strategic) for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, viewing Kennedy as being an essential source of insight into the history of the accelerating downturns in U.S. economy since the assassinations of both John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert.

Thence, the elections of certain Presidents, such as Richard Nixon, the silly Jimmy Carter, the “goofy” George H.W. Bush, his sorry son George W. Bush, Jr., and of the most evil of them all, President Barack Obama. Obama might be fairly considered on reflection, still today, as being the ultimate, exemplary, and notable rotten fruit of the assassinations of two Kennedy brothers; we have never, yet, reversed that downward trend in our nation’s economy, political history, and public morality, which has accelerated since the time of those Kennedy assassinations.⁴ The present pack of four notable Republican Presidential pre-candidates (in clear contrast to the respectable stubborn patriots of that same political party), are to be seen in the light of such heritages as those of the two Kennedy brothers who were inspired by the President Franklin Roosevelt legacy, and who worked toward that end, through the aid of efforts by that President’s widow, Eleanor Roosevelt.⁵

3. Perhaps a surprising fact, but a true one.

4. Again, Perhaps a surprising fact, but a true one.

5. President Lyndon Johnson was not a bad President, but, since the assassination of President Kennedy, he had suffered a well-informed fear of the fascist guns of French and Spanish haters of President Charles de

Now, the worst of the worst among them all to present date, has been the virtually imported specimen, President Barack Obama; none of the notable four current Republican candidates,—and they are totally unacceptable,—but even they could not be as outrightly evil as Obama, and are likely to be seen, perhaps, even as “lesser evils” were Obama to be continued as the Democratic candidate, even if thermonuclear warfare did not break out before the coming Presidential election could occur.

The fact to be considered on that account, is, that, of the presently four leading Republican candidates in sight, three are outright scoundrels, and, the fourth, a deviant populist infected with an Austrian-school variety of the British imperialist school: a combined variety which might be tolerated in a relatively small central-European nation, but would be a national U.S. catastrophe in its own right, were it tolerated in a major power, such as the U.S.A., in high office at this time of grave world crisis. There are some very good Republicans, and some not so bad; unfortunately, none of them who might be considered a decent candidate, is currently standing for a Presidential nomination, at this present time.

An A.D. 2012 Presidential candidate who would be the appropriate antithesis of both Barack Obama and the “Bush league,” and therefore actually a patriot,

Gaule which had been sent, very, very briefly in-and-out from Europe for the relevant mission. Robert Kennedy had been shot down as John F. Kennedy before him. Excepting the matter of President Ronald Reagan’s defense of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), no U.S. President since John F. Kennedy, has done better than Johnson on that account, and several cases, such as George W. Bush, Jr., and the Emperor Nero-like Obama, have been much worse, that still to the present date.

would be the only decent choice at this moment; but, he, or she must also possess certain crucial, other qualifications in addition to those standard virtues. Obama's British-made warfare policies could be reasonably foreseen as meaning that a very large number of American voters were dead, even a great majority, even before the actual 2012 election could have occurred.

We could probably endure all such evils as those, on three preconditions. First that Obama is summarily dumped, under Section Four of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment; second, that the Glass-Steagall Law is re-enacted; and, third, that the commitment to a Third National Bank's establishment be clearly foreseen. Anyone who would not force through all three of those actions, is no leading and loyal citizen of our United States as a matter of fact, and should be judged accordingly.

Therefore, there would be, presently, no hope for the United States, not only economically, nor, probably, even biologically, unless the President waiting to be elected, is neither one of the four Republicans now on stage, nor, the worst choice of all, the mass-murderous, and treasonous mimic of the ancient Roman Emperor Nero, British imperial puppet and established, treasonous mass-murderer Barack Obama himself. Former President Bill Clinton will now soon reverse the fatal error of support for an Obama Presidency, or neither of us, he, or I, are likely to outlive the months ahead.

Any Democrat who supports an Obama re-nomination must be either mentally deficient, or is perhaps a member of an opportunist species better named "Democrat," one who suffers a tendency for a degree of, shall I say, an opportunist's lack of "excessive courage for the true cause," at this time of truly existential world crisis.

"John Q." Visits the Delicatessen

The typical modern voter for high office in government, whether in today's U.S.A., or in most of western and central Europe, does not support what is actually a principle of our founded system of government. He, or she, would prefer to raid the intellectual delights of a delicatessen. "I like ... because of his stand on ... [a list of slogans], but I might prefer ... because of his stand on ..."

In other words, unless you and I do something to change the current trend among Democratic Party leaders, the typical voter (including such leaders) tends to be just plain damned silly, or worse, in the way he, or she votes for President in the "pot luck" voting-booth

store. That poor fellow picks his preferred pickles from the political delicatessen's pot, and leaves the rest "discreetly" to "other people's" imaginations. That sort of fellow might gain what he, or she had, chosen for his own self-inflicted wound; but he would turn out, usually, to have done almost nothing, in fact, to actually contribute anything to their nation's fate, except in the worst sense of such intended achievements:

"Hey Joe, how about that clown you supported in the last election?"

"Yeah, I know: but, don't rub it in; how about that fruit-cake you backed for the election? My man will have learned his lesson. Next time, you'll see, he will not let them fool him that way a second time."

"Okay, Joe; you asked for it!"



Citizens of such preferences as those, do not leave behind an impressive standard of recorded intellectual achievement among our voter class.

Such are the ordinary facts known to the fairly witting citizens, facts which they use to mislead themselves into becoming an ostensibly "unwitting" accomplice in yet another electoral catastrophe.

I. How To Choose a U.S. President

The great folly which has been done to quickly ruin the beautiful achievement of our original U.S. Federal Constitution, was, to a large degree, an outcome of the elections of the misguided John Adams and Thomas Jefferson as Presidents of the United States. The root of the failures of those latter two Presidents, and of some numbers from among others later, came as an echo of the role of Britain's Lord Shelburne, who was, and continued throughout his life as the representative of the British East India Company's 1763 victory in the "Seven Years War," the so-called "Peace of Paris," and the founder of that office of universal evil known since that time as the British Foreign Office.

The corrupting role of that same Foreign Office has persisted with recently increased, corrupting influence, up through the present date, when an outright British agent, and a clinically insane one at that, currently occupies the U.S. Presidency, that on the brink of the threatened, relatively immediate brink of a global thermo-nuclear war which might actually unleash a



“The great folly” which ruined the “beautiful achievement of our original U.S. Federal Constitution, was, to a large degree, an outcome of the elections of the misguided John Adams and Thomas Jefferson as Presidents of the United States,” writes LaRouche. Portrait of Jefferson (left) by Rembrandt Peale (1800); Adams, by Asher B. Durand (1835).

process of extinction of the human species.

Most of that time, since the more unfortunate elections of those national figures called to be a “U.S. President,” such an implicitly treasonous figure approaching the extremes of Obama, has frequently turned out to have been almost as pitiable a quality of stock as Obama.

We have such cases as David Rockefeller’s pitiable, poor President Jimmy Carter, or even something far worse, one such as the British royal puppet known as Barack Obama who has been the very worst indeed, so far. Even if one from among the string of Presidents, had not actually done anything properly considered “bad,” the negligences, or sometimes worse, when considered in the face of sundry moments of true national crisis, were usually both chronic in character and legion in number. If the incumbent had been such a poorly chosen one as that, those who had, typically, merely voted for that candidate, were often just as “guilty of negligence” for that failure as the actually successfully foolish incumbent in office: both dipped in the same pot, often a smoking one.

What is worse has been the fact, that when each of the current Republican candidates opens his mouth, the support for Obama continues to soar.

Consider some relevant specific parts of this history:

The weaknesses which appeared during the John Adams and Thomas Jefferson Presidencies, were already a forewarning of the real process of ruin which the United States suffered, from time to time, under many of the list of Presidents and Vice-Presidents who have appeared among us, beginning with the apparently perpetual traitor Aaron Burr’s own treasonous protégés, Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren. Errant expressions from among earlier national heroes such as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, share their own somewhat less guilty part, in their opportunists’ role in the undermining of the great principle of the Federal Constitution; but, the legacy of outright treason began with the installation of Burr and Andrew Jackson, the same legacy of treason which had been attacked explicitly by such as those exceptionally great Presidents as the Abraham Lincoln, William McKinley, and John F. Kennedy, who have been assassinated in office, or the Franklin D. Roosevelt whose death was heartily enjoyed by Winston Churchill’s U.S. Wall Street puppet-President and “mean little bastard” Harry S Truman.

The chief reason for the typical citizen’s failure to choose an intelligent choice in the polls, after all else had been considered, has been either pretty damned obvious at the time, or should have been, at least not long after the fact. All as if to prove, again, and yet again, that ignorance of the truth is not really innocence.

To set forth my own intention here, reconsider the case of those who condoned the shameless fraud of the so-called Warren Commission’s hideously treasonous, summary treatment of the case of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy,⁶ or, the shame of the relevant accusers of President Bill Clinton, when they should have been exposed as the authors of a virtually

6. Notably, as one high-ranking victim of the shooting of President Kennedy’s party in Dallas that day, John Connally, attested in the matter of the “magic bullet” that day, there was never any proof of the Warren Commission’s frankly fraudulent hand-waving fraud presented in this matter. In the matter of the motives for the assassination of President Kennedy, there is no doubt of the very powerful political motives of the hysterically frantic motives expressed by the impassioned enemies of the President’s economic and strategic-warfare policies who launched a prolonged War in Indo-China over, quite literally, the assassinated President’s dead body.

treasonous element of fraud in the nominally “Republican” effort at the impeachment of President William J. Clinton. When, in fact, the really evil motive expressed by the accusers, was a concocted sophistry which I regarded at that time as implicitly treasonous in both its intended and expressed effect.

When Clinton Was the Target

The actual, cheap, opportunists’ motive for the attempted impeachment of “Bill Clinton” was, in its most essential features, located not among patriotically motivated American citizens, but among a set of sort-of-Aaron Burr-style, British imperial fellow-travellers (largely those encumbered with poorly deserved U.S. citizenships) working against the vital interests of both our republic, as also against the interests of the majority of most of the particular citizens of the United States. In fact, they had been working, wittingly or not, in devotion to the vile intentions of the British-led adversaries of the very continued existence of our republic.

How could that have happened to us?

My dear fellow-citizens, you sometimes seem like children in the manner you are so often, so readily taken in by cheap stage-magicians’ tricks in such cases of political sophistry! That relevant point needs some additional attention here.

As you should have known by now, President Clinton did, ultimately, beat off the crew which framed up the irrelevant charges for impeachment against him, that at a great cost to him, but far greater damage than that to the future of our republic itself. In that case, nothing was done to right the wrong against our national republic which had been done by the wretched evil-doers behind that impeachment effort.

It happened to be the case that, at the time that charge of impeachment was being crafted by the relevant culprits, President Clinton was engaged in crafting measures which, while not finally definitive in their aimed effect, would have temporarily halted that plunge into a threatened doom of the United States which the repeal of Glass-Steagall was to unleash; the half-ruined Presidency of Bill Clinton came to be expressed as that folly of his toleration of the repeal of the Glass-Steagall law which has caused all of the major suffering which our United States and the great majority of its popula-



C-SPAN

The attempted impeachment of President Clinton was not patriotically motivated; it was carried out by a gang of British imperial fellow-travellers, working against the vital interests of our republic. Shown: The floor proceedings of the U.S. Senate during the Clinton impeachment trial.

tion has suffered economically since that time.

President Clinton’s own error, in condoning the repeal of Glass-Steagall, was a very grave error for which many have suffered, and many will die as a result of the effects of the cancelling of Glass-Steagall since that time, up through the present date. I doubt, strongly, that he would have conceded to that swindle of repeal of Glass-Steagall, but for the depressing effects of the attempted impeachment proceedings. Also, the fact that Al Gore was Vice-President at that time, and that a Gore candidacy implicitly demanded Clinton’s bending to the interests of that inherently failed Gore candidacy, begs the question, whether it was not the foolish Gore candidacy itself which had already worsened President Clinton’s high-priced discomfiture, and had brought about the shameful Republican selection of the “goofy bozo,” George W. Bush, Jr.

The answer to all that, is: When it comes to a so-called “bottom line” of contemporary public opinion, most of our citizens have acted as if they were either awfully dumb in their public performance as citizens;

or, perhaps, they did not care; or, perhaps, were in an intellectually sloppy state of their thinking at that time. This sort of recurrently careless behavior on such accounts, among even a majority among the body of citizens generally today, has been a recent trend in practice, as expressed, notably, on most of the critical issues which have shaped the shaping of the fate of our nation, most of the time. Such has been the type of traditionally ordinary citizen who had usually relied upon the political equivalent of a virtual dead political horse, as his chosen means for attempting to reach what he presumes will be his nation's hopeful destination.⁷

What I have just stated on this matter, is not a matter of the usual sort of mere "hand-waving gestures" in which too many, even among scientists who wish to be considered "popular," indulge themselves all too often. There is, all too often, a viciously false substitution of the priestly opinions of some relic of an ancient Babylonian priestcraft, as a replacement for true political principles: a trend which continues to have been used to corrupt the opinions of most of our citizens.

This is not a recent case. Such shamefulness has been exhibited most of time since the wretched foolishness shown by those citizens who supported the election of the implicitly treasonous inclinations which had been sometimes traced as spoor found along the Cherokee Nation's "trail of tears," as strewn in the political wake of traitor Aaron Burr's puppet-President, Andrew Jackson.

The case of the misguided personal voter is among the most crucial of those dangers to our republic which must be faced in the current approach to the coming U.S. general election of 2012.

The error to that effect, is not merely that most of the voters are often even violently incompetent in their opinion on even the most crucial issues: the case of the election and re-election of the wretched President Andrew Jackson, is typical of that error from back then, whether it were the product of a malicious intention, or the foolish, simple lack of understanding the subject-matter.

In this case, President Thomas Jefferson's cover-up of the implication of Aaron Burr's murder of Alexander Hamilton, was a crucial step leading toward the role of the same Burr in the evil intent shown by both Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren in their complicity with

fellow-accomplice Aaron Burr. So much for the deep roots of sophistry (e.g., "Liberalism") which must occur within the leadership of the Democratic Party still today.

In the case of Andrew Jackson, in particular, his recurrently loutish inclination to do evil, was as fully intentional as it had become the habitual criminality of typical Aaron Burr cronies generally. The problem is not only that of the lack of any innocent coincidence between intention of the candidate, and presumption of the credulous voters; the more fundamental issue is, as in the case of Jackson, that not only does the voter serve as a too-readily-fooled dupe, but that the backers of the candidate used every sophistry "in the proverbial book," to "hoodwink the suckers" (suckers such as those who voted for the likenesses of Jackson and Van Buren, yet once more, and once more yet again, still today.)

II. The Issue of Political Principles

*The great challenge posed by the notion of the right of the citizen to choose an elected government has always been: **how often could the innately errant will of a current electoral majority of a party leadership be induced to change its customarily opportunist dedication, this time to represent, simultaneously, a democratic expression, and be a truthful judgment-in-fact?** Clearly, it could if most of our judges, elected Federal officials, and ordinary citizens could be obliged to be truthfully and consistently competent, as well as personally honest in their judgment, and, perhaps, might also be committed to the universal principle of the specifically human ("voluntarist") individuality at the same time: but whence did anyone construe the notion that there exists some form of truth inherent in the deep corruption which is called the systemic irrationality of doctrinal "liberalism"?*

Of course, arbitrary, and relatively tyrannical rule is to be abhorred and frustrated; but, it was never necessary, nor tolerable that "liberalism" be construed as being consistent with actual truthfulness in the strict sense of meanings.

The evidence on this point is to be made clear from the total sum of the evidence of not only the regrettable features of our own republic's history, but among the leaders of nations generally; without a principle of scientifically clear truth,

7. There has been a clearly visible decline in the level of "responsible behavior" among the members of our population since the combined effects of the Kennedy assassinations and the trend set during the combined effects of the unfolding of the Indo-China war and the anti-science cults launched during the late 1960s and the 1970s.

the goals of the creation of our United States can not, usually have not, and will not be secured.

What, therefore, is the meaning of the word “truth,” under these circumstances of today’s prevalent practice of the loose bowels of sophistry often exhibited at even the highest levels of popular judgment respecting the policy-shaping of, and among nations? The cases of the treasonous Aaron Burr, Andrew Jackson, and Martin Van Buren were often preferred as being presumed to be “democratic,” but were never truthful.

Indeed, for those who know the truth, a commitment to the re-election of President Barack Obama, could be the death of most Americans in thermonuclear bombardment, even before the November 2012 vote were to be cast.

A competent practice of discovery in physical science is to be greatly preferred, most of the time, over the customary vote in a so-called “democratic vote.” Yet, even a so-called “decent” scientific practice, has often shown its own faults on this account. That implication of a competent physical science is also indispensable for all facets of honest statecraft.

That is the crucial point at issue here: a crucial point of physical science. What is truth, actually?

This time, the Democratic Party leadership must be induced to become what is now absolutely necessary, and also, for a change, truthful, rather than merely populist sophistries. Should the Democratic Party’s leadership fail to deliver the necessary result against the wretched Obama, the hope of succor is left to the hope of some Republican candidates unlike any among the present four Republican candidates whose antics are currently boosting the potential vote for Obama.

The modern roots of the principles of a true republic, lie in such founders of our own republic as the original great predecessors, among the Winthrops and Mathers, such as the Cotton Mather of our first American republic, the Massachusetts Bay Colony. These are the precedents which must be traced into our present modern times. Those are needed root-principles from the central role performed by the Fourteenth-century Renaissance’s principal founder of modern science, Nicholas of Cusa; they include the Cotton Mather who, as the mentor of our great scientist-statesman Benjamin Franklin, emphasized the notion

of a principle: “To do good.”⁸

Nonetheless, the credentials of the United States go deeper, to the developments originally centered in not only the 1439 Great Ecumenical Council of Florence, but the coincidence of the A.D. 1431 torture and cremation of Jeanne d’Arc (while alive!) by her English captors, with a coincident, startled and shocked attention to this atrocity called to the Church councils in progress at that time. Thus, her martyrdom and its effects reverberated quickly throughout France and beyond, as this was most clearly echoed later in the role of France’s Louis XI as a leader within the process set into motion by the Great Ecumenical Council of Florence and the work of Nicholas of Cusa in the founding of all of the presently competent strains of modern European science. This was the setting of the true birth of all competent strains in modern physical science.

It remains, also, as the great principle underlying the launching of our own Federal Constitution.

That aspect of the principles of modern physical science, is of the most crucial importance in coming to an effective comprehension of the crisis in the principles of modern statecraft which I report to you here.

The Issue Lies in the Subject of Truth

During the interval from mid-2010, through early February 2012, I have devoted a major portion of my expended time in setting forth an identification and description of certain deep principles which underlie my unique achievements, since 1956-57 and beyond, as a relatively uniquely successful forecaster in the matter of economic developments. Since 1953, these methods of forecasting adopted by me have been a uniquely successful practice in general, insofar as I have been able to

8. In references to the writings of leading figures from the original Massachusetts Bay Colony, it is crucial to recognize the absolute distinction between the cautious relationship of the founders to Britain, since the Mayflower had “put into” the Portuguese colony at the tip of Cape Cod in search of directions, to find their way to the Plymouth Rock landing, as to be contrasted to the horrid state of moral, economic, and political affairs introduced to the colony under the viciously wicked representative of the “New Venetian Party” led across the English Channel, from the Netherlands, by William of Orange. The New Venetian Party represented that split from the original Venetian Party, a new Venetian Party which had been founded by Paolo Sarpi. The founding of the British empire, was to be traced from its roots in the original Roman Empire, via Byzantium, and via the “third Roman empire” of the Crusaders, via the subsequent role of the New Venetian Party. That “New Venetian” empire has been the essence of the founding of the present-day British empire since the triumph of the British East India Company’s “Seven Years War” at the February 1763 “Peace of Paris.”

deploy them, as this fact is exemplified in cases such as my celebrated victory in a December 2, 1971 debate against a then internationally leading, British Keynesian Professor, Abba Lerner, at New York City's Queens College.

My relevant, earlier entry into the field of economic forecasting as such, which had occurred during the mid-1950s, was an expression of my professional employment as a consultant in economic management, as expressed most notably in my exceptional achievements in recognizing the inherent folly of the current practices, and their implications, of marketing of both new and used automobiles under the rubrics of leading relevant automobile corporations.⁹

The outcome of those developments in my work as a professional management consulting executive during that time, was expressed as based in advances in my methods of physical-economic forecasting effected during the Summer of 1956, for what I had then pinpointed as a virtually certain crash of the U.S. economy to be experienced during the interval of the coming late February to early March in 1957.

