

[return to home page](#)

## This Week You Need To Know

### REVIVING THE SENSE OF MISSION FOR U.S. CITIZENS TODAY

*Here are the opening remarks of Lyndon LaRouche, to his campaign webcast in Boston, on Nov. 15, 2003.*

Thank you, folks. Thank you very much.

I should just do a few preliminary remarks. I'll address three subjects today. I was going to do something similar up there in Vermont yesterday, at the university at Middlebury, but they wanted me to shorten the presentation from three-quarters of an hour to a half an hour, which I did. So, I left some things out. So, I shall give you, today, a somewhat amplified version of what I said, to you—as a different audience, though I said it to a university campus audience—yesterday. And, as you will see, there is a significant difference, in the way that two points have to be presented.

All right. The three points are, which I will touch upon, to present here: First of all, the issue of war. And the question is, what is the nature of the policy—when did it start, and what is the policy, which has gotten us into a spreading process of war, in Asia and probably elsewhere?

Secondly, the economic crisis. This economy, in its present form, is now disintegrating. Nothing can prevent the present IMF system and the present Federal Reserve System, from disintegrating—nothing. But, it can go in one of two ways: It can go, either through intervention, as Franklin Roosevelt-style intervention back in 1933, to reorganize the system before total chaos erupts; or, we can wait, until it simply blows up, all by itself. There's a massive effort to postpone that blowup, now, by printing money in various ways. The best estimate is, that the blowup will occur, probably, by March or April of next year, at the latest. The ability to continue to print money, to postpone the program, will be blown out by then. It can blow out earlier. It could blow out next week; it's ready to blow now. The fundamentals are all *rotten*. There *are* no good fundamentals. The United States is the victim of the biggest "Snow job" in history, on economics, and we've got Treasury Secretary Snow to prove it. (The official liar of Washington, D.C.)

The third thing, is the question of the generation gap, and what the significance is, of the difference in the attitudes and roles of, principally, two generations: one, the generation which came into maturity, or semi-adult *immaturity* during the middle of the 1960s; the ones who are now in their fifties, who are generally running the institutions, and running government, businesses, and so forth. And the other, is the generation, which is now coming largely into college age, including those between 18 and 25 university-eligible age. And, it's the conflict between these two generations, which I shall turn to, in the conclusion: what the nature of it is; what we do about it.

All right, now, first on the war, itself: As I said, in the beginning of January of 2001, before George Bush was inaugurated—George W. Bush—as the acting President of the United States. Whether he was elected or not, is irrelevant; we know that Gore lost, in any case. But Gore was always lost, and he hasn't improved since.

But, I said, on the basis of his stupidity, the President's stupidity, and his commitments, it was inevitable that the

depression, which was already in progress in 2001, fully in progress, would not be stopped—it would become worse. And, the danger that this posed, apart from the economic collapse, was that, as in Germany, in the events of 1928 and '33, when the collapse of the economy struck Europe, as it struck the United States openly in 1929-33—in that period, some international bankers, led from London, but including prominent bankers such as Brown Brothers Harriman in the United States, Morgan, and so forth—the Morgan-du Pont-Mellon crowd. They did two things: First of all, at the end of 1932, they organized a fund to bail out Adolf Hitler. The Nazi Party was bankrupt at that point, at the end of '32. And so, the decision was made from London, to bail out Hitler. The bail-out came from New York City; it came from the firm of Harriman. The check, or the order, to bail out the Hitler campaign, was signed by Prescott Bush, the grandfather of the present President of the United States.

Now, at a later point, the British and American pro-Hitlerites changed their mind. They were perfectly content to have Hitler be a nuisance, for destroying continental Europe. But they were not willing to accept his becoming a threat to the English-speaking world.

And therefore, as you know, we prepared for war, when Winston Churchill, as Defense Secretary appealed to President Roosevelt, we accelerated our efforts to prepare for war. We prevented Britain from joining France in going into the Nazi camp. If Britain had gone into the Nazi camp at that time, then you would have had an immediate unity of fascist forces on the continent of Europe, which would immediately attack the Soviet Union, and expected to destroy the Soviet Union in a short time. Once they had destroyed the Soviet Union, they planned to take the combined naval forces of Japan, Britain, Germany, and France, and attack the United States, in an attack which was planned to include an attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese Navy.

This did not happen. The agreement between Roosevelt and Churchill prevented the British from surrendering to Hitler, and started the process which doomed Hitler's prospect for establishing world empire, including the destruction of the United States. Under those conditions, the English-speaking part of the British Commonwealth (as it's called today), and the United States, joined fully in supporting the war effort against Hitler. This including Brown Brothers Harriman—reluctantly; it included Morgan; it included Mellon; it included the British banks. It included Lord Halifax—a pro-Hitler man, who served as British Ambassador to Washington, during the war years. It included Lord Beaverbrook, who was also a pro-Hitler man, who functioned as British propaganda minister, in effect, during the wartime years. And Beaverbrook, whose progeny today, include Conrad Black and the Fox TV crowd—Rupert Murdoch—as his scions.

