

electoral support for Bush, and have been mobilizing against the Road Map. While Sharon was in Washington, Tom DeLay, U.S. House majority leader and top right-wing Christian Zionist, was in Israel speaking in the Knesset (parliament) in full support of all of Israel's positions. DeLay's trip was preceded by that of Gary Bauer, one of the most outspoken Christian Zionist political activists in the United States. Bauer, who has been one of the top opponents of the Road Map, was in Israel the week of July 11, where he announced that he would muster the electoral strength of the Christian right to undermine Bush's support for the Road Map.

The Other Meeting

Sharon's meeting with his other partner, Dick Cheney, whose proceedings remain secret, came at a time when the entire chicken-hawk cabal has been under tremendous pressure as a result of Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche's campaign to get Cheney impeached. LaRouche warned on July 18 that Cheney could start a new war by having Sharon launch a pre-emptive strike on Iran's nuclear complex ("Will Sharon Be Cheney's Hand Grenade?" *EIR*, July 25). There are clear indications that the Sharon-Cheney meeting centered on laying the groundwork for a strike against Iran, utilizing the same secret cooperation that took place during the build-up for the war against Iraq. Over the past weeks, Cheney's crew has demanded regime change in Iran and Syria.

This was hinted in a story in the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz* on July 30. Citing sources claiming to have been close to the talks between Sharon and President Bush, *Ha'aretz* said Sharon presented Bush with aerial photographs and other alleged evidence of Iranian efforts to attain enriched uranium for use in weapons development. Sharon also presented evidence claiming that Iran was supporting militant groups, including Hamas and Hizbollah, and that Iran was trying to undermine the cease-fire. He even alleged that Iran was offering \$50,000 to would-be suicide bombers.

There can be little doubt that Sharon's "report" would have been presented in far greater detail in his meeting with Cheney, where it is sure to be cooked up for the ongoing mobilization against Iran. In the above-cited article, *EIR* documented that Sharon had established, many months ago, his own channel into Defense Secretary Rumsfeld's Office of Special Plans, which cooked up "intelligence" on alleged weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, in direct cooperation with Cheney's office. It appears that this cooperation is now being extended to the operations against Iran and Syria.

Even in his press conference with Bush, Sharon attacked Iran and Syria saying, "It must be made clear to these countries that their evil deeds cannot continue." National Security Council spokesman Sean McCormack echoed, "Both Iran and Syria need to make a fundamental choice about the war on terrorism and to stop harboring and supporting terrorists and terrorist networks."

LaRouche Responds To 'Pure Politics' Questions

Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche replied on July 27 to the following set of questions submitted by Paige Rohe for PurePolitics.com. The interview has also been posted on the website.

Q: In light of your decades-long struggle against charges of conspiracy by the U.S. government, how do you think this would affect your relationship with the CIA, FBI, and Department of State were you to be elected President?

LaRouche: Already, today, after more than two years of poor George, and with the ongoing U.S. catastrophe in the hot sands of Iraq, many professionals would be delighted with the change. Others, according to custom, would adjust. A few skunks would discreetly seek employment away from the henhouse. Such is the relevant best available of all possible worlds.

All the documented 1973-1989 conspiracies against me, including discovered assassination-plots, came from within, most notably, the U.S. or Soviet governments, were done either under a government which no longer exists, or by powerful financier interests whose power would be much diminished by the mere fact of my election. Most in government have the habit of "going along to get along" with the presently established arrangements of that occasion.

Q: In order to help save what you refer to as a doomed world and national economy, Mr. LaRouche, you recommend removing the international "free trade" hegemony and replacing it with "the promotion of protected hard-commodity international trade, as part of the promotion of a global, long-term economic-recovery effort." [Paige references LaRouche's "Economics: At the End of a Delusion," which appears on the LaRouche in 2004 campaign website; it was also published in the Feb. 8, 2002 issue of *EIR*—ed.] Could you elaborate on how you will convince Congress and the American people that this plan is in their best interest?

LaRouche: In broad terms, I have several crucial advantages working for me. As FDR had the "advantage" of Hoover's bad performance, I will have, as negative advantages, the support of popular hatred against any prolongation of the presently accelerating effects of a systemic breakdown-crisis of the world's present, floating-exchange-rate monetary-financial system, and the related spectacle of Alan Greenspan fleeing the pages of history in his nightshirt. On the positive side, I would benefit from the combined factors of my published record of unequalled success of more than

thirty years as the world's leading long-range economic forecaster, and my position as the first President since Nixon's 1996-68 campaign as actually an advocate of the interests of "the forgotten man," the lower eighty percentile of family-income brackets.