The approach which I had adopted, an approach which led to the relatively unique success of my forecast "within the trade" during that interval, did not please the other executives of my corporate employer at that time, especially once the evidence showed that I had been successful in my forecasting the 1957 crash within the range of those specified dates, as in contrast to the failed views of the other leading executives of the firm and the relevant "trade" generally. The grave error of my rivals in that firm was their frankly foolish reliance on the intrinsically failed practice of a virtually Bertrand Russellite sort of "statistical forecasting,"

9. I think it a relevant personal note here, that it is my experience to find myself nagged by an energetic sense of shame, whenever I saw myself tempted to seek the likeness of a "passing grade" in respect to which my conscience recognized me as tempted to seek the comforts awarded to those corruptible persons who "go along to get along." My recollection on that account is most vivid when I decided to reject the taught classroom dogma of Euclidean geometry which I knew, from the start to be a fraudulent doctrine, because I had recognized, by the age of 15, the existence of a physical principle of construction which readily proves Euclidean geometry to have been a fraud from the start. A fact which I had been taught by examining the "holes" in high-rise steel construction at Boston's U.S. Charlestown Navy Yard. I could never tolerate submission to "Euclidean" and comparable, commonly taught academic hoaxes since that time.



EIRNS/Alan Yue

Since his celebrated victory in a 1971 debate with the then leading, British Keynesian Professor, Abba Lerner, LaRouche has been recognized as the world's most successful economic forecaster. LaRouche (seated) and Lerner, shown here at the debate.

rather than competently applied physical science.

Nonetheless, the continued development of my forecasting methods, during the 1960s and beyond, have been proven to have been the root of a capability which has continued to be uniquely exceptional in their successes thus far, and which continue to be what might be described as "broadly authoritative" in their effects at the present instant, especially when considered against the incompetent standard set by the sophisticated liberalism of John Maynard Keynes, and my defeated Keynesian "victim," the imported Keynesian Professor Abba Lerner, in the Queens College debate of Dec. 2, 1971.

That British Professor Abba Lerner had been hauled into the December 2nd debate against me, as a leading part of an effort to find, in the Keynesian Lerner, a global champion to defend those deeply embarrassed, leading U.S. economists who had failed utterly to recognize their utterly incompetent view of an already on-rushing deep 1971 recession, a recession which I had defined, and against which I had warned repeatedly, specifically throughout the late 1960s into the Summer of 1971. That conspicuous, and most embarrassing failure of the ostensibly leading academic and related economists of not only the U.S.A., but Europe, had been the result of a systemic incompetence inherent in what they had been teaching to the hatchlings of Academia for years, their academically most embarrassing

failure to recognize what was more the failure of their silly, Keynesian-like statistical doctrines, rather than that of the real (i.e., physical) economy itself.

From the beginning of my entry into the relevant studies which had led me into my profession as a physical economist about a decade-and-a-half earlier, my initial standard was set, as I have just noted above, by my adolescent recognition of the principled, physical-scientific incompetence of so-called Euclidean geometry. Thence, I had been led in my searches for further confirmation of my view of Euclidean and related methods into certain works of Bernhard Riemann, his 1854 habilitation dissertation most notably, from which I had already drawn certain systemic conclusions, during the mid-1950s, which I had brought into play, step by step, since the early years of the post-Truman decade.¹⁰

Consequently, the development of my professional commitment to the assessment of the economic catastrophe building up in the automotive and related credit practices during my first-hand engagements during the 1954-1957 interval, and, then, beyond represented an increasing commitment to the implications of the unique success implicit in the further exploration and application of Riemannian methods.

It was at a later time, since approximately early 1971, that my earlier emphasis on Riemann was first “adjusted” to incorporate the specific, and wonderful implications of the superior quality of scientific revolution generated through the work of V.I. Vernadsky. It would not be unfair, or an exaggeration, to emphasize that Riemann, Max Planck, Albert Einstein, and Vernadsky, express, typically, the innermost core of those conceptions upon which a fully humanistic comprehension of mankind’s role within our Solar system and its subsuming galaxy depends, as a leading challenge for the understanding of almost everything we really know concerning such matters presently.

That paradoxical subject is a matter which I have already elaborated in important features in my two-volume work represented, successively, by my recent **The Mystery of Your Time**¹¹ and **Science-vs-**

10. At that time, since late 1953, it had been the opening passages and concluding section of the Riemann habilitation dissertation, those dealing with the ontological issues posed by the intrinsic fraud of Euclidean axiomatics which had put me on the relevant track for the analysis of physical-economic practices.

11. Jan. 20, 2012 **EIR** http://www.larouche.com/lar/2012/3903/mystery_your_time.html or Lyndon LaRouche PAC <http://larouche.com/node/21206>

Oligarchism.¹² I mean the problem posed by a misguided, all-too-literal reliance on the grossly fallible role of bare human sense-perception as such.

There is an essential relevance of that referenced material, thus far, for the political-strategic-economic crisis immediately before us. In parts that report is left incomplete with respect to certain important, leading scientific work in which my own and my scientific associates’ work, among that of other professionals, is very much in energized progress at this time. Nonetheless, despite the conditional limitations I have self-imposed on presenting certain aspects of my present views now, and which I have therefore placed on my report, here at this time, what I do report is both valid and most urgently relevant, for as far as I am disposed to publish on what may be confidently treated as *work-urgently-in-progress* at this time.

I am not reluctant to identify that added material, except that it be considered only in concert with a relevant scientific or related audience where matters include still-debatable conclusions which are to be held as important, even urgently important subjects for early progress. Essentially, Albert Einstein’s “ $E=mc^2$ ” persists as the physical parameter which dominates the discussion more today than ever before. I limit the essential features of the argument presented in this present report to their bearing on the notion of what constitutes both a physical-scientific standard and a valid principle of constitutional law, as distinct from the fallacies inherent in the more ordinary notions of practiced law.

What Is Truly “American Law”?

The founding of the new quality of universal law which was presented to modern European culture in the context of the Great Ecumenical Council of Florence, had been most clearly conveyed to modern European science partly by the circles of Filippo Brunelleschi, and, more notably by the Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa who posed to Europe, then, the principled challenge of moving the channels of progress from the deeply corrupted habits of Europe to habitats across the great oceans. Christopher Columbus’ trans-Atlantic voyages of discovery, were among the specific outcomes of that injunction promulgated by the same Nicholas of Cusa whose work, such as

12. Feb. 17, 2012 **EIR** http://www.larouche.com/lar/2012/3907/science_v_oligarchism.html or Lyndon LaRouche PAC <http://larouche.com/node/21503>



"The notion of money must be now replaced, in its entirety, by the same principle of credit which was introduced to the U.S. Federal Constitution by the prompting of Benjamin Franklin and Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton." Detail of "The Signing of the U.S. Constitution," by Howard Chandler Christy (1940); Hamilton looks over Franklin's shoulder.

his **De Docta Ignorantia** distinguishes the principle upon which the founding of a competent modern science rests, from its then continued Mediterranean-based Roman and medieval predecessors.

The resulting, exemplary distinction of the notions of lawfulness conveyed by the work of Cusa and Cusa's current of scientific progress, can be efficiently summarized for purposes of definitions as a rejection of the reigning oligarchical system of doctrine and public practice throughout Europe at that time.

The effect of Cusa's influence to this effect, found its most original form of most significant influence in the appearance and development of the Massachusetts Bay colonization under the Seventeenth-century leadership of the Winthrops and Mathers, as expressed in the work of the original Harvard's Classical European program of education derived from influence of the work of Nicholas of Cusa in Europe of that time. This influence persisted as leading in the New England colony until the consummately evil New Venetian Party of the followers of Paolo Sarpi took over the crushing

of the Massachusetts settlement during the closing quarter of that century.

It had been at the urging of Cotton Mather, that young Benjamin Franklin was to move the development of his career from a Massachusetts colony crushed by the New Venetian Party's William of Orange, toward what became Franklin's worldwide influence extended across the Atlantic, and, hence, the creation of what became our uniquely constituted young American republic, a republic whose presently endangered genius had been a world-wide, historical force among mankind until the time of the repeal of that Glass-Steagall law adopted under President Franklin Roosevelt, which law had given a fresh basis for the continuation of the intention of the U.S. Federal Constitution, until the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert.

Since those murders of the two brothers, the net effect has been a consistent intellectual and moral decline of the U.S.A. and Western and Central Europe, a decline which was set abruptly into motion by the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, from which there is been no general physical, moral, or intellectual recovery in the trans-Atlantic region of the planet to the present date.

Therefore, our mission, which I have adopted as my own particular responsibility, and for which I have been much feared, increasingly, by the trans-Atlantic establishment, that, most notably, since my surge to a leading position of fearfully hated intellectual intention in the trans-Atlantic region in a British-monarchy-led response to my presentation of the case of the August-December 1971 proof of the intrinsic fallacy of the "economics doctrine" of the relevant elements of, in particular, the English-speaking trans-Atlantic community.

Understanding Our Failed Economists

The root of the evil to be considered by mankind at this crucial juncture in history, is, proverbially, the superstitious, and also extremely pathological nature of the belief in "money" as such. It is indispensable, if our civilization is to outlive the presently onrushing threat of an immediate outbreak of general thermonuclear warfare, that we free mankind of the pathological characteristic of the general belief in money. The notion of money must be now replaced, in its entirety, by the same principle of credit which was introduced to the U.S. Federal Constitution by the prompting of Benja-

min Franklin and Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton. Unless that change is made now, the very existence of our United States were almost about to cease to exist. The function of national and world economy must now be replaced, as if immediately, by a physical principle of credit, the same notion of credit emphasized by the combined genius of Benjamin Franklin and Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton.

After all, the original Massachusetts economy under the brilliantly successful design of the Winthrops and Mathers, was based on the principle of a credit system, that of the Pine Tree Shilling. That economic system never failed in its own design; it could only be crushed by a frankly Satanic force such as the New Venetian party of the followers of Paolo Sarpi, the so-called Netherlands party of William of Orange.

All the relevant incompetencies and related failures of the U.S.A. economy since that time, have been the consequence of substituting the British imperial model of a monetarist system for the U.S. constitutional credit-system. In fact, all monetarist systems of government are intrinsically branches of an imperialist system, one such still to be traced in its development through the pathway represented by the first “universal” system of Mediterranean culture known as the Roman Empire, as that precedent has been extended, almost without exception there, up through the present date.

There exists no intrinsic value in a system of money *per se*. Only the establishment of a credit system, to replace monetarist systems, could bring the world out of the presently lunging plunge into a general physical-economic breakdown-crisis of the planet generally in progress during the present moment.

The fact which I have just stated, thus, requires that we introduce a new chapter of this report, that required to create a separation of the state of monetarist practices habituated to the minds of our citizens presently, to a fresh bath taken in the cleansing waters of a credit system.



NASA

Once we have mastered the colonization of the Moon and Mars, development of matter-antimatter systems will allow mankind to reach out to the rim of the Solar System and beyond. Shown: An artist's concept of a crew carrying out drilling on Mars.

III. The United States as a Credit System, Not a Monetarist One

Probably, for not less than three generations, the organization of human society should be foreseen as depending presently upon a system of respectively fully sovereign nation-states, united in intention through a common commitment to a true credit-system, rather than any form of continuation of a monetarist system.

Long before the time three generations will have lapsed, the progress of mankind's entry to the “colonization” of nearby Solar space, and somewhat beyond, should have reached a preliminary state of “colonization” of not only our Moon, but also Mars.

The human habitation might still, then, be essentially limited to pioneering on the Moon and Mars, but, the security of those colonies, and also Earth itself, will have come to depend on a vast system of dense deployments of units of instrumentation for protection of mankind's life within the inner range of the Solar planetary system. It is also clear in the views of the relevant specialists, that that will be a domain in which an increasingly extra-terrestrial mankind “mines” the sources of asteroids and such, rather than going back to dig such materials out of Earth. That will be within the range of realization of thermonuclear fusion.

Later, when systems of matter/anti-matter are being deployed as a resource for developing a protective

screen of security objects, including galactic weather-forecasting, within the Solar system and nearby regions of the galaxy, we should have reached states of technological development virtually beyond the reach of our potential conceptions today; then, humanity should have reached the domain of man's matter/anti-matter travel to the rim of the Solar system and beyond.

There is a systematic approach to understanding the implications of those notions of the potential future of mankind within even the bounds of the remainder of the present century. The dark side of that issue, is that unless we accomplish such objectives, mankind might become extinct for lack of such progress. The continuation of the "zero technological growth" policy would probably lead toward the extinction of our species within the remainder of this century—already, within the course of the Twentieth Century, the "zero-growth" policies of the just-concluded century, such as the policies of the late Bertrand Russell, have already brought mankind to the brink of a beginning of a threat to the continued existence of the human species, a danger which inheres in what we are currently forbidding be done.

Those general observations stated to situate our prospects, should focus attention on the related subjects immediately faced by the presently living generations. During the meantime, the demonstrated, rising tempo of scientific human access to an increasing ration of the implications of matter/anti-matter functions, will almost certainly be of increasing significance for human progress on and beyond our planet Earth, during the decades immediately ahead.

Against that general background, there are two general principles of leading importance to be taken into account. In terms of broad generalities, there are two requirements which are absolutely essential, not only for the progress of humanity, but for prevention of qualitative failure to increase human per-capita productivity.

Mankind has recently entered a history of its existence within this Solar system and the galaxy which includes it, which includes conditions of that galaxy which human life on our planet has never experienced within the known several millions of years of its existence on Earth. The implication is the threat of a galactic quality of danger which had not been efficiently known to us earlier in any definite way during our species' earlier practice. On this basis alone, the challenge of preserving human life within this Solar system itself becomes a challenge to mankind within the span of this present century.

The presently known categories of means placed

within our reach and knowledge thus far, emphasize the development of forms of human practice depending upon the practice of both thermonuclear and matter/anti-matter means for both the spread of the prospective habitats of our species beyond the limits of Earth, and modes of transport and dwelling-places for human life made possible within the ranges of thermonuclear and matter/anti-matter capabilities.

So, transport of human passengers by means for reaching Mars orbit within approximately a week's duration, is presented as a subject for feasible development by means of thermonuclear fusion, and the prospect of matter/anti-matter applications in a calculable estimate of a future development. For what should be considered reasonable presumptions, such capabilities are considerable matters of currently active attention for accelerated developments.

There is a unique quality of implication in all this, respecting the special quality of known distinction of mankind from all other presently known as existing types of living species. Mankind's apparently specific distinction is that of an essentially, prospectively immortal species. This distinction is accessible to us explicitly in the role of human creativity; by this accessible means, the human individual surpasses what is called "death" through the expression of what is actual human creativity, a quality not known to exist in any other presently known species. Thus, morally the good which we may do is preserved across the span of successive generations, even probably for existence within our galaxy and beyond, through the aid of the discovery and mastery of so-called physical principles presently unknown to us.

Such is the proper human appetite for the perpetuation of the principle of human life and the work which awaits it within this universe. It is the specific expression of the reciprocal interdependency of human life and human creativity which supplies us the true notion of human immortality expressed as progress, expressed inclusively as thermonuclear fusion and matter/anti-matter modalities.

The alternative to such prospects is a virtually Nietzschean or comparable intellectual/emotional depravity. The greatest danger to all mankind, is the quality of cultural pessimism typified by Nietzschean and comparable expressions of depravity, depravity such as that expressed by the real-life form of a pro-satanic notion of "zero growth," which is the truest expression of what were properly identified as the expression of "sheer evil."

Empire Enters March with A Roar for Global War

by Nancy Spannaus

March 6—“All of our lives are hanging, literally, by a silken thread. If the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey and a series of other American military officers had not argued vehemently against a military attack on Iran, the greater part of humanity would have been lost, already now, in a global thermonuclear war.”

With those words, Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche called for an international mobilization to prevent World War III over the weekend of March 2-4, precisely the period when the footsoldiers of the British financial empire had declared their intentions to escalate toward a global confrontation against both Iran and Russia. The central foci of the British were the annual meeting of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in Washington, and the Russian Presidential election. In both cases, British agents, including Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, U.S. President Barack Obama, and the “democracy” movement in Russia, were threatening to detonate all-out war, if Russia and China, in particular, did not capitulate to the bankrupt Empire’s terms.

While hundreds of LaRouche movement activists took to the streets over the weekend to alert the public, there were also high-ranking military-political circles in the West, who share the LaRouches’ understanding of the nuclear war danger, and were speaking out. Russian patriots also did their part to meet the threat, by re-electing Vladimir Putin as President, as an affirmation of their commitment to sovereignty (see following article).

Yet, as Lyndon LaRouche emphasized after the announcement of the Putin victory, the “surprise extinction” of the human race through thermonuclear war remains an imminent danger, due to the fact that the desperate British Empire retains de facto control over the U.S. Presidency through its puppet, the insane narcissist Barack Obama. “I’m calmly sitting here, wondering if I’m going to be extinct by morning, or the morning after,” LaRouche said. Those who have not moved to remove Obama from office by the 25th Amendment or impeachment, or do not do so immediately, are directly responsible if that war does get detonated in the days and weeks ahead.

An Extraordinary Mobilization

While much of the anti-war mobilization being carried out in the U.S. and Europe is occurring behind the scenes, two extraordinary reflections of that activity surfaced in early March, serving to buttress the LaRouche movement’s campaign.

On March 2, an interview with former French Prime Minister Michel Rocard was published in the French daily *Libération*. Rocard blasted the “collective political imbecility” of the current French Presidential election campaign, pointing especially to the fact that the public debate was ignoring one of the main dangers facing the world, a potential “nuclear” war arising from the conflict in the Middle East. We quote:

“Nobody is watching the Middle East. We have an Anglo-American strategy there, accepted by others, no-



White House video

Israeli Premier Netanyahu and President Obama—both British agents—shake hands on their mutual commitment to detonate all-out war, if the Empire doesn't get its way.

tably including ourselves, whose aim is to torpedo any possibility of serious discussions with the Iranians. And to even engage in provocations from time to time. As if the aim were to prepare a climate of tolerance making Israeli strikes acceptable. In this hypothesis, the war would become an Iranian-Syrian war, supported by China and Russia, as we saw at the UN, against the West at large and its clients. And Europe is silent. *That is a crisis with millions of dead, the hypothesis being that it would be nuclear from the beginning.* I know well those cases and I have never been so frightened. . . . What is new, is the intensity of danger with respect to the superficial state of mind” (emphasis added).

No political leader from the European continent outside of the LaRouche movement, except the Russians, has so explicitly warned of the nuclear war danger.

Equally stunning was the move by leading retired military and intelligence officials in the United States. On March 5, the second day of the AIPAC Conference, eight such officials signed a full-page ad in the *Washington Post*, calling on President Obama to “Say No to a War of Choice with Iran.” While featuring a short text which insisted that diplomacy was still possible and “military action at this time is not only unnecessary,” but “dangerous—for the United States and for Israel,” the ad, paid for by the National Iranian-American Council, featured anti-war quotes from current and former military officers and Secretaries of Defense—including the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey.

Dempsey has taken the point over recent weeks in insisting that war with Iran should and can be avoided, because that country is a “rational actor” amenable to diplomacy. Indeed, the record shows that Iran has repeatedly sought, and even agreed to, diplomatic offers to resolve questions about its nuclear program, only to be rebuffed.

The ad’s signators are an impressive group: Maj. Gen. Paul Eaton (USA, ret.); Tom Finger, former Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Analysis; Lt. Gen. Robert G. Gard, Jr. (USA, ret.); Gen. Joseph Hoar (USMC, ret.); Brig. Gen. John H. Johns, PhD (USA, ret.); Maj. Gen.

Rudolph Ostovich III (USA, ret.); Paul Pillar, former National Intelligence Officer for Near East and South Asia; and Col. Lawrence Wilkerson (USA, ret.).

Who’s Listening?

Why do such distinguished military-intelligence professionals have to take to the pages of a newspaper to try to get the President’s attention on such a life-or-death matter for the nation and the world? Because not only is the U.S. President a British pawn, but all the top political institutions—both political parties and the Congress—are currently being controlled by a combination of lunatics and cowards, who refuse to take the most basic measures to save the nation, starting with removing Obama, and then re-imposing Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall Act.

Indeed, knowledgeable sources report that Obama responded to his top military advisors’ request that he “lower the boom” on the Israelis and demand they not carry out a pre-emptive strike against Iran, by saying that he would not, and he would “prefer not to know” if the Israelis were going to take this action.

The behavior of the U.S. Congress at the annual AIPAC meetings is reflective of the problem the American public faces (and has in part created). Every year, hundreds of Congressmen and Senators vie with each other to vow more support for Israel, no matter what its policies—and, for the substantial amount of monies which AIPAC provides. When Israeli policy is being steered by a British puppet such as Benjamin Netanyahu, this obeisance can be extremely dangerous.

Netanyahu and his Defense Minister Ehud Barak have spared few efforts in demanding that the U.S. Administration back its intention to take on Iran, even with a preemptive strike. After getting a visit from General Dempsey, in which he was told, according to Dempsey's own report, that an attack on Iran would be "premature" and dangerous, Netanyahu decided to send Barak to Washington prior to the AIPAC meeting, to demand U.S. backing for a military attack against Iran. Among his concerns was that Israeli President Shimon Peres, a representative of the older generation of Israeli founders, had expressed his disagreement with Netanyahu's bellicose perspective for immediate military action. Barak lashed out at Peres, who was scheduled to meet with Obama, for failing to follow the government's line.

At AIPAC itself, it was Netanyahu who took the lead in pushing for war, including—according to press leaks—in his three hours of private meetings with President Obama. Netanyahu is insisting publicly that Israel cannot tolerate Iran having the *capability* of developing a nuclear weapon—effectively a demand for Iran to give up all uranium enrichment capability and its nuclear science. He is also insisting—according to one report, on the advice of British "Arabist" Bernard Lewis—that any nuclear capability represents an imminent danger to Israel, in effect, that Iran would immediately attack.

At AIPAC, Bibi went for the ultra-dramatic, comparing Iran to Nazi Germany, and reading letters of those who were demanding that President Roosevelt bomb Auschwitz. "We've waited for diplomacy to work; we've waited for sanctions to work. None of us can afford to wait much longer," Netanyahu said. "As Prime Minister of Israel, I will never let my people live in the shadow of annihilation." "It must always have the ability to defend itself, by itself against any threats, he said."

In fact, Iran has no nuclear weapons. Bibi's evaluation is contradicted by the evaluation of all major intelligence agencies in the United States, and by some in Israel itself. Not only is it clear that Iran does not have a nuclear bomb or the means of delivering it, but it is not seeking a war in which it would immediately be subject to incineration from nuclear-armed Israel (if not others).

But Netanyahu's warmongering lunacy is being supported by vocal Senators, including Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), and John McCain (R-Ariz.), and a host of hysterical Congressmen. Even more insidious is the back-up being provided by the

current leadership of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is following the pathway of promoting disinformation, or simply unsubstantiated rumors, about Iran's nuclear program in a way similar to the path which led to the (British-pushed) disinformation which led to the 2003 Iraq War (see Interview with Robert Kelley, this issue).

The British Hand

The most dangerous aspect of the current war danger is the one which even the most conscientious opponents of preemptive war by Israel, or the United States, are ignoring—the controlling British hand. As LaRouche has repeatedly emphasized, the controlling power in this Middle East cockpit is not the powers in the region, but the British empire, whose masters are seeking to assure their world power by forcing the sovereign nations of Russia and China to capitulate—by threat of nuclear war. Israel, Iran, Syria, even the United States, are only pawns in this imperial strategic game.

All the more reason to reassert America's true interest and sovereignty, not to mention survival—by removing Obama.



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

London Clearly States Its Intention To Wipe Out Sovereign Russia

March 6—On Feb. 29, four days before the Russia Presidential elections, Lord Robert Cecil's Chatham House, the mother of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and the headquarters of the post-World War I British imperialism of the Round Table, issued a highly publicized report on Russia, following Vladimir Putin's March 4 election as President. What that 70-page report makes clear in black and white is what Lyndon LaRouche and this magazine have been warning of for several months now: London is determined to destroy a sovereign Russia, and therefore has made Putin a major target for the immediate period ahead.

By the time the report was released, of course, it was already clear that the popular Putin was going to win the Presidential election on the first round, and he did, with over 63% of the votes cast. But London has made clear, with this report and other measures, that what they deem "Putinism" must be destroyed, either by assassinating him, creating chaos through London-spawned terror and so-called democracy movements, or by a thermonuclear war confrontation straight out.

The Chatham House Report

In the Chatham House report, British Imperialism makes the Marxist argument that the system of "Putinism" will inevitably, and quickly be laid low by its own internal contradictions—especially that between the social-class superstructure of "personalist" rule, and the need to develop what the authors consider the productive forces.

Advanced technology requires liberal democracy in order to function, the authors claim. They echo the argument of certain liberal Russian oppositionists who locate an insoluble contradiction in the fact that opposition to Putin is centered in a supposed "new creative class" of Internet-savvy Gen-Xers—the class respon-

sible for the latest economic breakthroughs—such as Facebook.

All five authors are Chatham House Fellows or Associate Fellows. The most rabid is Lilia Shevtsova, who doubles as a senior associate of the Carnegie Moscow Center, formerly the bailiwick of now-U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul. In an earlier incarnation, she had received a PhD in political science from the Academy of Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (the highest educational establishment of the CPSU, which prepared theoretical workers for Party institutions) in 1976. Shevtsova classes "Putinism" as "autocracy," and writes that Russia has suffered under it for centuries—i.e., it is the old Tsarist system. If that is true, then London's wild threats against Putin today reveal an intention to replay the assassination in 1881, of the reformer Tsar Alexander II, who freed the serfs. It is Shevtsova who asks whether Putin will be able to escape the fate of Muammar Qaddafi, who was murdered after surrendering to the Obama-British-French forces last year.

Chatham House repeats almost verbatim the lines set forth in the London *Economist* articles last December (which we described in the first of the three articles in the Brits vs. Putin dossier, in *EIR* of Dec. 16. "City of London mouthpiece *The Economist* magazine spelled out the intention in two articles and an editorial in its Dec. 10 issue, writing that unrest after the Dec. 4 State Duma elections 'may not be the beginning of a revolution, but it is the end of Vladimir Putin's era of alleged stability.'"

Like all the British strategists who hate Putin, the authors are liberal imperialists. They insist that the strategic objective of the West should be "integrating Russia into a liberal world system." Expressing the insanity of the bankrupt British globalist empire, they insist that Russia (a country with a formidable strategic

nuclear arsenal) is “punching above its weight” in world affairs. It is telling that the author of the chapter titled “Russia’s Geopolitical Compass: Losing Direction” is James Nixey, a specialist in the Caucasus, Britain’s traditional stomping ground for destabilizing Russia.

The Democracy Movements

Not surprisingly, the aftermath of the Presidential elections has proceeded according to the Chatham House/*Economist* script. A report was immediately released by European election observers claiming that the election results were fraudulent, because of the pattern of media coverage of the candidates prior to the voting. A rally of protest was held the day after the election.

In Moscow’s Pushkin Square, Left Front leader Sergei Udaltsov, who, during the campaign was a spokesman for Communist Party candidate Zyuganov, was one of the extraparliamentary protestors who turned the authorized March 5 rally into a provocation, ending in his arrest along with blogger Alexei Navalny, and others. Some 15-20,000 people demonstrated in the evening under the now-customary “Honest Elections” banner. Navalny revved up the crowd by shouting “We here are the power!” Gorbachov ally Vladimir Ryzhkov of the unregistered Parnas party led chants of “Russia without Putin,” proclaimed “Their elections are a farce, their power is illegitimate,” and announced a larger rally to be organized for Saturday, March 10.

When the rally ended, Udaltsov urged people to stay. Around 1,000 did. After an hour, according to Russian media reports, the OMON police special forces started demanding that the crowd disperse. They then enforced the order, linking arms to push the protesters out of the square. Udaltsov, Navalny, and other resisters were arrested—an act the demonstrators undoubtedly wanted, in order to try to build the March 10 demonstration.

How successful these forces will be is unpredictable, but they are not the only line of attack by London.

Assassination Threat

On Feb. 7, Russia’s state-owned First Channel TV, followed by state television Rossiya-1 and other channels, revealed that Ukrainian and Russian security services last month foiled an attempt on the life of Prime

Minister Putin. According to the testimony of the young men involved in the attack plans, the assassination attempt on Putin was to have been activated immediately after the March 4 Presidential election. The detailed reports given by Russian TV about the background to this particular foiled plot, gives insight to what are likely ongoing operations against the Russian President-elect.

One arrested participant in the plot, Adam Osmayev, quite recently had been an economics student at the University of Buckingham in the U.K. It was in London, according to his televised interview with First Channel, that he “became interested in explosives.” Osmayev had been sought by security forces since 2007 for plotting a bomb attack against Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov. According to another participant in the operation, Ilya Pyanzin, the group was flown into Ukraine via the U.A.E. and Turkey, and was headed for Moscow, where they were to undertake attacks on economic facilities, and assassinate Putin. Osmayev told interviewers that his group was experimenting with explosives that could penetrate heavy armor.

Orchestration of the operation is being attributed to Chechen separatist leader Doku Umarov, a key figure in British-linked schemes for a North Caucasus emirate, to secede from Russia.

According to First Channel’s report, the scheme was only one of several attempts on Putin’s life over recent years. Cited in the broadcast were foiled attempts in Azerbaijan in 2001, Kislovodsk (Stavropol Territory, near the North Caucasus) in 2008, and Novgorod in 2009. The First Channel report summarized, “The terrorist war against Russia, which began in the 1990s, continues, despite some successes of our security services, and the extremists openly name their main targets: Vladimir Putin has been number one for them for a long time.”

One of the major funders of the Chechen separatist/terrorist movement is none other than zillionaire Boris Berezovsky, currently a fugitive from Russia in London. Berezovsky, who has previously called for using “force” against Putin, made headlines with an interview in the Israeli paper *Ha’aretz* at the end of February, in which he warned that Putin would end up like Qaddafi.

London is also the home to support networks for the North Caucasus insurgency, some of whom the Queen’s government has refused to extradite to Russia to face charges for their crimes.

IAEA Should Investigate November 2011 Report on Iran for Forgeries, Lies

by Michele Steinberg

When a country goes to war, as the U.S. did in 2003 with disastrous results, there should be some lessons learned on the table. It would appear there are no lessons learned being used in the current hysteria. The most important is peer review. The accusations leveled against Iraq in the nuclear area in 2003 were largely from the mouth of one single low-level analyst in the U.S. He got far outside his competence and made accusations that were shredded in peer reviews by far more competent people, yet his view bubbled to the top because the peers were muzzled and his scary message was more welcome in high circles. The November 2011 IAEA Board Report [on Iran] looks like *déjà vu*. . . . I think the Board of Governors should demand an investigation of the report and an independent review, line by line, of where that information was coming from, and why it was spun so heavily to one side.

—Robert Kelley,
former IAEA Chief Inspector

March 4—On Feb. 21, 2012, at the Rayburn House Office Building in Washington, D.C., at the invitation of the National Iranian American Council (NIAC), Robert Kelley, a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Iraq Action Team in 1992 and 2003, former chief inspector for the IAEA in Iraq (1992-93 and 2002-03), and weapons inspector in South Africa and Libya, joined Dr. Hans Blix, the former director general of the IAEA, and former chief of the UN inspection commission, UNMOVIC. Speaking to the standing room only audience of Congressional staffers, diplomats, political officials, journalists, and activists, the two experts made clear that there is no evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapon, or a nuclear

weapons program, and that war against Iran is unnecessary and will be a disaster for the region and the world. Both support the immediate return to diplomatic talks between Iran and concerned parties, especially the United States.

Earlier, in a Jan. 11, 2012 Bloomberg article entitled, “Nuclear Arms Charge Against Iran Is No Slam Dunk,” Kelley, a nuclear engineer with over 30 years of experience in the field, questioned the evidence presented in the November 2011 IAEA report on Iran.

In 2003, Kelley was chief analyst on Iraq, when the IAEA uncovered—and exposed—that the infamous “Niger yellow cake” documents, which purported to show that Iraq was developing nuclear weapons, were forgeries. On March 7, 2003, Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, then head of the IAEA, exposed the Niger yellow cake fraud in testimony to the UN Security Council in New York. It was too late. Despite that March 7 testimony by Blix and ElBaradei that inspections in Iraq were accelerating, with complete cooperation from the Iraqi government, and that there was no evidence of resumed nuclear weapons activity, the bombs began to fall on March 19, 2003. The Iraq War had been started by British Prime Minister Tony Blair and President George W. Bush.

Robert Kelley was interviewed by *EIR*’s Michele Steinberg on Feb. 29, 2012, the day that Iran presented an important communication—a Modality Plan—to the IAEA. The interview follows.

The ‘Modality Plan’

EIR: Just this morning, Iran said it required the International Atomic Energy Agency to sign something called a “Modality Plan” for continuing inspections, especially of the Parchin site [a military complex—ed.], following the last visit by IAEA inspectors. Can you explain the significance of this, especially



YouTube

“The IAEA is throwing accusations around like crazy!” Kelley exclaimed. “You know, ‘This place is doing this, and this place is doing that, and there’s this big cylinder,’ and yet, if they find out something isn’t true, they just go silent.”

because of the heated atmosphere against Iran following the IAEA’s Feb. 24 report?¹

Kelley: Well, I haven’t seen the Modality in question, but I think it’s an extremely wise thing to do on Iran’s part. Iran has allowed access to some of their sites in the past, and nobody knows what sites the IAEA asked to go to; they don’t know what they were looking for, and they don’t know what they found. If the IAEA is granted access, both sides must agree to disclose where they went, what they were looking for, and what they found. Otherwise, it is lose-lose for Iran. If IAEA finds nothing and keeps quiet, Iran loses. If IAEA finds something and it implicates Iran, Iran loses.

IAEA has already visited Parchin twice, in 2005, I believe. They did not say where they went, what they were looking for, and what they found, or didn’t find. Iran is the sole loser in this example and they are smart to have agreed upon terms in advance.

EIR: As you said, the Parchin site has been inspected previously; could you analyze this last visit by the IAEA that led to the Feb. 24 report? Was Iran ambushed in a way, in making the Parchin visit an immediate issue? The refusal to allow the February visit to

1. The Feb. 24 IAEA report states, “The Agency continues to have serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran’s nuclear program,” without presenting any new evidence. Another section of the report affirms once again that all the nuclear sites being inspected and filmed round-the-clock, are secure, that there is no diversion of nuclear materials, and there is no evidence that other sites exist.

Parchin has certainly been used in the Israeli Cabinet, and in the U.S. Congress, as evidence of Iran’s non-compliance.

Kelley: The first thing to look at about Parchin, is that it’s a huge site, I would guess conservatively, about 1,000 buildings. So back in 2005, when the IAEA was given the right, I think, to go to five buildings on the first trip, and five buildings on the second trip, they got to choose the buildings they wanted to go to, and they didn’t find anything, apparently.

That’s the reason for the Modality: that is, the IAEA should have said where they went, and what they were looking for, and what they didn’t find. The IAEA was looking, I think, in the wrong part of the Parchin site. Again, it’s maybe 24 square miles, 1,000 buildings, and the building that’s recently been called to their attention is several miles away from where they were looking the first time.

So now they’re saying we know exactly the building we want to go to and we think we know what was going on there—let us go. And I think the Iranians are saying, “We’ll let you go there, but after you’ve been, you have to tell the world what you actually found.”

Lessons Not Learned

EIR: You were at the IAEA prior to the invasion of Iraq in 2003, and it turns out that the weapons of mass destruction—which had been the subject of many horrifying statements by Tony Blair, Condoleezza Rice, Dick Cheney, George W. Bush—didn’t exist. We’re still there, with thousands of Americans killed, tens of thousands injured, 167,000 Iraqi civilians killed according to one UN report. What have we learned from that, about the IAEA process?

Kelley: What we learned back in 2002 and 2003, when we were in the run-up to the war, was that peer review was very important, that expert review is very important, and that the analysis should not be left to one person, or to a very small group of people. That’s what happened that year.

What have we learned since then? *Absolutely nothing. The same thing is going on again.* A very small group of people, if not down to individuals, are doing analysis and putting forth their opinions, and those opinions are not being checked.

In 2003, for example, an analyst at the CIA was in-

sisting that certain aluminum tubes would be used in gas centrifuges. He had a very limited experience of his own in the government; but in Washington, it was seen as a very large experience, and his views were given a lot of exposure. As it turned out, there were genuine experts in the Department of Energy in particular, who refuted his arguments at every point, and showed why he was provably and actually wrong. And those peer reviews actually never made it to the attention of the decision-makers in the Administration, or they chose to ignore them.

I think the same thing's going on now.

EIR: It seems like there's a game going on, where Iran cannot pin down the accusations against her—especially unpublished information from individual countries.

It seems as if the IAEA would be in a position to contradict unfounded information that is coming from various countries, but it does not. And then, in the U.S. intelligence services, they can cherry-pick information from the IAEA. And I've never seen a director of the IAEA, while he was director, contradict any of the statements coming out of various capitals. Is the director aware of these misstatements, and what could be done about it?


Kelley: In a way, you have it a little bit backwards, because the intelligence agencies are not cherry-picking from the IAEA report, because they're the source of the IAEA report. The IAEA is very competent in going and looking at nuclear materials, and making measurements of how much uranium is in the drum, or what enrichment material is coming out of the centrifuge—that's what they do.

They don't know anything about weapons, they don't have a mission to look at weapons, they don't have a mandate to look at weapons. People who think that the IAEA is a weapons watchdog are just terribly, terribly mistaken.

So when the IAEA gets a job like this, and begins to analyze it, they very quickly get out of their depth, and you begin to see a lot of conclusions and analysis coming out of the IAEA that are just not supported by the facts.

Furthermore, none of this information is developed by the IAEA themselves. They're being given information by several member states apparently, and they're just taking that information and parroting it back to us.

If you read the IAEA's Board of Governors' report,



U.S. Department of State

Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei (left), former director of the IAEA (1997-2009) exposed the forgery of the Niger yellow-cake documents to the UN Security Council on March 7, 2003. On Feb. 5, U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell had presented "evidence" of Iraqi WMD, partially based on the yellow-cake story. He later admitted that it was worst mistake he had ever made. On March 19, the United States attacked Iraq.

they're not saying that they've "concluded" these things, "analyzed" these things or whatever; they're saying that, "we have been told that. . . It is said that. . . A member state tells us that an Iranian went to this conference." This is not information that they're developing themselves.

So, you really can't say that the member states are cherry-picking from the IAEA; they're actually just setting the IAEA up as a sounding board and cherry-picking themselves.

EIR: But with the authority of a UN agency behind it.

Kelley: You know, IAEA is not a United Nations organization. It's independent of the UN. They report findings and violations of the treaty to the UN. Just a small point, but it's important.

The Niger Yellow-Cake Caper

EIR: Going back to the case of Iraq. Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei exposed the forgery of the Niger yellow cake to the United Nations Security Council. I asked you, why did it take so long to expose that forgery? I think there were two steps to that: The United States never exposed that forgery, and yet, talked about the Niger yellow cake for months. But then, my recollection is

that there was a dramatic statement by Dr. ElBaradei exposing that these were forgeries.

Kelley: He said they were “not authentic,” which is what I have criticized him for: for not being more forceful.

EIR: Okay. Tell me what was going on. When did the IAEA get the documents? Had the U.S. dragged its heels on providing them? Tell us the whole story.

Kelley: Clearly, the U.S. dragged their heels. The U.S. was making public statements about uranium from Africa—I believe it was a very important citation in the President’s [George W. Bush’s] speech that he gave in Ohio, I think it was in that Fall, and came out in a number of places.

And the IAEA kept asking to see those documents and see that evidence. That evidence didn’t come until February of 2003. The documents were given to us in Vienna on the same day they were given to the leader of the IAEA Iraq team in New York. He flew back that night, and the next day, he began working on them, because he was a native French speaker, and an experienced analyst, and he was the best person to look at information that largely was in French.

And in about three hours, he was able to determine major flaws in the documents that showed that they were forgeries: There were things like grammar; dates had been whited out on a genuine memo and changed; typefaces varied within the document where you could see that the document had been modified; and people who had signed things allegedly, were dead when they signed them.

So it was very, very clear that the documents were forgeries. And it took about, I would say, three hours of hard work to prove that. So, the U.S. had the documents for months, and when they turned them over to the IAEA, the problem got solved very quickly.

I believe some people in the press who originally got those documents in Rome, came to the same conclusion very quickly as well.