The people will tend to support the President who supports the people; for most Americans today, such as those now watching their social security, power supplies, and health-care evaporate under both recent and current managements, that will be an unusual but gratifying experience.

Q: In addition to resolving the United States's economic problems, could you expound upon your views on your top three domestic issues you will believe are of primary importance to the American people (i.e., adequate health care, crime, the war on terror)?

LaRouche: The customary politics of "what are your issues?" frankly turns my stomach, especially when secondary-school teachers assign their cruelly misinformed charges the task of writing letters to candidates on "Where do you stand on the issues?" I do think, however, that that reflected state of our educational system is a significant issue. A competent occupant of the position of President of the U.S.A. proceeds according a mission-orientation for the performance of his office in his time, as General Douglas MacArthur won that Pacific War which was fought over the greatest area, with the lowest cost of life, by avoiding battles not worth fighting, all in the quickest possible time. MacArthur's whole life was summed up in that one consuming mission of 1941-45. So it goes, as for MacArthur's case, with those qualified U.S. Presidents, who have left their honorable mark on the continuing historical development of our institutions.

The all-subsuming issue is: I am the only visible contender who actually has competently defined, and documented a comprehensive mission for the Presidency, our economy, and our foreign relations, at this juncture of national and world history. The evidence indicates that the single most important issue of the present campaign is, that none of my putative rivals could define a coherent mission-orientation, even if they were willing to try, even if the neo-conservatives now dominating the Democratic National Committee gave them permission to speak. One of the more significant reasons they could not, is that they are so busy ducking, bobbing, and weaving demands for their stated "position on each of the list of issues," that they no longer seem actually to know who they themselves are. (I presume you know the fable of the toad and the centipede.)

Q: What would be your role as President in promoting national security, in light of the events of September 11th, 2001, and the establishment of the office of Homeland Security?

LaRouche: Sept. 11, 2001 was the U.S.A.'s approximation of the Reichstag Fire of February 1933, an incident which

was stage-managed by Goering on Hitler's behalf. This was precisely the type of likely risk against which I had warned publicly at the time of George W. Bush's January inauguration. This incident of Sept. 11th brought Vice-President Cheney and his neo-conservative rabble to their presently, widely exposed position of power inside the Bush Administration.

I am not a poor dumb bunny like our current George. Although I more than merely suspect that there are some who might wish to do something against my Presidency, as they did against his, I doubt that anyone capable of successfully orchestrating such a stunt would be reckless enough to take the risk of attempting that against my administration. Had adequate security of the type which had been supposed to be operational on Sept. 11, 2001, been properly functioning, three successive planes could not have done by surprise what was done that day. Maybe the first incident had been barely possible, but not three in an on-line-coordinated, controlled administrative pattern of the type recorded as the pattern on that day.

The cumbersome "Rube Goldberg" of Homeland Defense would have done no good that day, or perhaps any day. Traditional security and law-enforcement vigilance, properly implemented, would be our best possible defense. I do intend to strengthen the relevant intelligence functions, as I have discussed these matters with relevant types of senior professionals to whom I would, once again, turn for advice and related assistance. The lessons of "our Reichstag Fire" will prompt me to ensure that what should have been in place on the morning of Sept. 11th, or any comparable future day, will be in place, and functioning, and regularly reviewed for improvements.

Q: Under your administration what do you foresee the role of the United States will be in the decisions and actions of the United Nations?

LaRouche: The historic interest of our republic, from the beginning, was to prepare the way for a world composed of a community of principle among a system of perfectly sovereign nation-state republics. Broadly, in addition to its vital, primary, Security Council function of enforcing a military doctrine of strategic defense among nations, the UNO is presently the most convenient diplomatic forum within which to promote such a "community of principle," as Secretary of State John Quincy Adams defined that term in his letter advising President Monroe in the matter of the Monroe Doctrine.

Q: In an attempt to bring the readers of PurePolitics.com a more intimate view of the candidates for President, we are asking one question to all, irrelevant of their political campaigns. Mr. LaRouche, what is your favorite flavor of ice cream?

LaRouche: At the moment, lime. Since you brought that subject up, I can imagine the taste of it now!