EIR: And yet, for months the Niger documents were used as a critical piece of evidence. Do you think something like this is going on now in Iran? I’ve heard reports of a stolen laptop. It’s hard to follow the accusations and counter-accusations, but in your view, are there forgeries or falsifications going on regarding Iran that are being taken as true?

Kelley: I think it’s very possible. You mentioned the

laptop computer. That’s the basis for a huge amount of information that was given to the IAEA years ago, and I think the U.S. intelligence community has concluded that the laptop computer, or whatever that digital file was, may be largely correct, largely real information.

But, the U.S. intelligence community also concluded that Iran stopped its weaponization program back in 2003, which is consistent with the so-called laptop.

Where the forgery issue becomes a concern, if you go through the IAEA November report, they’ve num-

The lack of curiosity, the lack of initiative on the part of the IAEA: To say, “Well, here’s information that somebody says was no good,” and then turn around and use it. . . . They hide the fact that this information was rejected once before. It throws the credibility of the whole report into question.

bered the paragraphs, so you can go through paragraph by paragraph, and make tables, and you can see lots of things. And one of the things that I looked for was how many of the paragraphs concern information that the weaponization program is still continuing in Iran.

Out of 62 paragraphs, 2 paragraphs suggest that the program is continuing. If you look at those two paragraphs, one of them, you can’t tell—because they don’t give you enough information to know—if it’s true or false. They just make a statement that someone has told them that the program’s continuing.

But the other paragraph that refers to this, has information that was published in the *Times* of London in the Fall of 2009, and that information looks very suspicious. It apparently has grammatical and word problems, as did documents given to the IAEA in the past that were shown to be forgeries.

And Mohamed ElBaradei says in his memoirs, the IAEA got that information from Israel in the Fall of 2009, and decided they couldn’t use it because the information wasn’t sourced; they couldn’t tell where it came from, and it looked very questionable.

So ElBaradei rejected the information on good grounds. He was a careful lawyer, who said, “I’m not going to use information that I can’t vet.” And yet, it

turns up in November of 2011 as being one of the two arguments that Iran is continuing the weaponization program.

The lack of curiosity, the lack of initiative on the part of the IAEA: To say, information that ElBaradei rejected, and now we're using it, is just amazing. You couldn't get away with that in academia; you couldn't get away with that in the intelligence community, saying that, "Well, here's information that somebody says was no good," and then turn around and use it. And not at least say, "I've resurrected this information because now I know it is good." They don't do that. They hide the fact that this information was rejected once before. It throws the credibility of the whole report into question.



IAEA/D. Calma

The IAEA Board of Governors (shown here in a September 2011 meeting) does not develop its own information, Kelley pointed out: If you read the report, "they're not saying that they've 'concluded' these things, 'analyzed' these things or whatever; they're saying that, 'we have been told that'...."

Tension in the Board of Governors

EIR: Is there a format, where the UNSC members, who can be pretty aggressive at times, can do that type of questioning?

Kelley: This report was not generated specifically for the the Security Council, it's generated for the Board of Governors of the IAEA. And it's the Board of Governors, I think, who should sit down and say, "Where did this report come from?"

I think the Board of Governors should demand an investigation of the report and an independent review, line by line, of where that information was coming from, and why it was spun so heavily to one side.

EIR: Is the Board of Governors the same as the membership of the IAEA?

Kelley: The Board of Governors is 35 states, which are chosen on a very complicated formula that came up way back in the 1950s, and in each geographic region of the world, there are several "nuclear-have" states that will always be on the Board of Governors, like the U.S., or the U.K., or France, and then other states are chosen on a rotating basis to be part of it.

But the Board of Governors represents the whole world, and to some extent in recent years—it used to operate on consensus—now it's kind of divided into the developed states and the Non-Aligned Movement, so

you see a lot of tension on the Board now. I think the formula is such that Russia and China are always there. The Board is reconstituted every year, and you'll see maybe 20 countries that are always on it, because of this formula, and then others rotate in and out.

EIR: The Times of London is [owned by Rupert Murdoch's] News Corp., that is under legal investigation for tapping phones and other illegal activities. So, you're saying that the Times of London received this leaked document that was the same that had been rejected by Dr. ElBaradei?

Kelley: I get the story in bits and pieces, but it would appear that a government gave the document to the IAEA, and ElBaradei said, "Thank you, [but] I don't trust this." That government then took a version of the document to London and found a newspaper that would publish it. And that happened to be the *Times*. It was 2009, just about the time that ElBaradei finished his final term as director general. So, he rejected it, and I read somewhere, that about 14 days later, the information appeared in the press.

EIR: The whole question of countries giving information such as the allegations that appear in the November report—and this has happened before—where the country does not have to give the underlying evi-

dence, seems to be a problem. National security, understood. But it is troubling that even the member countries and Board of Governors are not allowed to see the actual original information given. Correct?

Kelley: Like any statement of that kind, it varies from time to time. This thing we mentioned about the *Times* of London, in ElBaradei's memoir, he says that he was told by the government that gave it to him, that he could show it to Iran. In other cases, a government will give something, but say you absolutely can't show this to the aggrieved party. Well, that makes a difference, of course.

What you'd expect the IAEA to do in a case like that, is to say, okay, you've given me the information; I'll try to verify it by independent means. If they verify it by independent means, then the party that gave it to them is vindicated. If they can't verify it by independent means, then, if the party won't agree to have the information disseminated or further analyzed, I think the IAEA is within their rights to say, "Well, we really can't use that."

For example, in 1991-92, at the end of the first Gulf War, a number of countries were providing the IAEA with very detailed information about where to look for Iraq's nuclear program. And IAEA went to those places and found Iraq's nuclear program. So, it wasn't too much of an issue, because the information was genuine enough to lead people to the place they needed to go.

If, in later years, you get information and you can't verify it, and you can't go to those places, then the job certainly gets harder. It doesn't mean that the information that people are giving you is wrong, that it's not accurate, but if you can't prove it, then, given that you're working in a very legal environment, you have to decide how far can you push it.

EIR: Could you elaborate on your view that the U.S. is the source of the Annex information [section of the report reflecting information from sources other than direct IAEA inspections and verification—ed.] in the 2011 November report? Secondly, there are two terms that confuse people: "Alleged Studies" and "Possible Military Dimensions"—PMDs. PMDs have been used in some debates, including important debates in the U.S. Congress, to mean "WMD" [weapons of mass destruction] and Alleged Studies becomes, "evidence of." What do these terms really mean, and where do they come from?

Kelley: Right. These terms are probably not defined

in any legal book, or anyplace like that. But the term Alleged Studies comes from the information that the U.S. provided to the IAEA, some eight years ago, and that's the laptop computer you referred to.

So, supposedly, the U.S. either got a laptop computer or maybe it was a DVD, but it had a lot of digital files on it, both text and other things, and that information was given to the IAEA, many, many years ago. And that's called the Alleged Studies.

So, it's not a surprise that there's nothing since 2003 in that package, since it's old news. . . . That's when they got it.

"Possible Military Dimensions" or PMDs is the IAEA sitting down and saying, "Well, a lot of people have told us that Iran has a nuclear weapons program. What are its 'possible military dimensions'?"

And that is a reasonable thing for the IAEA to be asking; after all, they are a verification agency that is trying to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. And so, they would like to know, is this big enrichment enterprise that we see at the Qoms centrifuge plant, for example, for weapons? So, they're looking at the dimensions, the possible dimensions, of this unknown program. That in itself is a reasonable thing to do. When they get out of their technical depth, then you start to see a problem.

It would not be unreasonable for the IAEA to do this, and then trip over some information, or find some information on their own that proved the point. If there is an Iranian program and they find it, so be it. That would be a good thing for them to do.

'Absolute Lies'

EIR: But, going back to the Modality question: If they go a specific site and they don't find anything, the IAEA might not say that they didn't find anything. So that again brings Iraq back to mind: We had satellite photos—this site, that site. I think some neo-conservatives, and others who wanted a war with Iraq, assumed that Iraq would never agree to letting inspectors back in. So it was safe to claim anything, based on satellite photos; but when inspectors went to those sites, they saw nothing related to WMD, including when they did tests of the soil, and other things that don't appear to the naked eye.

Has that happened in regard to Iran, where some of the PMDs have been checked out, but they're being required to be checked out again and again?

Kelley: You're looking at two very different situations. I was the chief analyst for Iraq back in 2002 and 2003, and we had a whole list of places where we thought

something was happening. When we were let back into the country, we said to the Iraqis, we want to go to these places, and check these things. The Iraqis were incredibly cooperative, but the political correctness out there says, “Ah no, Iraq impeded the inspectors,” etc., etc.

That’s an *absolute lie* from people who weren’t there. The Iraqis knew that this was their last chance to prevent a war, and every time I asked them to do something, they said, “Now, or later?” You know, “Let’s do

The Iraqis were incredibly cooperative, but the political correctness out there says, “Ah no, Iraq impeded the inspectors,” etc., etc. That’s an absolute lie from people who weren’t there.

it. Let’s get it done. You want to talk to that person, you’ll talk to them today. You want to go to this place, we’ll take you now.”

And we went to all those places and there was nothing.

Now in the case of Iran, maybe they do have something to hide. It’s a very different problem you’re looking at, a lot of suspicious things, satellite photographs, as you mentioned. And you say, well, there might be something there.

I think Iran is in a position of answering questions; particularly, they’re answering questions about things they know aren’t true, and they’re having a very hard time proving they’re not true. Or, maybe in other cases, they’re hiding something, and we can’t tell. But it’s a very different situation from Iraq, where we knew there was *nothing*.

The Modality issue is important because the IAEA is throwing accusations around like crazy! You know, “This place is doing this, and this place is doing that, and there’s this big cylinder,” and yet, if they find out something isn’t true, they just go silent.

And look, Iran is going to be saying in this case, “If you’re going to accuse us of doing something, and we’re going to answer your questions, then you are going to have to say, you asked us this question; we gave you this answer; and it’s satisfactory.”

This actually happened, about three or four years ago. They came up with something called the “Agreed Work Plan,” and one of the things about the AWP, was that the IAEA had, say, half a dozen allegations of

things that they said Iran was doing. And they worked through it with Iran, and at the end of the AWP, the IAEA had crossed off everything on the plan, and said, “Okay, we investigated that.”

EIR: Part of the Agreed Work Plan was a 117-page document that Foreign Minister [Ali Akbar] Salehi of Iran mentioned, prior to the November 2011 report coming out, and he said that Iran had already answered the questions in the 117 pages, and yet the IAEA doesn’t seem to want to accept this.

I was hoping to actually have a copy of the report, and according to the Press Office of the IAEA, this is not available to the public, to the press, and it was not even clear to me whether the member countries of the IAEA have seen it. It seems like an important document that could be analyzed and vetted by professionals, peer reviewed, and so forth, so it is not left to this murky, foggy process.

Kelley: Well, I’m with you on this one. In fact, I’ve never seen that report, and I really would like to see it, because I think it would be extremely interesting. I would think that the Iranians would find it extremely useful, from their point of view, to release it. Somebody told me once, I think they did, but I guess it just never saw the light of day or got circulated.

And I was wondering the same thing in the last few days. Apparently Iran gave the IAEA a letter as part of these so-called failed negotiations and said, “This is the next step.”

I would think Iran would be the one who would want to release that information. And so here, I am very critical of the Iranians. If they are really writing such reports, and they really stand behind them, they should be releasing them to a wider audience, so that their position versus the IAEA’s would be clearer. I commented to you earlier that the Iranian Ambassador, if you see him in a social event or something, will criticize the IAEA’s inspections at Parchin; to you, one on one, he will make negative comments about it. But they don’t seem to go out of their way to make those comments more public. Clearly they are already public. He is making them in a public place, but they are really lousy at PR, is what I guess I am saying.

No Abatement in the Drive for War

EIR: That said, I have two further questions. The one is the question of the U.S. National Intelligence Estimate. In 2007, when the NIE declassified version was



WordPress.com

The IAEA inspected the Parchin military complex (shown here in a satellite photo) in 2005, but found nothing. Now they are saying “we know exactly the building we want to go to, and we think we know what was going on there—let us go.’ And I think the Iranians are saying, ‘We’ll let you go there, but after you’ve been, you have to tell the world what you actually found.’”

released, there was such a strong response from the public, from the press, etc., that it kind of stopped the drive for war cold.

Kelley: Right.

EIR: Nothing like that has happened with the 2010 NIE—there is no declassified version, but from the little bits and pieces that have been commented about, the reports that have been given to authorized Members of Congress, it really reaffirms the 2007 finding that the weapons program was stopped, and this is backed up by statements of [Director of National Intelligence] Gen. James Clapper, [Defense Secretary Leon] Panetta, and so forth to the Congress.

Kelley: Just in the last few days.

EIR: Yet there is no abatement in the drive for war as we are going into a major political meeting in the United States, the American-Israel Public Affairs Council, AIPAC. I monitor the press every day for talk of the military option in Iran, and I can’t get through all the articles in a day, including maps, descriptions of nuclear submarines coming from Britain, and aircraft

from Israel, and so forth. So the war talk is very, very much on.

So the NIE II from 2010 seems to be buried. But also the IAEA report—two IAEA reports—have gone a long way to building that feeding frenzy. Was there an end run to maybe some channels that got that information outside of the U.S.? I am sure there are source reports that say “Iran has this,” or “Iran has that,” and other agencies contradicted it, and so they went to someone who wouldn’t contradict it. Is that feasible to you?

Kelley: Very much.

EIR: That someone being the IAEA?

Kelley: Right. Well, you made reference in an earlier part of this interview to the fact that the U.S. government gave the Niger documents to the IAEA. That was an end run at the time, because there was a debate within the government about whether the Niger documents were genuine,

and the group that thought the Niger documents weren’t genuine used the IAEA to get the word out. So there’s a precedent for that. Give it to somebody who is outside the government, and let them talk.

Certainly, what you see right now is that there must be two groups within the U.S. government. There is a very visible one that publishes the NIE; there is the Secretary of Defense who says he does not think the program is active today—I don’t want to put words in his mouth, but you’ve seen what he says: They haven’t made the decision to go forward, or something like that.

And then you have somebody who is pumping up the IAEA to be much more activist—and I am searching for words here—but to be active and to be polarized, get the word out that they want to get out. So there is something going on, and there is an end run in the IAEA; in this case, it’s being used as a mouthpiece. I think the IAEA under ElBaradei would not have done that. I think the IAEA under Blix definitely wouldn’t have done that. They would have tried to behave in a more neutral fashion, and I think they would have used the good judgment that Blix and ElBaradei used in saying, we are lawyers and we want our evidence to be strong and to be

public... And Blix said the same thing on Capitol Hill last week, when we were with him, that you have to be very careful about information, that we can vet it.

EIR: The point of the authenticity and importance of the IAEA's accepting or rejecting information could be a matter of life and death. So is there a precedent for something you mentioned earlier, which I think is extremely important: a Board of Governors' investigation of how the reports were put together? And how likely is that to happen?

Kelley: I am not aware of any precedent to that. The Board of Governors is usually not terribly activist about things like that. Is it likely? It is certainly not going to be generated by any of the Western states that I am most familiar with. The Non-Aligned Movement is becoming stronger and stronger on the Board. Maybe they would press for something like that.

Transparency Needed on Both Sides

EIR: What do you think would be a viable war avoidance outcome to the P5+1 [UN Security Council Permanent Five plus Germany] talks with Iran, provided they are not derailed by some of the tensions

coming off of the IAEA report?

Kelley: I am a nuclear engineer, not a political scientist. It seems to me that many good voices are speaking out on all sides. Blix, for example, is saying we need good faith negotiations with the Iranians; there needs to be some kind of reward for good behavior; there needs to be more transparency and openness, there should be talks, where if Iran says we agree to do something in a verifiable way, the West would say, "Okay, then we agree to back off" on some demand we are making, or some sanction, for example. That to me is a very important thing.


Another is, I think Iran really should benefit from what went on in Iraq. The Iraqis learned to be very transparent, and the Iraqis said, if you have any reasonable request, we will deal with it. If they are not doing anything in Parchin, they should conclude this Modality and should say, "Let's write down the terms of what you are going to do. We really, really want to do this; we know that you are not going to find anything, but when you get done, you'll tell people what you didn't find, and you'll drop this issue, and say this issue is dead and cold and buried."

So a little bit more openness on both sides. The IAEA should be taking more information to Iran and showing it to them directly. We proved the forgeries in Iraq were forgeries by letting the Iraqis help us to take them apart. And we took them apart and they said, "Look at this and this and this," and it could be independently verified they were forgeries.

And finally, I think the IAEA needs to be more transparent with the public. They need to put out information that can be checked by peers and by others out there and can be resolved in a collegial fashion, which is not happening right now. Certainly, I have criticized some of the things in the IAEA report, and the response is just stonewall silence. They are just hoping these objections will go away. And if I'm wrong, I should also be held accountable if I say this information doesn't look real to me, and they say, "Well it is, because—."

EIR: Thank you Robert. If there is an investigation that comes about I think many of the issues that you raised in detail provide some very good outlines for the investigation, not just by the IAEA but by the United Nations, by the United States government. I think commissions should take place before wars, not after.

Kelley: Yes, I think I certainly would agree with that.



THE EURASIAN LAND-BRIDGE
'The New Silk Road'—Locomotive For Worldwide Economic Development
An EIR Special Report

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

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

International Intelligence

A Million Filipinos Rally Against Aquino Power Grab

Feb. 28—Nearly a million people filled the streets of Manila today, and several hundred thousand more did the same in cities throughout the Philippines, in “prayer rallies” which were organized as a protest against President Obama’s puppet President in Manila, Noyon Aquino. Aquino is running a sham impeachment process against the Supreme Court Chief Justice, to clear the way for Aquino’s plan to illegally turn his country into a military base for Obama’s war policy against China.

Aquino, only days earlier, had called for a mass turnout for the celebration of the 1986 U.S.-orchestrated coup against Ferdinand Marcos, which placed his mother Cory Aquino in power on behalf of the Anglo-American imperial interests. However, his hopes for a new “people’s power” fizzled, as only a few hundred people showed up.

Today’s rally was organized mainly by a religious sect, Iglesia ni Cristo. As a million people showed their muscle against Aquino, his impeachment trial against the Chief Justice is falling apart for lack of evidence of any wrongdoing.

China: U.S. Syria Policy Is al-Qaeda and Civil War

March 2—China’s *People’s Daily* wrote, after the joint Russia-Chinese veto of the United Nations Libya-like resolution on Syria:

“The U.S.-edition ‘solution on Syria issue’ has become very clear and its key points include: First, pre-setting the goal of regime change The United States ... regards itself as the master of Syria’s domestic affairs.... It has completely eliminated the possibility of solving the Syria issue in a peaceful way of dialogue....

“Fourth, highlighting the role of the Arab League.... According to reports, the Special Forces of the United Kingdom

and Qatar have entered Syria, providing guidance and assistance to opposition groups to launch attacks on government forces. The United States, under the banner of ‘supporting the Arab League efforts to resolve the Syrian crisis,’ maneuvers behind the scenes and controls the development of the situation.

“Fifth... the al-Qaeda and other extremist forces are taking advantage of the chaos in Syria and speeding up to infiltrate it.

“Overthrowing Bashar’s regime is much more complicated than ‘toppling’ other political strongmen in the Middle East. So, the ‘routines’ with which the U.S.A. and the Western countries have made a proven track record in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen are hard to be workable in Syria.

“If Bashar’s regime cannot restrain its domestic unrest or open an inclusive political dialogue process timely, it can be expected that the results brought by the American version ‘Syrian Solution’ shall be escalating violence; Syria sinks into the quagmire of civil war ... and the situation in the Middle East destabilizes further.”

Brits Protest Argentine ‘Buy Elsewhere’ Campaign

March 1—A round of calls from Argentine Industry Minister Debora Giorgi to the heads of some 20 Argentine companies on Feb. 28, suggesting that they cease purchasing goods from the U.K., and instead turn to countries which support Argentina’s sovereign rights over the Malvinas Islands, has driven the British government into outer orbit.

Britain’s Cameron government, which has been building up its military might in the South Atlantic over recent months, protested that “the right approach here is one of cooperation, not confrontation.” The Prime Minister’s spokesman threatened that the U.K. might pull investments out of Argentina.

The British Foreign Office has demanded that the European Union lodge a collective protest against Argentina. The irony of that was not lost on Argentina,

whose Foreign Minister Hector Timerman responded with a press release, welcoming the United Kingdom’s having finally “gone to an [international] forum to seek a diplomatic solution to the Malvinas issue.” Argentina proposed that the EU join with UNASUR (the Union of South American States) in analyzing the Malvinas issue, and called on the U.K. to take up diplomatic negotiations, which the United Nations has repeatedly urged.

Russia Again Offers Cooperation with U.S.

March 1—A conference on U.S.-Russian relations, sponsored by the American University in Moscow, gathered a crowd of more than 200 people in the Hart Senate Building in Washington, with a number of speakers from Moscow, including a representative from Russia’s Putin Presidential campaign as well as a member of the opposition.

Stephen Cohen, a New York University professor, presented a devastating indictment of U.S. policy toward Russia over the last 20 years, with recent U.S. governments either refusing to make key agreements, or reneging on agreements already made. Cohen noted that the latest rebuff involved newly appointed U.S. Ambassador Michael McFaul’s meetings with the opposition, which has caused a furor among Russia’s policy elites.

Sergey Rogov, of the Russian U.S.-Canada Institute, gave a run-down of Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s recent article on foreign policy published in *Moskovskie Novosti* (*Moscow News*). While the Western press describes the article as a “Putin diatribe” against the West, Rogov underlined that in it, Putin clearly says that he is prepared to reach an overall partnership agreement with the United States, urging it to return to the basis of the consensus reached with President George W. Bush at Kennebunkport.

Rogov condemned Obama’s “open-ended development of ballistic missile defense.”

Ritual Sacrifice Spreads From Greece to Spain

by Dennis Small

March 5—Arguably the most significant development at the March 1 European Union summit in Brussels, was the the decision that Spain’s 46 million population would be marched to their ritual sacrifice on the altar of Mone-tarism, the pagan god of the British monarchy. The nation of Greece, with its 11 million people, has already been murdered at that altar over the last year, as a marker of the general disintegration of the trans-Atlantic system.

“This thing has gone, remorselessly, since the Fall of 2007, and especially since the Autumn of 2008, this process of a general breakdown of the entire trans-Atlantic system, the financial-economic breakdown has been proceeding,” Lyndon LaRouche commented on March 3. “And anyone who didn’t say so, was obviously incompetent.”

Promptly after signing on to the brutal European fiscal deficit treaty finalized at the March 1 summit, Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy called a press conference in Brussels to announce that his government’s deficit target for 2012 would be 5.8% of Gross Domestic Product, and not the more stringent 4.4% demanded by the European Commission. Just over two months into his term, Rajoy found himself pleading for flexibility and clemency from the very EU dictatorship he had helped to enthrone.

Predictably, the Empire’s hit-men turned their thumbs down. “Spain must respect the targets it has been given,” Eurogroup President Jean-Claude Juncker snarled. “Spain will have to do everything to prove that

it remains firmly” committed to its budget-consolidation drive, he decreed. European Council President Herman Van Rompuy threatened that “the markets” will punish Spain for not meeting demanded budget objectives, and that will drive up the cost of the bankrupt nation’s debt even further.

Notwithstanding Rajoy’s subsequent theatrics about how Spain would not abide by the EU deficit target, because this was a “sovereign decision” by Spain, it is about as sovereign as the man with a gun pointed at his head, who defiantly proclaims he will only plunge his own dagger *two* inches into his mother’s chest, instead of the *three* the assailant demands. The austerity policy being imposed by the EU enforcers on London’s behalf, at either the 4.4% target or the 5.8% one, simply cannot be sustained, and either way means the death of the nation.

Spain will now follow Greece into the concentration camps—although in both countries there are also explosions of popular outrage against the policies, especially among youth.

Economic Murder

Spain’s current budget deficit is estimated at 8.5% of GDP, and the Rajoy government is saying it will knock almost \$36 billion off the deficit this year, by cutting spending and raising taxes. The federal government will cut its deficit by 20%, while the autonomous provinces, which are responsible for one third of all government spending in Spain—including the lion’s

share of essential social services, such as health and education—are being told they have to cut their budget deficits by fully *one-half*. Some 5,000 city, provincial, and federal agencies and companies, including those that provide basic services such as water and urban transport, are said to be on the government’s list for fire-sale privatization.

Imposing such radical austerity upon a country which already admits to 23.3% official unemployment, higher than that of devastated Greece, and increasing at an accelerating rate, has triggered the kind of self-feeding economic implosion underway for the last year in Greece. This is vintage IMF economic strangulation of victim nations. The more government spending is slashed and workers laid off, the more the economy collapses, and the more tax revenues decline—thus *increasing* the very budget deficit the EU, the IMF, and the bankers claim to be intent on reducing.

Well-meaning but naive observers often decry this as a terrible mistake, a “failure” of IMF policies. What they fail to recognize is that such physical economic devolution is the *intended* effect of British monetarist policy, where the debt renegotiation packages are just the window dressing for the intended genocide. Greece, and now Spain, are IMF *successes*.

In Spain, nearly 300,000 people have lost their jobs since Rajoy took office only last Dec. 21, and Cabinet ministers projected on March 2 that under their plans, another 630,000 people will be thrown out of work by the end of 2012, bringing the national total to over 6 million unemployed, in a nation of 46 million. Among youth, unemployment now surpasses 50%. Moreover, as in the United States, official unemployment statistics do not include those who are only able to find part-time work, nor those who have given up looking for work altogether.

In fact, all of Europe is plunging into the same abyss as Spain and Greece. Official unemployment in the 17-nation Eurozone hit an all-time high of 10.7% in January, according to Eurostat, the EU statistics agency. Greece’s official unemployment rate was 19.9%; in Ireland 14.4%; and in France, “only” 9.4%.

Bailing Out the Banks

One of the most publicized aspects of the March 1 EU summit was its formal approval of the “Greek bail-out package” agreed to by Eurozone finance ministers on Feb. 21. Under the terms of the accord, EU nations are to disburse EU130 billion to Greece—which the un-

elected, banker-imposed government of that country will promptly use to pay off their creditor banks, in exchange for Greece’s private bondholders accepting a 53.5% “haircut” on the face value of their bonds, and Greece signing on to fascist austerity measures which mean the death of the nation:

- 150,000 civil servants will be fired;
- The monthly minimum wage will be slashed by 22%;
- Public sector workers will have wage cuts imposed *retroactively*, meaning 64,000 teachers and others worked without salary in February;
- Permanent foreign monitors will be put in place in all the ministries in Athens, and will oversee an escrow account that will always have three months’ worth of debt payments in it;
- The Greek Constitution is to be amended to place external debt payments explicitly before public welfare. This is pure and brutal imperialism.

The private bondholder “haircut” aspect of the deal is particularly ludicrous.

On March 2, Moody’s rating agency joined Fitch and Standard & Poor’s in downgrading Greece to its lowest level, because it expects the much ballyhooed haircut negotiations to end in a default this coming week. March 8 is the deadline for Greece to announce what percentage of its bondholders have “voluntarily” agreed to the terms of their haircut. If it doesn’t reach 95%, which it almost certainly will not, then Greece will invoke the Collective Action Clause (CAC) of the deal, which imposes the haircut on everyone. That in turn will force the International Swaps and Derivatives Association (ISDA) to declare the whole proceeding to be a “credit event”—i.e., a default—and thus activate untold billions in credit default swaps, in Greece and possibly across all of Europe.

With the entire trans-Atlantic system imploding, the British Empire’s financiers are doing the only thing they know how to do: hyperinflate like there’s no tomorrow . . . which there won’t be, under their policy.

On Feb. 28, the European Central Bank opened the floodgates to offer banks unlimited three-year loans at 1% interest, to try to keep their dead system afloat. The banks promptly borrowed EU529.5 billion of the virtually free money, more than the EU489 billion scooped up in the first round of the so-called Longer Term Refinancing Operation (LTRO) in December 2011.

The investment bankers were ecstatic—but that won’t last long.

The 25th Amendment Is the First Step in Doubling Food Production

by Dennis J. Mason

Feb. 29—In both the formal sessions and discussions on the sidelines, the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Feb. 23-24 Agricultural Outlook Forum 2012 expressed the fight at the heart of the collapse of the trans-Atlantic empire. Will we turn our creative minds toward the problems we face, and master the forces of nature, as is our destiny? Will we Americans have the guts to chuck Barack Obama from the Presidency, and create the conditions for doubling food production? Or will we continue to be subservient to the British empire, whose intention is to kill off the majority of the people of the world, by thermonuclear war, disease, or famine?

Under Obama, the Department of Agriculture (USDA) is governed by the latter outlook. The assumptions of fixed resources, market-analysis, and popular consensus set the tone at the opening plenary session and most of the 31 panels.

The Forum was titled “Moving Agriculture Forward,” and there were attendees who knew that could be done. In private discussions, there were marked disgust, anger, and frustration with the current batch of candidates for the Presidency, and the staged and mindless farce called Presidential debates. Everyone understood that both Obama and the present Republican candidates are non-options.

Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack and USDA Chief Economist Joseph Glauber set the stage by lying to the 2,000 attendees at the opening plenary session, that the economy is in a “fragile recovery,” and prospects look good. Vilsack extolled such measures as Obama’s Presidential Memorandum (Feb. 21) ordering all government agencies to buy more “bio-based products” (paint, soap, fuel), in effect, using food for non-food use, despite the U.S. and world shortages of corn and soy relative to need. Glauber simply brushed away food supply concerns, forecasting a large 2012 U.S. corn harvest (see accompanying article).

The concluding session of the plenary featured eight

former Secretaries of Agriculture, who exchanged platitudes about next to nothing—as whispers among the audience noted with disgust. No questions from the crowd were permitted.

This 89th annual Agricultural Outlook Forum marked an exceptionally dismal institutional irony, since 2012 is the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Agriculture Department, under President Abraham Lincoln, who acted with foresight to see to the enactment of the both Land Grant College Act and the Homestead Act, during the Civil War.

Some speakers resorted to pseudo-science in making their case, typified by reliance on the International Panel on Climate Change as an authority, and by the use of elements of Hans Joachim Schellnhuber’s genocidal WGBU report¹ in several of the presentations.

There are, however, better elements within and around the USDA which, if tasked with the goal of doubling food production worldwide, could set to work to make that happen. It is these better elements on which we focus our attention.

Salmonella: More Questions than Answers

The panel on “Fighting Foodborne Illness” focused on the study of salmonella, particularly in cattle. Though there have been reports of a new subset of multi-drug-resistant salmonella, the panelists emphasized that there is no emergency per se in salmonella outbreaks. Salmonella is only now coming under the purview of the USDA, and the goal is to reduce incidence by half. An initial question posed by the panel was, since we have

1. The German Advisory Council on Global Change (WBGU), which is headed by Dr. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, Honorary Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (CBE), on April 6, 2011 issued a report titled *World in Transition: A Social Contract for Sustainability*. See Helga Zepp-LaRouche, “No to Global Gleichschaltung: Make June 17 the Day of German Resistance,” *EIR*, May 6, 2011; and several articles in *EIR*, May 13, 2011.



USDA/Lance Cheung

U.S. Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack speaks at the “Moving Agriculture Forward” forum in Arlington, Va., Feb. 23, 2012. He offered platitudes about the “recovery.”

decreased the incidence of *E. coli* bacteria by over 90% in our beef, why can we have such control over one pathogen, but not another, in the same product?

One of the main challenges is tracing a given bacterium to its source. Salmonella appears widely across the food chain, and can also be carried by pests, pets, and otherwise. DNA gene-sequencing costs have fallen in the last 15 years, to some \$200/genome; the sequencing process compiles a core set of nucleotides, which can aid in tracing an illness back to its source. It is important to know the source, if your aim is prevention.

The presentation emphasized that we must reassess our approach to controlling salmonella. A deeper investigation of the bacteria, and its relationship to beef cattle, brings up a host of new questions and lines of investigation.

For example, the incidence of salmonella in cattle tends to rise, the closer one gets to the Equator, with an incidence as low as 1% in northern Canada, compared to some 80% in Mexico. Studies on the other side of the Atlantic show the same trend. One question thus posed is: What role does the bacteria play in the overall health of the animal, especially in the lower latitudes?

There are more than 2,500 known serotypes of salmonella, of which some 1,700 make people sick. Six serotypes account for more than 50% of human illness;

20 account for over 70% of reported cases of salmonella poisoning. What role do the other serotypes play? The panelists alluded to evidence that some serotypes actually contribute to the well-being of the host, and reported that the top two serotypes found in cattle are *not* responsible for outbreaks among humans.

Add to the mix that most of the deaths occur in people over 65 years of age. Perhaps there is some change in the composition of the bacteria of the gut which comes with age. What, exactly, is the relationship between the bacteria and the host?

Another element is seasonal: There are more bacteria in the Summer and Fall than in the Winter and Spring. Montevideo, the prevalent serotype in beef cattle, survives well in insects, and there are, overall, different serotypes found in the hide of the cow, than in its feces. These indicators point to insects as a potential

entry point for the bacteria.

Study of the behavior of the bacteria inside the cattle showed that the lymph nodes are a key point of habitation for salmonella. This unlocks some aspects of disease control, at least as far as beef is concerned, such as the repopulation of the bacteria in the later stages of the supply chain.

I bring this panel discussion to the reader’s attention for several reasons. As presented by the panelists, this investigation of the salmonella bacterium begins to broach some of the investigations of the LaRouchePAC Basement science team. Here, we find a possible relationship between the incidence of the bacteria and broader biospheric determinants, as indicated in the increase of incidence in cattle closer to the Equator. Also, the question of the role of salmonella bacteria in promotion of the health of the host organism, in some cases, suggests a possible relationship of particular bacteria to animal and vegetative organisms more generally, and seems to echo the role that viruses play in the living organism. Most people simply associate bacteria and viruses with disease; a deeper investigation of these important questions will be very fruitful for mankind, as we gain greater mastery over the biosphere and expand the biosphere into space.

The panelists reiterated several times that an honest

investigation will require a paradigm shift as concerns the approach to the problem: instead of simple disease control methods of trying to eradicate the bacteria from the production line (sanitizing feed at the ranch, etc.), a shift toward better understanding the nature of the bacteria. I add here that this sort of shift more generally in science today is vehemently opposed by those who crafted the Obama Presidency. A change in approach, while absolutely necessary, requires a change in the direction of the nation, beginning with the removal of Barack Obama from the Presidency via impeachment or the 25th Amendment to the Constitution.

The Extended Sensorium: Instrumentation for Agriculture

The panel on “Innovations To Minimize Crop Loss in a Changing Climate” is more directly applicable to the challenge of doubling food production, and, with a change in policy, points to a powerful suite of tools to aid in crafting national and international policy on agriculture. Under present policy and funding trends, the recently refined capabilities outlined below are being

tailored to suit insurance purposes under the domain of the USDA’s Risk Management Agency, and also to suit an expanding bio-fuels and bio-products policy.


But we have a proven and increasingly precise capability to utilize soil data and climate mapping, to determine, for example, the best places to grow particular crops in a given region of the world. Combining this capability with advanced mapping of crops and other ground cover gives us very useful instrumentation to guide the farmer at work.

The main focus of discussion was the PRISM Climate Group, based at Oregon State University (<http://www.prism.oregonstate.edu/>). Essentially, the problem they tackled was how to create a more reliable metric to gauge the effects of weather, to validate eligibility for claims for “prevented planting” insurance payouts. Often, the claim tickets would have language such as, “unusually wet,” or “abnormally hot,” which, while descriptive, were not precise. The challenge was to define “unusual” and “normal” in a way that could be validated more scientifically.

The approach was to use geospatial climatology and modern technology to define relative normal and abnormal conditions over a given area, using observational data sets on the order of 10 or 30 years, as a basis for comparing the more ephemeral 2-5 day weather patterns within the context of the climate model. In other words, the PRISM model allows us to project historical observational data onto a map with unprecedented accuracy, allowing us to see the characteristics of the area in terms of temperature and humidity extremes, precipitation, etc., while taking into account topographical characteristics such as rain shadow, temperature inversion, and other phenomena peculiar to a particular area of interest.

Having this available in an updatable and expandable interface, deployable for a given area on a moment’s notice, has far more potential than simply verifying whether a farmer suffered flooding out of season.

The panelists gave an example from their work in China. Their mission was to determine the most suitable grasses for urban areas for the country as a whole. They had, however, access to very few on-site plots for testing. After gaining access to comprehensive data on China’s soil and climate, they were able to find areas in the United States which had the same characteristics as areas in China where they would have preferred to have done testing. On this basis, they could make solid recommendations on a regional and country-wide basis.




**Finish Off the Speculators Now:
Cap Food Prices!**

The approaching food crisis demands that the U.S. government heed the warnings of Lyndon LaRouche and follow in the steps of Franklin Roosevelt. Shut out the speculators and fix food prices now.

<http://larouchepac.com/node/18381>

FIGURE 1



Among other things, PRISM has been instrumental in redefining the USDA Plant Hardiness Zone map (Figure 1), with finer resolution and more precision than was possible before.

The panel also covered CropScope, which is an interface for using the Cropland Data Layer, and details everything that covers the United States—crops, water, developed areas, etc.—with resolution down to 30 meters/pixel, and with data back to 1997. With CropScope, you can easily zoom into and define an area of interest anywhere in the United States, see how the land is being used today, and define parameters for comparison with how that land was used in a previous year.

Launched in January 2011, CropScope is a relatively new tool, designed to be an element in a suite of tools for land management, with the ability to export a given area of interest in several formats, including .KML for direct use in an Earth browser such as Google Earth.

These tools, combined with remote sensing from air and space, and modern methods of precision agriculture, have the potential to give today’s farmer far more power over the land than ever before.

Moving Agriculture Forward

It is clear that we have the capability to double the world’s food production if we so choose. With our expanded sensorium on the ground and in the skies, we have the tools to draft national and international policy with more depth than has been possible in the past. Should we so choose, we could make a comprehensive plan to utilize every fertile acre on Earth, to provide people with all the food they need. With modern methods of soil management, we are beginning to craft the ability to bring fallow acreage into production. And as we move into the domain of fusion power, our potential for managing and replenishing the soil will increase exponentially.

The state of the art is by no means perfect; we are only now beginning to bring the wealth of observational data into service more comprehensively at the farm. The potential is vast. The problem is, under the British imperial system, we are forbidden to apply our technology in a meaningful way. And a change in direction of U.S. agriculture policy will only happen when the direction of the nation as a whole is changed, after Obama is ousted.

Tornados Show Killer Obama Food Policy

by Marcia Merry Baker

March 5—Spring planting season begins in the U.S. cornbelt in a month, which this year should be a time of emergency measures to ensure the maximum Fall harvest, along with support for other crops, livestock, and the farming sector itself. This is so for many reasons, the first of which—illustrated by last week’s deadly tornado storms through the central states—is that episodes of weather extremes are to be expected because of the condition of the solar and galactic systems. These are hitting an agriculture sector worldwide which already faces chaos, if no financial reorganization takes place soon to stop the pending crash of the monetary system.

World corn supplies are way below what is needed, as shown in one critical metric: “stocks” or carry-over reserves from one harvest to the next, relative to use. U.S. stocks as a percent of current corn usage (itself too low), are running at 6.3%, way below a food security level. This represents only 23 days-of-use.

U.S. corn production declined in the last two crop seasons, from 333 million metric tons in 2009-10 (40% of the world production of 819 million metric tons), down to 316 mmt, now projected down to 314 mmt in the 2011-12 marketing year. This is automatically an issue for the world food supply. In the Southern Hemisphere, the corn harvest now coming in in Argentina—the second-biggest source of corn exports—will be lowered because of drought.

Yet the official overview of the Obama Administration, expressed by the Agriculture Department (USDA) at its Agricultural Outlook Forum 2012 (see accompanying article), was that there are “strong prospects” for farming this year. The Feb. 23 keynotes by Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack and USDA Chief Economist Joseph Glauber reiterated all the axioms that got us into this food-short situation to begin with: Put your trust in “market forces,” don’t curb speculation, swallow the greenie line that bio-products are good for farmers and the environment, and obey the World Trade Organization and the globalist commodity cartels behind the

WTO. Above all, do not end Wall Street/London bail-outs by restoring the Glass-Steagall bank regulation law; do not launch new “TVAs” anywhere, which would increase the availability of water, land, and power. Accept that resources are fixed.

EIR asked Secretary Vilsack, at his Feb. 23 press conference, why not put in Glass-Steagall to sort out the financial mess, and make way for urgent land and water projects—for example, to support the Army Corps of Engineers in restoring the Missouri River levees and flood damage repair? Vilsack replied with the decoy proposal for a National Infrastructure Bank, with private funding and control. He reiterated the Administration’s lie that the Army Corps has enough funding.

These axioms and assertions are all in line with the last 40 years of subversion of national economies by international financial interests, best called the British Empire.

Break with this kind of thinking, force a policy shift, and we can quickly intervene with measures for short-term increases in food and emergency relief where needed, as well as build a platform of secure agriculture production for the future. The science and technology exist, or are within reach, to transform biogenetics in ways unforetold.

Most immediately what is required, is to stabilize family-farm-scale operations with parity-based pricing, ban speculation, provide maximum support for all necessary inputs and for building infrastructure, especially for defense against expected weather extremes.

Probabilism or Science?


From Feb. 29 to March 2, two waves of tornado storms originated in the Midwest and raged eastward, hitting ten states. The death toll as of today stands at 51. Not only homes and towns were ruined, but agriculture was affected by damage to barns, out-buildings, machinery, livestock, and by debris strewn across fields. Cornbelt counties were hit in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. One farm in Washington County, Ind., lost three barns, equipment, and 34 out of 48 Angus cattle. Neighbors saw cows flying through the air.

The point is not that this particular storm wave caused extensive farm damage of this type before Spring planting, but rather, the occurrence of the destructive events is indicative of many weather incidents that can come later in the season—heat, drought, flooding, hail, insects, crop diseases, as well as more torna-

FIGURE 1

U.S. Corn: Feed and Residual Use, Ethanol, and Exports

(Bushels, Billions)



Source: USDA.

dos. This is why we need stocks.

In 1988, for example, Summer drought centered in the cornbelt brought the harvest down 30% compared to the norm at the time. In 1993, the corn crop fell by 33% from the norm, when flooding hit the Upper Midwest.

Even Vilsack made reference to the fact that in 2011, fully 55 million farmland acres (out of a U.S. crop base of 325 million) were hit by “storms, fire, drought, and flooding.” Economist Glauber showed a dramatic set of two U.S. drought maps—Feb. 16, 2011 and Feb. 16, 2012 (produced weekly from the Drought Monitor by NOAA), which showed the continuation of terrible aridity across the southern states.

However, “Don’t worry about 2012,” was the implicit USDA keynote message from Dr. Glauber. Why? He said that farmers will respond to market inducements of high corn prices from “tight stocks”—the polite term for scarcity—so they will plant a huge area of 94 million acres (38 million hectares) to corn this Spring, the largest area sown to corn since 1944.

To the obvious question, “Will the crop thrive to harvest?” Glauber again said not to worry. He predicted that the average cornfield is likely to “return to trend” of a rising output of bushels per acre, after yields fell for two years in a row. Why? Statistics! It is “probable” to have a good year, when it comes after two years of below-trend yields!

This probabilistic view is countered by other,

equally gambling-based analyses. University of Illinois economists wrote in February, “The odds slightly favor a corn yield above trend in 2012, but there is certainly precedent for another year below trend...”

Finally, Glauber added another special factor to his rosy picture of how today’s “tight” corn supplies will be remedied. He predicted that corn use for ethanol will cease rising so fast, thus aiding the food supply by freeing more corn for livestock feed and human food use. In 2011, the volume of U.S. corn going for biofuel exceeded, for the first time ever, the volume going into the food chain. Poultry, cattle, and hog producers have been loudly sounding alarms. (See “‘Unavailability’ of Livestock

Feed Signals: U.S. Food Shortages Are Here,” *EIR*, Sept. 23, 2011).

Figure 1 shows the USDA illustration of Glauber’s point. The circle (added by *EIR*) indicates that as of 2011, corn for ethanol exceeded food uses. The USDA claims this will abate in 2012, and corn for livestock use will remain above ethanol use through 2021.

What is left out of the USDA projections, are the chain-reaction consequences of weather, pricing, and biofuels now hitting ranchers and farmers everywhere. For example, the U.S. cattle inventory is shrinking below the numbers required for meat and herd replacement. Cattle are down to barely 90 million, from over 110 million in recent years. We are at the lowest cattle inventory since 1952. This reflects the liquidation of herds because of feed costs, as well as drought, water shortages, and related fundamentals. Likewise, poultry and hog producers are slammed by high corn prices and related factors.

Ignoring this, the *USDA Long-Term Projections* report glibly states in their “market adjustment” doublespeak: “Total U.S. red meat and poultry production is projected to fall in 2012 and 2013 in response to reduced producer returns over much of the past several years. Meat production then increases [from 2014 onwards] in response to improved returns.”

In reality, we are at the point of no return, unless this thinking and imperial food practices are stopped.

marciabaker@larouchepub.com

British Hedge-Fund Project: The ‘Americans Elect’ Hoax

by Gretchen Small

March 5—What would you say, if you were told that a top hedge-fund speculator, who, for more than three decades, has doubled as a British intelligence agent organizing the overthrow of governments deemed unacceptable, and has set out to orchestrate the 2012 U.S. Presidential election by marshalling the power of the Internet to create a third “option,” with the objective of ensuring that whoever wins, the result would be to rip up the Constitution and to install a technocratic fascist dictator as “President”?

Preposterous? No more so than the continuing toleration of Barack Obama and the current four Republican candidates as an actual “democratic” exercise. Or accepting the idea that computers can think, and that communicating electronically with people is the essence of human relations.

This new hand grenade the British are lobbing into the U.S. election is ready to be detonated. In the name of creating a “third pathway” for choosing a candidate, an outfit calling itself “Americans Elect” has already secured a line on the Presidential ballot in 17 states for its as yet to be decided “non-partisan ticket.” It claims to be poised to do the same in another 18 states soon, and intends to be on the ballot in all 50 states by the election in November.

Americans Elect is the brainchild of the British-trained and -run hedge-fund speculator Peter Ackerman,

who created, heads, and finances the International Centre for Non-Violent Conflict (ICNC), whose strategies Ackerman says he is deploying to shape the U.S. elections. Although headquartered in Washington, D.C., his ICNC serves as one of London’s premier “‘democratic’ regime-change” training centers globally.

These networks that are now promising that Americans Elect will deliver “shock therapy” to the U.S. political system in 2012, play a central role in the British apparatus deployed with the stated purpose of overthrowing and/or assassinating Russia’s incoming President Vladimir Putin in the immediate period ahead, despite his landslide election victory.

EIR published the authoritative dossier on that London apparatus in our Feb. 3, 2012 issue, titled, “Destabilizing Russia: The ‘Democracy’ Agenda of McFaul and His Oxford Masters.” The dossier became one of the hottest items in the Russian blogosphere in the lead-up to the March 4 Presidential elections, and drove President Obama’s Ambassador to Russia, Michael McFaul, into public fits of enraged twittering.

Such projects only succeed, when citizens refuse to think on as big a scale as our enemy.

Nonpartisan Financier Fascism

“Using the Internet you have the power to help break gridlock and change politics as usual. No special



Peter Ackerman, the British-trained hedge-fund speculator and founder of Americans Elect, is trying to bring anti-Constitutional “regime change” (fascism) to the United States.

interest. No agendas. Country before party. A greater voice for all Americans, no matter their party. You have the power to be heard. Every registered voter can be a delegate. Any constitutionally-eligible citizen can be a candidate. The power to choose new direction and new leadership in 2012. Real issues. Real candidates. Real votes. New direction, new leadership.”

Step right up. Get your snake oil here, the circus barker cries. That is the tenor of everything posted on AE’s disgusting, “it’s all about you” website.

Americans Elect was set up in 2010 by “private equity financier” Ackerman, who continues as its chairman. His son Elliot, a former Marine Corps Special Ops and intelligence officer, is its chief operating executive. So far, Peter Ackerman has put in a reported \$5 million of his own capital, and fellow hedge-fund speculator John Burbank is said to have put in \$2.5 million from his multi-billion-dollar Passport Capital, LLC.

The total kitty at AE’s disposal is now said to be \$22 million, but all its other contributors are undisclosed, because this outfit, whose sole declared purpose is to nominate a Presidential ticket, is registered as a 501c “social welfare organization,” which, unlike organizations involved in elections, does not have to make public its donors nor the amounts contributed.

Its Leadership Advisory Board, however, is listed, and as of February 2012, that included at least 15 other hedge-fund honchos; JPMorgan Chase managing director W. David Lawson; Lynn Forester de Rothschild,

the CEO of her husband’s E.L. Rothschild; and Charles Dallara, the managing director of the bankers’ cartel (a.k.a. the Institute of International Finance), who has been on hand to personally dictate conditions for bail-outs and genocide at pretty much every European summit of the past year. Among others with equally invalid claims to “serving no special interest.”

With their \$22 million, Americans Elect’s financiers are reported to have hired 3,000 petition gatherers, and marshalled about as many volunteers. A June “online convention” of AE “delegates” (currently numbering around 350,000) is to select a candidate, who must pick a running-mate from another party.

Names being bandied about as candidates cover the spectrum, but AE’s propaganda echoes that of the aborted 2008 “independent” campaign of Wall Street billionaire Michael Bloomberg: bipartisan fascist fiscal austerity.

On Feb. 19, AE champion and *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman proposed that if former U.S. Comptroller David Walker¹ were to run as an independent, his participation in the Presidential debates would force the Democratic and Republican candidates to address the necessity (sic) of ripping up Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

As Comptroller, Walker championed the financiers’ lie that entitlements must be eliminated; upon leaving government, he was picked up by Blackstone Equity’s Peter Peterson as the poster boy for his drive to take down all of Franklin Roosevelt’s social programs, and to impose British-style rationing of health care.

Lo and behold, Walker is a member of the Americans Elect Advisory Board. AE put out a press release the day after Friedman suggested a Walker nomination, hailing Walker. “Dave Walker knows the facts, the truth and the tough choice we face in connection with our nation’s poor finances and other key challenges. . . . Walker understands that Americans Elect’s online nominating process for president combined with its independence from the two major political parties has the ability to shock the current political system in a positive manner.”

The Devil in Your Elections

Ackerman embodies everything rotten about the world that emerged triumphant from the British-or-

1. See Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Ducking the Issue! David Walker’s Sleight of Hand,” *EIR*, March 16, 2007.

dered assassinations of the two Kennedys—from parastatistical monetarism, to systems analysis, artificial intelligence, and the “democracy” of extreme group-think.

In his opening to LaRouchePAC’s explosive pamphlet, “The Noosphere vs. The Blogosphere: Is the Devil in Your Laptop?” (November 2007), Lyndon LaRouche addressed the underlying coherence of three cases of mass insanity typifying the New Dark Age into which the world was then sinking: Henry Paulson’s bank bailout, a grisly MySpace, Facebook-organized murder in Italy, and yet another school mass killing by a video-game-addicted youth. LaRouche’s title to his chapter, “From Milken & Enron to Perugia: ‘Extreme Events’!”, captures the life and work of Peter Ackerman.

Born in 1946 in New York, by the time Ackerman graduated with a PhD from Tuft University’s Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in 1976, he was already under British intelligence control. His doctoral thesis, “Strategic Aspects of Nonviolent Resistance Movements,” was written under the direction of the Oxford-trained Bertrand Russellite ideologue Gene Sharp, whose trajectory is featured in *EIR*’s “McFaul” dossier.

Perhaps because of the fascination with “assymetric conflict” he says he developed at that time, Ackerman went into finance when he left school, hired in 1978 by the infamous organized crime-permeated financial house Drexel Burnham Lambert. Not in some minor role, either; his first position was as Assistant to the President. According to his testimony before IRS examiners questioning several years’ tax filings in 2006, Ackerman ran Drexel’s “Special Projects Group” from 1978-89, overseeing such pivotal restructurings as the Penn Central Railroad and Meyer Lansky’s Resorts International. In George Anders’ book, *Merchants of Debt*, Ackerman is identified as the chief strategist for the company, who increasingly ran the shop as Milken became tied up in legal battles from 1987 on.

When Milken finally went to jail in the Fall of 1990, Ackerman was not in town, having left for London early that year. There, he and his wife, Joanne Leedom-Ackerman, set up Rockport Capital, Inc., and he dove back into the project of using democracy as an imperial strategic weapon. Ackerman was a visiting scholar at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), where he re-worked his dissertation into a book, co-authored with the then-president of Sharp’s Albert Einstein Institute (AEI), Christopher Kruegler, who bases

his work on the theory of “civilian-based defense,” which was concocted by the leading military light of Bertrand Russell’s Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Sir Stephen King-Hall. Published in 1994, the introduction to *Strategic Non-Violent Conflict: The Dynamics of People Power in the 20th Century* was written by Sharp, and the foreword by the RAND Corporation’s nuclear war gamer, Thomas Schelling of “rational irrationality” fame.

By that time, Ackerman and his wife were both on the board of Sharp’s AEI.

Since moving back to the United States at the end of 1995, Ackerman has continued his two loves: making millions speculating, and overthrowing governments. His book morphed into a movie, adapted as a PBS series and packaged as an educational program for high school students, and then remade as a computer game.

In 2002, Ackerman went beyond financing Sharp’s AEI, to set up the ICNC as a complementary institution, with expanded capabilities for financing and training agents. Projects range from training Iranian and Venezuelan dissidents (in 2005, he co-authored with universal fascist Michael Ledeen a call for Arab revolutions), to financing “journalists” for the Mexican-based NarcoNews (whose name is self-explanatory).

Quitting Britain’s Game

At an Oct. 22, 2010 gala fundraiser in New York City, Ackerman discussed his work at the ICNC, as the methodology applied to Americans Elect. “What you see is the need, particularly in authoritarian systems, to have some kind of external power to change a system that’s dysfunctional. . . . Now, recently, I’ve been involved with another system that I think most here would agree is dysfunctional: our own political system. . . . What I am undertaking as the chairman of the Americans Elect initiative is an effort to create an online virtual primary and convention. . . . What I think will happen again, just like in civil resistance, we’ll have a new force that will come to play in a system that is struggling. ”

Put that together with Ackerman’s 2004 report that he was working with Lawrence Livermore Labs to develop “new communicating techniques” to be used in youth insurgencies, and his statements elsewhere that he is most enthused about his video game, issued in an upgraded edition as “People Power. The Game of Civil Resistance.” In this game, “the player takes on the role of strategist in a nonviolent movement against a variety

of adversaries in pre-packaged scenarios,” the adversaries being run by artificial intelligence.

Ackerman, dubbed “The Sniff” at Drexel Burnham Lambert for his butt-kissing of the boss, decided early on whose game he would play in, never questioning the “pre-packaged scenarios” served up by his British bosses.

Wouldn’t you prefer to think for yourself?

An Alternative

LaRouche Slate Offers ‘The Competent Candidate’

LaRouchePAC issued this leaflet on Feb. 18, with photos of the six Congressional [candidates](#) who constitute the LaRouche Federal Slate. It is titled, “The Competent Candidate for the Presidency Is the LaRouche Federal Slate.”

There is a contest going on now which will determine the immediate fate of the United States, but it is not the Presidential election. The media may hype so-and-so’s recent or expected electoral victory, but the battle for the United States is not going on in the primary polls either. RIGHT NOW there is a minute-to-minute fight for the existence of our nation, which is threatened by the potential of a global thermonuclear war and the controlled hyperinflationary disintegration of the world’s economy. Any candidate who is addressing “issues” instead of this stark reality should not be allowed anywhere near the Presidency of the United States.

However, do not despair about the lack of qualified candidates. The LaRouche Federal Slate is acting now to drive through the necessary actions to be taken, as would a functioning Presidency. Although our “leaders” have been demoralized by generations of wars and do not have the courage to stand up on their own, the LaRouche Slate is ready to lead morally and truthfully; in a sense, to be the leadership of the leadership. The first step is Glass-Steagall. The financial system of Europe is beyond the reach of any monetary mechanism which could be constructed to bail it out again. European banks have admitted they will need EU5 trillion before the end of the year, far beyond the debt of

Greece, signalling the fact that this is not a crisis of any nation, it is a crisis of the system. Any candidate who is not for Glass-Steagall to restore a functioning national banking system is not fit to be President.

The potential wars in Syria and Iran, which U.S. military deployments show are actually aimed at Russia and China, were scheduled to begin directly following the killing of Qaddafi, but due to Lyndon LaRouche’s timely intervention, which was joined by leading U.S. military generals, these wars have been delayed. The recent vetoes by Russia and China of a UN Security Council resolution hindered the ongoing British attempt to use the overthrow of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to launch this global thermonuclear war, causing uproars from UN Ambassador Susan Rice, British Foreign Secretary William Hague, and President Obama, who claimed that Russia and China now have blood on their hands.

The homicidal irony of Barack Obama is that even while he lauds his killing of Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda forces from Iraq have been found to be part of the opposition to Assad, committing atrocities against the citizens of Syria, in common cause and sponsorship with our British-run President!

In Iran, similar operations have been exposed, as the British admitted to covert operations against Iran, and an MEK operative, captured in Iran for the attempted assassination of an Iranian scientist, confessed to his recruitment and training by the Israeli Mossad. Ongoing sanctions against Iran are creating a food crisis for the citizens, in a medieval-style hunger blockade. These are the conditions that must be addressed with real leadership, not to comment on false “facts,” but to address the larger issue: the collapse of the monetarist system.

The LaRouche Slate is fighting for a return to a system of sovereign nation-states, which are cooperating for human development with our eyes on the stars. Citizens too must not simply blame the shadows on the wall, but look into yourselves and ask: How has your thinking been affected by these decades of collapse, war, and loss—as seen in the assassination of John F. Kennedy—of moral leadership? Human happiness, as Gottfried Leibniz said, arises from wisdom, through the pursuit of knowledge, scientific truth, and acting on this understanding to better the lives of others. We have to act now to stop the Empire at work in our minds, and fight for the policies that must be adopted for human survival, beginning with the removal of Obama from office.

Senators Demand Probe Of Saudi-9/11 Ties

by Edward Spannaus

March 5—Two former U.S. Senators who had access to top-secret information on the 9/11 attacks, are asking a Federal judge to allow a full investigation of evidence that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia played a direct role in those attacks. They are arguing that, in fact, this evidence has never been fully examined. If such an investigation were allowed to proceed, over the objections of the Obama Administration, it would reveal not only the Saudi role in 9/11, but more importantly, it would identify the British hand behind the Saudis and the 9/11 hijackers—which *EIR* has documented many times, including as recently as our March 2 issue.¹

Filing the affidavits were former Sen. Bob Graham of Florida (D), who was chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee before and after the 2001 attacks, and was also the co-chairman of the House-Senate Intelligence Committees' Joint Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks; and former Sen. Bob Kerrey of Nebraska (D), who served on the 9/11 Commission in 2003-04. Both were also governors of their respective states before serving in the U.S. Senate.

In their sworn statements, submitted to the U.S. District Court in Manhattan on Feb. 24, Graham and Kerrey forcefully rebut the spurious Saudi contention, made in recently filed legal briefs, that the official 9/11 investigations "exonerated" the Kingdom of any involvement in the 9/11 attacks.

Obama Protects al-Qaeda Sponsors

At issue here is an effort by the families of 9/11 victims, to reinstate the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the Saudi High Commission, and various Saudi-funded charities as defendants in their long-standing lawsuit. In 2008, the Saudis were dismissed as defendants by a Federal court on the grounds of sovereign immunity, but more recently, a Federal appeals court allowed the families to reinstate their claims. The Saudis are again seeking dismissal of the families' claims, and the

1. "Obama-al-Qaeda Mujahideen Connection Unveiled," *EIR*, March 2, 2012.

Obama Justice Department is taking the side of the Saudis, against the 9/11 victims' families!

In 2009, to the outrage of the 9/11 families, the Justice Department backed the Saudi royal family, including four Saudi princes, in a brief filed with the U.S. Supreme Court. Then-Solicitor General Elena Kagan—whom Obama later elevated to the Supreme Court—argued that "the princes are immune from petitioners' claims."

"I find this reprehensible," Kristen Breitweiser, a leader of the Sept. 11 families, told the *New York Times*. "One would have hoped that the Obama administration would have taken a different stance than the Bush administration, and you wonder what message this sends to victims of terrorism around the world."

Even though the long-standing legal doctrine of "sovereign immunity" holds that a foreign sovereign state cannot be sued in U.S. courts without its consent, there are exceptions in U.S. law for countries that are regarded as "state sponsors of terrorism," or if a foreign state has provided "material support or resources" for an act of terrorism. In light of the flimsy evidence which the Justice Department routinely relies on to prosecute often-hapless, low-level individuals in terrorism cases, it is preposterous for the Obama Administration to pretend that the Saudi Kingdom and royal family are exempt from claims by victims of the terrorist actions in which they are deeply implicated.

Investigation or Cover-Up?

Another of the grounds on which the Saudis are demanding that the families' case again be thrown out, is that the Saudi role was already thoroughly investigated and resulted in their exoneration from any culpability for the terrorist attacks. However, as both Graham and Kerrey state, their investigations were limited in scope and resources, and neither fully investigated the Saudi role, nor in any manner "exonerated" the Saudi government and its agents.

"Stated simply, the 9/11 Commission did not have the time, opportunity or resources to pursue all potentially relevant evidence on that important question, and the American public deserves a more comprehensive inquiry into the issue," wrote Kerrey.

"I am convinced that there was a direct line between at least some of the terrorists who carried out the September 11th attacks and the government of Saudi Arabia," Graham said in his affidavit, citing, among other things, the San Diego case of Omar al-Bayoumi (which *EIR* has covered extensively in the past).

Graham states that al-Bayoumi “provided financial and other assistance to [hijackers] al-Hazmi and al-Midhar in the months leading up to the September 11th attacks,” and he describes Bayoumi meeting with the hijackers, holding a dinner for them, finding them an apartment, fronting the initial payments for the apartment, and providing continuing financial assistance. During this same time, Graham states, Baymoumi’s income from the Saudi government and from a private Saudi firm “increased eightfold.”

Graham concludes, “I am convinced that al-Bayoumi was an agent of the government of Saudi Arabia,” and that to date, this evidence has not been fully explored and pursued, “to the considerable detriment of the American public.” He adds that whether other hijackers also received support from the Saudi government “has never been adequately explored.”

A statement by the 9/11 families also points to the suppressed 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry Report concerning Saudi Arabia, disclosure of which has been blocked, first by the Bush Administration, and now by the Obama Administration.

In addition to the Graham and Kerry affidavits, lawyers for the families also submitted military and CIA reports to the court that back up the families’ contention that the U.S. government has identified the Saudi-based charities in question as terrorist support organizations.

The Sarasota Connection

Senator Graham knows a lot more than he was able to put into his recent affidavit. Last Fall, a second element of the Saudi support apparatus, in addition to that exposed in San Diego, was revealed to have been operating in Florida, less than 20 miles from the airfield at which a number of the 9/11 hijackers underwent training.

In September, the *Miami Herald* and other news outlets disclosed that a wealthy and well-connected Saudi family had abruptly fled from their home just days before the 9/11 attacks, leaving behind three cars and most of their personal belongings, including medicines and a full refrigerator. Records showed that 9/11 pilot Mohamed Atta and another hijacker had repeatedly visited the luxury Sarasota residence, and that the house had telephone contact with a dozen other hijackers and terrorist suspects.

Graham believes that both the San Diego and Sarasota operations were part of an extensive Saudi shadow “support network” for the hijackers. “The chances that 19 people, most of whom had never been in the U.S.,

who did not speak English, and most of whom did not know each other, could have completed training, practiced and executed such a complicated plot, defies common sense,” Graham said last Fall. He suggests that this shadow support network also operated in other U.S. cities where clusters of hijackers lived before the 9/11 attacks.

Graham has been vociferous in criticizing the FBI for never disclosing any of this information to the Congressional 9/11 investigation. After the disclosures about the Sarasota network were published in September 2011, the FBI issued a terse statement, which said: “At no time did the FBI develop evidence that connected the family members to any of the 9/11 hijackers . . . and there was no connection to the FBI plot.”

The FBI has also stonewalled FOIA requests made by newspapers on the Sarasota case, although documents recently disclosed by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement showed that Abdulazziz al-Hijjii, who lived in the Sarasota house, also had contact with another top al-Qaeda leader. The house was owned by al-Hijjii’s father-in-law, who is a financial advisor to leading members of the Saudi royal family. Al-Hijjii was recently discovered to be living in London and working at the British offices of the Saudi ARAMCO oil company.

On March 2, Salon.com columnist and constitutional lawyer Glenn Greenwald followed up the new disclosures on the Saudi 9/11 story, taking note of what he calls “one of the towering, central contradictions in War on Terror logic: namely, that the only foreign government which likely had any connection to 9/11 is the one which is the least likely to be attacked by the U.S.”

Greenwald quotes Obama from last October affirming “the strong partnership” between the United States and Saudi Arabia, and the Obama Administration’s announcement in December that it will sell \$30 billion of F-15 fighter jets to the Saudis. “Meanwhile,” Greenwald continues, “the U.S. in just the last three years alone—in the name of 9/11 and Terrorism—has dropped bombs on at least six Muslim countries whose governments had no connection whatsoever to 9/11 (often aimed at groups that did not even exist at the time of that attack). And now Washington is abuzz with exciting debates about the mechanics of how yet another country that had nothing whatsoever to do with 9/11—Iran—should be aggressively attacked.”

“I’d bet the Saudi Ambassador to the U.S. has closer ties to Al Qaeda than 90% of the people we’ve killed with drones,” Greenwald quotes a commentator saying.

Overcoming the Existential Threat of Thermonuclear War

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

The following is Helga Zepp-LaRouche's keynote speech to the Berlin conference of the Schiller Institute on Feb. 25, translated here from German. The video is at <http://www.schiller-institut.de/>. An overview of the conference and the transcript of the videotaped speech by Lyndon LaRouche appeared in last week's issue.

We convened this conference not out of pessimism, but with the intention of intervening in world history to change the paradigm underlying world policies today. And we are optimistic that this is possible.

But still I must begin with some quite terrible things, because for anyone who is observing developments around Iran and Syria, and the strategic situation as a whole, there is no doubt that we are living through the greatest crisis in modern history. And if this direction is not changed immediately, the crisis will end horribly. Unless urgent steps are taken to define the whole situation in a new way, I think we may be actually only days or weeks away from a huge catastrophe.

Ostensibly it was the situation in Syria and the escalation around Iran that ignited the crisis, but actually this crisis is inextricably linked to the escalating disintegration of the financial system in the trans-Atlantic region.

Unfortunately, I have to declare the highest level of alert, because the indications right now are that the intention is—I won't say it will definitely happen, but the

intention is—to launch a military strike against Iran, perhaps in early March or April. And if this happens, it would be the trigger for a global thermonuclear war, with the United States, the U.K., NATO, Israel, Australia, and maybe a few other countries on one side, and Syria, Iran, Russia, China, and other countries on the other. Given the incredible destructive potential that would be unleashed by a global thermonuclear war, one can assume that there is a risk that this would be the end of human civilization.

I can assure you, and I say this with the benefit of background knowledge, that all the world's leading governments and all military leaders are absolutely clear about this, and the evidence is available to anyone who takes the trouble to follow strategic developments.

Comparing this with what is being disseminated by the mass media and the so-called "mainstream" politicians, one can only say that there is more confetti being strewn around here than at the Carnival parade in Mainz.

Iran's Nuclear Program

The most recent report, for example, that Iran had denied experts from the International Atomic Energy Agency access to Iran's nuclear sites, led immediately to a hue and cry: "Aha, this proves that Iran still has a nuclear weapons program!" And of course the spokesman for the Iranian Foreign Ministry, [Ramin] Meh-



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

Helga Zepp-LaRouche welcomes singer Raymond Björling to the conference. He performed during the musical evening on Feb. 26.

manparast, immediately explained that the assignment of this team of inspectors was not to examine the nuclear facilities themselves, but to negotiate the framework for future cooperation with the IAEA—i.e., there was simply no obstruction of this assignment. And then it was reported that this team had requested access to the Parchin military base. Of course, no country would give a team of inspectors access to secret facilities unless that had been explicitly mandated, especially not in the case of Iran, given that almost every day since last October, there have been statements from Israel, Great Britain, and the United States, that a military strike is likely by April.

Meanwhile, according to the media, the deputy head of Iran's Armed Forces, Mohammed Hejazi, declared that Iran was ready to launch a preemptive strike if its national interests were threatened. The Iranian ambassador to Russia, Seyed Mahmoud-Reza Sajjadi, immediately issued a correction, saying that Iran had no intention of preventive military action.

If you consider this disinformation to be psychological warfare, then you have to ask: What role is the current leadership of the IAEA playing?

And this agency's latest report, which stated that Iran would have nuclear weapons within a year, was extremely dubious. It was immediately contradicted by Hans Blix, former head of the IAEA. It is also contra-

dicted by the November 2011 U.S. National Intelligence Estimate, which is the evaluation of the umbrella organization of all the American intelligence agencies; the NIE confirmed its finding of 2007, that Iran has not been pursuing a nuclear weapons program since 2003. Hans Blix also said that all the information that the IAEA obtained came from French, British, and American intelligence sources, and was not specifically investigated by the agency itself.

Now a new IAEA report has been published, which in effect repeats that Iran was not willing to cooperate; a definitive report is expected early in March.

All of this is coming to a head this week, with the March

4-6 annual meeting in Washington of AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, an organization usually dominated by the hawks). And U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said that a military strike against Iran by Israel is likely during between April and June—June being a “red line,” because by then, Iran will allegedly have managed to bunker its nuclear research installations deep underground, so that bombs could no longer reach them.¹

The new IAEA report is supposed to come out during the first week of March, and would hit the AIPAC conference like a thunderbolt. That would be about a day after the Russian election, which Vladimir Putin is expected to win.

So, we are looking at an immediate escalation in March-April, or perhaps even earlier. The truth is that we may be only days or weeks away from a global thermonuclear war. And that would be tantamount to the obliteration of civilization.

Background to the Crisis

Let's look at how things could get to that point. Look at the alliance of the forces of the British Empire—

1. See David Ignatius, “Is Israel Preparing To Attack Iran?” *Washington Post*, Feb. 2, 2010. The evaluation about Iranian bunkers is attributed by Ignatius to “the Israelis”—ed.



George H.W. Bush Library

President George H.W. Bush and Mrs. Bush with the Royals at the White House, May 14, 1991. Bush and the British decided to create a globalized empire based on the Anglo-American special relationship, after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

understood to mean the whole combination of financial institutions of globalization, i.e., central banks, investment banks, hedge funds, holding companies, special purpose entities, insurance companies. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, when there was a chance to actually create a new world order of peace for the 21st Century, the so-called neocons in the United States around the Bush, Sr. government, along with the British government, decided to create a globalized empire on the basis of the Anglo-American special relationship. That was the idea, from 1990-91 on, to carry out “regime change” in all countries whose governments resisted the Empire’s. That was the reason for the first Gulf War. This process was interrupted by the eight years of the Clinton Administration, but the trend toward global empire continued in the background even then, as represented by Richard Perle, or the policy of the so-called “Clean Break,”² which was the neocons’ response to Bill Clinton’s Oslo policy.

This policy was continued by Bush, Jr., leading to the second Iraq War, the Afghanistan War, and of course to the war of aggression against Libya and the murder

2. “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm,” issued in 1996 by the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies in Jerusalem. Directed to then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, it called for a shift toward pre-emptive military action, and for regime change in Iraq, Syria, and Iran—ed.

of Qaddafi. And now, continuing this policy, regime change and military operations against Syria and Iran are on the agenda.

How close we are to World War III was shown by nothing so clearly as the revelation of a *de facto* alliance among the United States, Great Britain, al-Qaeda, and the Iranian terrorist organization MEK (Mujahideen-e-Khalq); the latter two are operating in both Iran and Syria, where the new head of al-Qaeda, Ayman al-Zawahiri, is the string-puller behind the suicide attacks in Damascus and Aleppo, for the sabotage of pipelines and other infrastructure, for the murder of Syrian government officials and military personnel—all the while operating from Iraq.

What does this mean, if the present governments of the United States and Great Britain apparently have no qualms about working with the September 2001 assassins?

The background to Sept. 11 was revealed long ago: the role of the al-Yamamah Anglo-Saudi apparatus, with Saudi Prince Bandar bin Sultan playing a very crucial role in financing al-Qaeda; the role of the British BAE group, which essentially built up this apparatus about 24 years ago, and which is now supplying the Syrian opposition with money and weapons.

The MEK, under the protection of U.S. military



The Anglo-Saudi al-Yamamah apparatus, and Saudi Ambassador to the United States Prince Bandar bin Sultan personally, played a key role in 9/11. Shown are buddies President George W. Bush with Bandar in 2006.

forces at Camp Ashraf in Iraq, has been carrying out acts of sabotage against Iran since 2003. They were responsible for sabotage of Iranian military facilities, and probably also for the assassination of four Iranian nuclear scientists, to which Iran has actually responded relatively mildly. But looking at this escalation, one must state very clearly that the war has actually already begun.

The news media scarcely took note of it, but anyone who wants to investigate can find out that since last Autumn, an absolutely massive military buildup has been under way in the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, and the Eastern Mediterranean. There are currently three U.S. aircraft carriers there, each with the capacity to carry several hundred fighter planes and cruise missiles; there are also destroyers, frigates, nuclear submarines, plus British and Canadian warships. Overall, there is a nuclear destructive power there which is several orders of magnitude larger than would be required to wipe out the entire human race, and which bears no relation whatsoever to support for the Syrian opposition, for example, or to operations against Iran.

It is the logic of the regime of thermonuclear weapons, that once they are used at all, the entire arsenal is used. The Third World War will not happen with first one nuclear weapon being launched, then a counter-strike, and then another; in a nuclear war, the entire arsenal of one side will actually be deployed, because counterstrikes would be anticipated.

In view of this situation, and of course the fact that the European missile defense systems are viewed by Russia as part of the tactic or strategy of encirclement, Prime Minister Putin has just now announced that Russia's military potential will be increased by EU583 billion. He explained that in a world filled with such turmoil, certain forces are tempted to solve their own problems at the expense of third parties—for example, by demanding that resources of global importance be removed from the exclusive sovereignty of individual nations, and this of course refers primarily to Russia's resources, in Siberia and the Far East; that Russia will not go along with such a thing, not even theoretically; that conflicts and new regional and local wars are breaking out repeatedly along the very borders of Russia, intentionally manufactured chaos, undermining the basic principles of international law.



government.ru
Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin talks with reporters about the U.S. deployment of a global missile-defense system, December 2009. Today, Putin is warning that Russia will have an effective and asymmetrical response to this deployment.

Putin warned that Russia will find an answer to all this with an effective and asymmetrical response to the global missile defense system, and that it is Russia's position that this missile defense system is a significant expansion of the strategic missile system by other means, because it destroys relative parity.

President Medvedev acted on this by activating the radar facilities in Kaliningrad, as a first measure. Foreign Minister Lavrov was even more explicit. He said very unambiguously that the power center of economic potential has shifted to Asia, and that there are obviously people or forces who want to distract attention from this by means of provocative adventures in the Near and Middle East.

The danger of the situation is underscored not only by these statements by Putin and Medvedev; in Russia now there is a television debate on the most popular TV channel between Presidential candidates Vladimir Zhirinovskiy and Mikhail Prokhorov, who spoke openly about it: There will be a war this Summer. We are already in the same position as in 1937-38, i.e., with only half a year to go. Who will be next? Syria. Why did we let the Americans and NATO come up to our southern borders? And then scenarios were developed on how an escalation could occur. The details are not important, and could be seen differently; but what is important, is that in prime time on Russian television, there was a



Presidential Press Office

Russian President Dmitri Medvedev at a military unit in Kaliningrad, Nov. 29, 2011. Russia's missile attack early warning radar station is deployed there.

debate about World War III being right around the corner.

What War Means for Europe

We in Germany clearly have a problem, because we are hostage to this threat of global nuclear conflict. Defense Minister [Thomas] de Maizière was recently asked, at the Munich Security Conference, how Germany would act in the event of a war against Iran. De Maizière refused to make any statement or to speculate about it. The only problem is that Chancellor Merkel adheres to the dogma that Israel's security is a *raison d'état* for Germany, and that Germany is prepared to defend Israel in case of emergency. One thing must be absolutely clear: If such an emergency should occur, we are talking about World War III, in which Germany would be on the side of the United States, Great Britain, and NATO, and would be involved in a thermonuclear exchange with Russia, China, and some other states. In plain language: Nobody in Germany would be expected to survive such a war.

And so, we urgently need an alternative to this insanity. But now, if you consider the financial policy background of these developments against the backdrop of the escalating euro crisis, yet another dimension comes into view. Every five minutes, Mrs. Merkel re-

peats that "If the euro fails, Europe fails." But precisely the opposite is true! Namely, if we do not rid ourselves of the euro as quickly as possible, Europe will not survive. If we do not regain our sovereignty, we won't even be able to decide whether—or not—we want to become cannon-fodder for a third world war.

Let us recall that the price we had to pay for reunification was our abandonment of the deutschemark and the formation of the European monetary union. Mitterrand, Thatcher, and Bush Sr. declared at the time, that they would not allow Germany to reunite, unless Germany hobbled itself by becoming integrated into the EU, and became constrained inside the corset of the European Union. And as Jacques Attali, the *éminence grise* of French politics and a close advisor of Fran-

çois Mitterrand, recently said in an interview, the European monetary union was deliberately created with a birth defect, so that later on, political unification could be forced into being, which was not possible at the outset. In other words, looking at the European Union today, we see that it has become a supranational dictatorship aimed at eliminating the nation-state, and that the escalating series of EU treaties, from Maastricht to Lisbon, has invested the EU with ever more extensive imperial structures.

Let us recall that one of the top advisors to the EU's so-called "Foreign Minister" Catherine Ashton, is Robert Cooper, who was quite open about the fact that he's aiming at a new liberal imperialism. And in his 2003 book, *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, he proclaimed that the EU is an imperial "post-modern system," which is a necessary counterweight to the pre-modern states which tend toward chaos, on the one hand, and on the other, the great nation-states such as the United States. Cooper writes that "The most far-reaching form of imperial expansion is that of the European Union... The post-modern European answer to threats is to extend the system of co-operative empire ever wider."

Neither the EU nor its governments are going to admit that, of course, but already back when [Hubert]

Védrine was France’s Foreign Minister, a fracas broke out when Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote an article in the journal *The National Interest*, where he stated that Europe is more or less merely a militarized colony, and that in any case, the image of man has changed so much that whereas up to now, *Homo sapiens* has been at the center, now we’re in a post-human era, and that the age of the Peace of Westphalia is over, and that therefore the expansion of NATO and of the EU all the way to Russia’s borders must be aggressively pursued. The remarks contained in this article touched off a huge scandal, and Védrine recalled all French ambassadors from around the world to Paris for a meeting. But apparently, Brzezinski himself has gotten panicky in the meantime, since he recently issued an urgent warning against a military strike on Iran, because it would have unforeseeable consequences.

But Brzezinski was entirely right when he pointed out that the EU treaties marked the beginning of a “post-human era”—as we can see today in what’s happening to the Greeks, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Portuguese. The propaganda line of the EU advocates, and of the advocates of European integration, has always been that a single Europe promotes peace; but today we see the reality, when people in Greece are burning the German flag, and hideous caricatures of Mrs. Merkel are in circulation. As a direct result of this policy, not since World War II have the peoples of Europe been so at loggerheads with each other, as they are now. The unified European state exists only inside the heads of the EU bureaucracy’s oligarchical elite. For the European population, on the other hand, there is no common culture, and no such thing as a media-shaped sphere of public discourse. What do Germans know about how people in Brittany are thinking, or in Sicily? What do the northern Swedes know about Slovakia? So, the whole idea of a unified state is a fiction.

Failure of the Euro System

The euro is a failed experiment. And now, if there’s an attempt to leverage the European Financial Stability Facility by a factor of ten to one, into a money-printing machine, or to establish the European Monetary System as a *de facto* permanent bailout mechanism, then this would be the end of our sovereignty and control over our own budget, the so-called “sovereign right of par-



The Greek press is full of hideous caricatures of Chancellor Angela Merkel, like this one in Demokratia on Feb. 10.

liament.” We would lose all sovereignty to an EU dictatorship which would no longer be in any way accountable to our citizens. It is a relapse, not into a post-Westphalian order, but rather into a pre-Westphalian order—that is, the period before the Thirty Years War, or perhaps the preceding 150 years of religious warfare—only this time, in the age of thermonuclear weapons.

The next-to-last President of Germany, Horst Köhler, resigned rather than putting his signature on the first bailout package for Greece. And what about [the most recent President] Christian Wulff’s resignation? I think the key to that is in the speech he delivered in Lindau, along with other remarks he made previously in Lower Saxony. Let me quote from his Lindau address:

“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 ultimately rescue the rescuers? When will the accumulated deficits be distributed among whom, and who will shoulder them?...

“Instead of setting a clear regulatory framework, governments are increasingly allowing themselves to be driven by global financial markets....

“First of all, politicians have to regain their ability to act. They have at long last to stop reacting frantically to

every fall on the stock markets. They mustn't feel dependent on or allow themselves to be led around the ring by the nose by banks, rating agencies or the erratic media. Politicians have to formulate policies for the common good and they have to show courage and strength in the face of conflict with individual interest groups. They have to put structures into order and, if necessary, adapt the regulatory framework so that scarce resources can be used in the best possible way and business and society can thrive. Politicians have to take a long-term view and, if necessary, make unpopular decisions. In a liberal democracy, decisions always have to be made in parliament. For that's where legitimacy lies. In a democracy the power comes from the people, who elect and vote for their representatives."

I think these remarks make it quite clear that the position which Wulff took in Lindau is in total opposition to the current policy of the EU and of the German government. And there exists no connection between this and the unparalleled media assault against him over receipt of favors, which perhaps aren't very pretty, but which are totally normal in politics, and something that almost all politicians engage in. And now we are to get a new President who characterizes the Monday demonstrations against Hartz IV as foolish, who describes the Occupy Movement as "unspeakably inane," and who believes that the free-market economy, which has just proven to be more bankrupt than the G.D.R. ever was, is our "guarantor of freedom."

What we urgently need, is the same measure of transparency about this [incoming President Joachim] Gauck, as the media and politicians have created concerning Christian Wulff—only this time *before* he has been sworn in.

Alternatives for Germany

If we look at this situation, then I think we need a completely different kind of politics in Germany. If we



EU/Benoit Bourgeois

Former German President Christian Wulff infuriated the financial oligarchy by pointing out that the repeated bailouts of the banks were not helping the situation, but making it worse. A scandal was cooked up and he resigned last month.

simply go along further on this path, in the direction of the NATO military alliance, then we're hostages to the impending new world war. If we continue in the direction of the EU, Germany's fate will be absolutely sealed.

But there are, of course, alternatives. For example, in 2001, Russian President Putin delivered an address before the German Parliament in which he proposed to intensify absolutely extensive cooperation between the two countries. The current Deputy Prime Minister, [Dmitri] Rogozin, recently reiterated the offer that the common problems of humanity will have to be solved jointly by a Strategic Defense of the Earth initiative—the SDE proposal, which is absolutely in the tradition of the SDI³ policy. Former Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov has likewise called

upon the world's nations to jointly develop the unbelievably rich resources of the Arctic.

Anyone who is not completely blind has to recognize that the EU in its current form is not in Germany's interests, but that rather it has become an empire, an oligarchical system directed by a tiny money and power elite, by an EU bureaucracy which is essentially serving the financial beneficiaries of the bailout packages, while the masses of the populace are deliberately kept in backwardness.

How does this oligarchy operate? Through manipulation of sense-perception, and a dumbing-down of the emotions associated with those senses. It's based on the model of the Roman Empire: bread and circuses—in modernized forms, of course. If you look today at how full-grown men, week after week, show more interest in their favorite soccer team's game scores, than they do in humanity's future over the next few weeks; when

3. Lyndon LaRouche's concept of a strategic defense initiative, which was officially adopted by President Reagan in 1983, envisioned U.S.-Soviet cooperation for mutual ABM defense based on "higher physical principles," in the common interests of mankind. This policy was sabotaged on both the Soviet and U.S. sides.



Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, relief in the Basilica di S. Pietro in Vincoli, Italy. Cusa was the first to discover what we now call the biogenetic law of evolution; for him, this meant that man is only wholly man when he participates in divine reason.

and economic order into agreement with the cosmic order, will we be able to overcome humanity's existential crisis, and the potential extinction of the human species. This necessity corresponds to a profound philosophical principle in the Christian-humanist tradition of European intellectual history. But this idea also exists in other cultures—for example, in the Vedic tradition in Indian philosophy, or, in another guise, also in Confucianism.

The laws of the universe are anti-entropic. The kernel of this idea was first recognized in the 15th Century by Nicholas of Cusa, who discovered the so-called biogenetic law of evolution. It was he who, for the first time, distinguished among three completely distinct domains: the domain of the inorganic, of the biological, and of human reason. And for Nicholas of Cusa, there was also the fourth domain of divine reason. He basically defined evolution in such a way, that no mode in any of these domains can fully accentuate its potential, unless it also participates at one point with the next-higher species. Which is to say that man is only wholly man when he participates in divine reason. And Nicholas defined evolution such that, unlike with Darwin, for whom evolution was from the bottom up, the lower are, as it were, pulled upward by the higher, so that development occurs from the top down.

Kepler grasped this idea, but first and foremost, it was Vladimir Vernadsky, the Russian scientist, who added to the domains of the inorganic and the biological, the domain of reason, which he called the Noösphere, which reaches ever higher levels of complexity, and whose action on the universe is continuously increasing. That is, with advancing evolution, the impact of human reason becomes increasingly efficient. The German-born scientist Krafft Ehricke, a space pioneer who developed crucial rockets for the Apollo program, determined, from this standpoint, that space travel and colonization must be the next step in human evolution.

Life, which, with the help of photosynthesis, developed out of the ocean, and has arrived at ever-higher levels of energy-flux density, reached a new level with the appearance of mankind, which must find its next level with the colonization of space. When you consider that in the history of our universe, mankind is an extremely recent phenomenon, then measured against the age of the universe, the Earth has existed for only a single day. The development of complex life-forms has existed for three hours, mankind has existed for three minutes, and what has come down to us as recorded history, has existed for a mere 10 seconds.

Anti-Entropic Development

Now, there are pessimists among scientists, among geophysicists and others, who are convinced that mankind will disappear again a second after midnight. But this will only occur if we fail to act more intelligently than the dinosaurs did. Over the last 500 million years, there have constantly been cycles of 60 to 65 million years, at the end of which, in each case, there have been extinctions in which up to 96% of all species have been obliterated. But every time, following the extinction, a more highly developed form of existence has come into being, whose metabolism and basic means of subsistence were associated with higher energy-flux densities. For example, after the extinction of the dinosaurs, the last great extinction, came the mammals, which had already existed in a rudimentary way before, but which now became the dominant species.

That is, we can find proof in the history of the uni-

verse that the development of the biosphere on Earth operates absolutely anti-entropically, never in the opposite direction, but always at higher energy-flux densities. And the species which, for whatever reason, wanted to remain at the same level, have always died out, as did the dinosaurs; and if mankind were to stick with green ideology, the same fate will befall us.

Galactic Threats

At the same time, we have to deal with the dangers resulting from our planet's position in the universe, and which we had better acknowledge. The Earth has almost been struck by asteroids nearly 5,000 times in the past, and so far we do not have the technical capabilities to deflect them, although it would be very serious if they were to hit the Earth. We have had a clear increase in the number of earthquakes over the last period, including the March 11, 2011 earthquake of 9.0 on the Richter scale, with the known results at Fukushima; we have had extreme weather phenomena—droughts, floods—and volcanic eruptions, none of which have anything to do with so-called “anthropogenic climate change.” Instead, over the last year, we have had to register unusual activity throughout the Solar System. For example, in December 2010 there was a massive storm on Saturn, which lasted until July 2011, and thus beyond the usual 30-year cycle which has to do with Saturn's orbital period. This storm came seven years ahead of schedule, and was the largest storm since observations began to be made.

We also have solar activity which has not been observed for 400 years, and which points toward a long-lasting solar minimum, which would perhaps be like the period of the great Irish Frost around 1740, which ushered in the longest cold period in modern European history. There were two huge X-class solar flares at the beginning of 2011. In the Sun's Northern Hemisphere there were several X-class flares, while at the same time, in the Southern Hemisphere, the situation at the end of the year was remarkably peaceful—and then suddenly it became very active, and there were several coronal mass-ejections, which had large-scale effects on processes on Earth. The so-called solar maximum was not expected to be reached until 2013, but there are various indications that it already occurred at the end of 2011, with potentially enormous dangers for the Earth.

If coronal mass ejections strike the Earth's magnetic field, this can result in geomagnetic storms which

could, in serious cases, shut down the electricity supply of entire continents, and would practically produce a dark age overnight. In the second half of 2011 there were more such coronal mass ejections, which the Earth only barely escaped. The Sun's activity has a huge influence on our weather; by contrast, man's CO₂ emissions are totally negligible, something like the impact of mayflies on an elephant.

A year ago, the climate mafia still had relative hegemony. Although scientists such as Hendrik Svensmark and those at the CERN research facility had long since reported their research on the influence of cosmic rays on cloud formation, and had established the effect of cosmic radiation on our atmosphere, namely that the formation of clouds has to do with ionization, it was still common doctrine that man was responsible for climate change. But this cosmic radiation has an enormous effect on the cooling or warming of the Earth, and on the amount of precipitation.

But meanwhile, even the gutter press is now reporting that the Sun's activity influences our weather, and I would say that this is, at a minimum, the result of our own activities worldwide.

Considering all these relationships, it must be really clear to anyone, that if mankind remains within the paradigm of the oligarchical system and green ideology, and thereby of the monetarism and positivism with which it is consistent, then our fate will be the same as that of the dinosaurs and of millions of other species which were not creative, and did not adapt themselves to the anti-entropic laws of the universe.

In contrast to all other forms of life—at least of those forms we know of so far—mankind is a unique species, which, by virtue of our creative capacity, can understand the laws of the universe ever more profoundly and with greater precision, and can discover and apply new universal principles; and therefore we are also the only species that can deal with these challenges, and therefore we are potentially the only immortal species.

The reason for this lies in the principle which Nicholas of Cusa already understood in the 15th Century, namely that the laws of the microcosm, human reason, and those of the macrocosm, the self-developing universe, are absolutely identical.

Plato described this as mankind's capability to form appropriate hypotheses. Nicholas took this same point further, namely that the intangible idea which a man



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

The Schiller Institute Orchestra and Chorus performed Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, under the baton of Sergej Strid (inset): "Over the starry tabernacle, a loving father must dwell."



Schiller Institute

progress must go hand-in-hand with the humanist education of man, because it is never technology in itself which is good or bad, but rather it is the human individual who decides whether a technology will be employed toward a good or a bad end. Mankind can only

can generate in his creative reason, is capable of generating a change and further development of the physical universe. In other words, an intangible idea has a physical effect in the physical universe, and this is the proof that there is this coherence of the microcosm and the macrocosm.

Look to the Stars!

If we want to overcome the crisis on Earth—the potential extinction of the human species in a thermonuclear World War III—then we must, in this hour of danger, not only turn our gaze toward the stars, but to the galaxies, and look at the unbelievable expanse of a self-developing universe.

Kraftt Ehrlicke coined the concept of the extraterrestrial imperative, namely that mankind will only grow up once it accepts the fact that the next level of evolution lies in manned space flight and colonization of space. But Kraftt Ehrlicke was also aware of the fact that this absolute affirmation of scientific and technological

survive if the majority of people grow up, if the knowledge of universal principles in science and art, which are verifiable—they are universal, because they can at any point be proven, and thus they signify rationality—if these principles become the basis upon which the greatest proportion of mankind thinks.

In just the part of the universe known up to now, there are hundreds of millions of galaxies. Just imagine: It's almost the limit of human imagination which is being challenged here. And this evening, we'll hear the choral section of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, in the musical part of this conference—the symphony for which Beethoven took Schiller's poem "Ode to Joy" as the foundation, and in whose chorus comes the wonderful line, "Over the starry tabernacle, a loving father must dwell" ("Überm Sternezelt muß ein lieber Vater wohnen"). And as I gaze upward at that tent of stars, composed as it is of hundreds of billions of galaxies, I say, with awe, and with optimism: "Over the starry tabernacle, there *must* dwell a loving father!"

Truth vs. Propaganda: The Situation in Syria

Mohammad Mahfoud, president of the Danish-Syrian Friendship Society, spoke on the first panel of the Schiller Institute conference in Berlin Feb. 25.

First of all, I would ask you to excuse my English, because I'm more used to speaking in Danish or Arabic, but I will do my best.

To begin with, I am not involved in the government in Syria; we don't get any money from Syria; we have nothing to do with the Syrian government. We are doing all this only for our love for our country and our Syrian people in Syria. And we think that the media in the West are not fair in this conflict. They are only looking from the one side, and that's what they call the opposition.

But we have another meaning in this conflict, and what is strange now, is that nobody wants to listen to what the Syrians want. The conflict in Syria becomes a conflict for [French President Nicolas] Sarkozy and Saudi Arabia, and Qatar, and nobody wants to hear what the Syrian people want in Syria.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here, and for the opportunity to tell you about the situation in Syria these days. My whole family lives in Syria—parents, sisters, and brothers. I am in daily contact with them, and also with other family members, friends, and others. Last year I travelled several times to Syria, both with journalists and others, and on my own. I travelled to different places in Syria, talked to different people from different groups. On the street, I got a good idea of what is going on; and also from talking to the Patriarch, the Bishop, the Grand Mufti, and supporters and opponents of the government.

Let's start with what is going on, in brief, and how it all started.

It started last March, almost a year ago, with demonstrations; we have to separate between the peaceful and the violent demonstrations. In some cities, there were smaller demonstrations of peaceful demonstrators, who asked for faster reforms. This was accepted by the government, and it became a national dialogue.



EIRNS/Christopher Lewis

"There is only one opposition," reported Mahfoud. "It is based in Syria; it has nothing to do with the so-called revolution. The opposition has condemned the foreign actors. The government and the opposition are having constructive dialogues about reforms."

Then, there are the violent demonstrations. These started in Daraa, a smaller town on the border with Jordan. What at first seemed to be peaceful, suddenly changed their nature: We heard about people being shot at. On the news, we heard the police and security people had shot at peaceful demonstrators, while others said that there were people who shot at both the demonstrators and the security people.

We soon found out that there was a strange third element: Someone wanted to make it a violent conflict, using the different religious sects as fuel. Also it became clear that there were many foreign actors—countries, and groups, and individuals. Money, satellite phones—huge amounts of money were smuggled in.

Terrible crimes against civilians started to happen, something absolutely unusual in Syria. These crimes had a certain pattern, no matter where they happened: The victims were sometimes from one sect, sometimes from another, but the brutality was the same, and the criminals were videotaped in their acts, and [the videotapes were] sent to Al-Jazeera and other channels.¹

The unrest always took place in areas where extremists and social problems were mixed up.

Also, we saw that the whole cyberspace capability was well-established already from the start. One day,

1. See Hussein Askary, "Al Jazeera Demystified," *EIR*, Jan. 27, 2012.

there was nothing, and the next day, huge groups with websites, etc., were all over the place. All closely attached to the Muslim Brotherhood abroad, they even had human rights groups that no one had ever heard of before, but became far more important than all the established international human rights groups. The group I'm talking about is the so-called Human Rights Observatory, based in London. It became, from the beginning, the only source that the media in the West would use. Rarely, they would have something from the established ones, but always unconfirmed. At the same time, the media in the West used Al-Jazeera and Barada (based in London, run by the Muslim Brotherhood and certain other figures, and financed by the U.S. Administration), as their main source, together with YouTube.

Actors in the Conflict in Syria

First, we have to split up what the Western media call the opposition:

1. The real opposition—nonviolent.
2. Armed groups—violent—including many al-Qaeda fighters.
3. So-called exiles.

There is only one opposition: It is based in Syria, it has nothing to do with the so-called revolution. The opposition has condemned the foreign actors. The government and the opposition are having constructive dialogues about reforms. The referendum next week is one of the results. The media in the West don't listen to them either.

Then we have the armed groups in the border cities, near Lebanon (Homs), and Turkey. In these groups, we see mostly foreign fighters, for example, al-Qaeda and French and British forces—and other nationalities, with a high percentage from Turkey, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Libya.

Al-Qaeda and Libyan terrorists are playing a key role in the horrible crimes against civilians and security personnel, and also in terrorist acts, such as the terror bombings in Damascus and Aleppo.

Especially Qatar and Saudi Arabia are financing the whole attack on Syria. Among the key players are [former Lebanese prime minister] Saad Hariri and Saudi Prince Bandar.

Then we have figures, mainly in the West, who may have more or less Syrian blood in their veins. These are the ones whom the West is trying to put up front, and these are again mostly people from the Muslim Brotherhood.

Wherever we look, we also end up among extremists and certain Western administrations.

Today, Homs as a Center

Homs is next to the border with Lebanon, from where armed groups and weapons are being smuggled into the area called Bab Amro. The other areas in Homs have no problems, but the people are feeling unsafe because of the armed gangs in the town. The armed gangs in Bab Amro have committed terrible crimes against civilians, public figures, and security people. Also, they keep civilians hostage in Bab Amro. So, one relatively small area, where armed groups, mainly al-Qaeda extremists, are terrorizing people in a country with 23 million population, is now getting the whole West into action.


We Syrians support democratic reforms and believe in our President Bashar al-Assad, and his promise of reforms. We will survive those conspiracies against us. We will get a free, democratic selection in 2014, and the Syrian people will respect that selection.

Thank you.

DOPE, INC.

Is Back In Print!

Dope, Inc., first commissioned by Lyndon LaRouche, and the underground bestseller since 1978, is back in print for the first time since 1992. The 320-page paperback, includes reprints from the third edition, and in-depth studies from *EIR*, analyzing the scope and size of the international illegal drug-trafficking empire known as Dope, Inc., including its latest incarnation in the drug wars being waged out of, and against Russia and Europe today.



*This edition, published by Progressive Independent Media, is currently available in limited numbers, so there is no time to waste in buying yours today. The cost is \$25 per book, with \$4 for shipping and handling. It is available through www.larouchepub.com, and *EIR*, at 1-800-278-3135.*

One Year After Japan's Mega-Quake

March 11 will be the one-year anniversary of the 9.0 magnitude earthquake which shook the Tohoku region of Japan, leveling entire cities, and killing tens of thousands.

After a relative calm on the earthquake front for the past couple of weeks, the first weekend of March saw several stronger quakes—one near New Zealand, which also had been hit about one year ago, and one in central Argentina. Citizens in the San Francisco Bay area were awakened March 5 by a weaker 4.0 magnitude tembler, but after the events of the past year, even the experience of such weaker tremors surely causes those awakened to think upon those more dangerous quakes of the past year, and the looming and relatively well-known threat of a major earthquake to hit California—a warning which President Obama has ignored.

This coincides with a pick-up in activity on our Sun, which unleashed an X-1 class solar flare March 5. The LPAC site (www.larouhepac.com) over the past year has outlined the fallacy of studying weather from a purely terrestrial standpoint.

This March, we are also reminded of the destructive tornados which hit the United States last year. Smaller outbreaks began in January and February of this year. On Feb. 29, Harrisburg, Ill. was hit with an EF-4 tornado. Over 50 people have been killed in tornados over the past week, from North Carolina up to Indiana.

On March 5, we also learned that Obama is scheduled to give the graduation address at Joplin (Missouri) High School, which was badly damaged by the May 2011 tornados, and is only partially rebuilt. You may recall that Obama spoke in Joplin almost one year ago, and talked about the inability to know why and when such weather events hit.

Contrast Obama's "we can't know" statements from one year ago, and repeated by him since then, to Lyndon LaRouche's views on the subject of man controlling processes at the level of the galaxy, in his "The Mystery of Your Time" (*EIR*, Jan. 20, 2012).

"I am considering the advent of men and women today as explorers of the future of mankind, who, for the moment, will be seemingly even minuscule, relative to the vastly growing density of the devices which are presently relevant to not only the security of mankind's persons within the Solar system, but including here at home. I point to a much vaster array of responsive instruments of information, command, and control, such as that associated with such functions as security placed, to mankind's advantage, within not only remote and difficult regions of the Solar system itself, but penetrating special regions of our galaxy."


If we had dumped Obama one year ago, not only could we have rebuilt areas like Joplin, but we could have made major breakthroughs in the science of weather forecasting. This would have involved collaborative work with Russia on proposals such as the IGMASS Global Monitoring System and the more recent Strategic Defense of Earth proposal. The LaRouche Basement team has responded to these proposals, further elaborating and expanding the parameters to be taken into account, while under Obama, we have done nothing but hurtle towards a great conflict with Russia, including provocations around the Russian Presidential election.

Reflecting upon the extreme weather of the past year, now wreaking havoc once again, we should ask ourselves why we haven't yet dumped this President of ours, and quickly act to do so.

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 _____