So, what you have is, you have this continuity of a process which led into this war.

Now, I said, in January of 2001, the danger is this: They put Hitler into power, through these bankers—U.S. and British bankers—put Hitler into power as the Chancellor of Germany, on the 30th of January, 1933. In the third week of February, Hermann Goering, who was head of the Nazi Party in Brandenburg, organized the burning of the Reichstag, the national parliament of Germany. And, the burning of the national parliament was used, a law devised by the guy who taught Leo Strauss, of Chicago University: Carl Schmitt. Hitler was made dictator, and that point *World War II was inevitable*.

And we fought it.

The danger is, that under these kinds of conditions, as I said in January, we have to aware of the danger of a Reichstag Fire, or something like it in the United States. That Reichstag Fire occurred, on Sept. 11, 2001. Since that time, the United States has been sliding toward dictatorship and war. Now, we're the United States, we are not Germany of 1933. And therefore, the ability of the chief proponent of the Reichstag Fire approach, Vice President Dick Cheney, has not been able to become full dictator; he does not have full, total control over the puppet-President George W. Bush, Jr. But he has close to it. And therefore, since 2002, I've been engaged actively in trying to have Dick Cheney removed from office.

Because Dick Cheney and the neo-conservatives associated with him, are not only an imitation of the Adolf Hitler movement, they are a continuation of it! As I've identified it, it's a movement, that was called in the 20th Century, the Synarchists. The Synarchist organization was created, actually, under another name, called the Martinists, in France, back in the 1780s. It was created by the British leadership at that time, Lord Shelburne, who was the political boss of the British East India Company, and the paymaster of the British Parliament, and of George III, himself.

He planned this operation, beginning 1763, to frustrate what he saw as a forthcoming struggle for independence in the North American English-speaking colonies. The other thing, was to destroy France, which was the chief rival of British power in Europe. The purpose of Lord Shelburne's operation, was to ensure that the emerging British Empire—that is, the British maritime power, representing financier-oligarchical private interests—would not only control the British Isles, India, and other things they'd stolen by that time, but that it would dominate Europe, and dominate the world, like ancient Venice, like a kind of Roman Empire, or a new form of Roman Empire.

And therefore, what he did is, he planned two things, especially once the American Revolution had occurred: Was to prevent the continued influence of the American Revolution in continental Europe—to wipe it out; to destroy the influence of the American Revolution and the Constitutional republic.

Secondly, to destroy France—a continuation of the operation. It was he, through his agents, who created the French Revolution. The French Revolution was an operation of the British East India Company, under Lord Shelburne. They not only created the Bastille event, through agents of Shelburne—one was called Philippe Égalité, and the other was Jacques Necker. It was done as a stunt to get Necker as the Prime Minister of France, which worked at that time. Then, they disappeared from the stage. They were followed by Danton and Marat, who were British agents, trained under Shelburne's influence, in London; dispatched to France; and acted, and even all of their speeches were written in London, under Jeremy Bentham's direction. All their orders, were British orders. Then, they succeeded these fellows, by the Jacobin Terror, which was eliminated in 1794. Then, they moved, in the middle of the decade, toward Napoleon Bonaparte.

All of these things were done, by a group called the Martinists, a cult which was created around this. And Napoleon Bonaparte was a reflection of that.

Since that time, to the present, you had the continuation of this kind of operation, trying to destroy the United States—the War of 1812 involvement against us, was an attempt to destroy the United States. Other things were done: The war with Mexico was an attempt to destroy the United States. The Civil War was organized by these people, to destroy the United States. The occupation of Mexico, in 1863, was done from there, as part of an effort to destroy the United States. And, the thing was, it was not just our country they wanted to destroy: They wanted to destroy the tradition of the American Revolution, of the American Republic, because we represented the alternative model to this Anglo-Dutch Liberal parliamentary form of government, which the British ruled.

But, in this period, the British game was, generally, to cause trouble on the continent of Europe, in such a way, that never on the continent of Europe would a combination of power arise, which would be able to challenge British power. After 1865, when the United States had won the Civil War, against Britain—and France, and Napoleon III, and so forth—at that point, the British recognized that the United States could never be conquered from outside. Therefore, they gave up on these attempts to overthrow our government by military force, or from the outside.

Instead, they went to another road: corruption. They got us under the control of the London gold exchange standard system. That was step number one. The King of England, Edward VII, at the beginning of the century, used one of his agents in New York City, Jacob Schiff, who designed the Federal Reserve System of the United States, as a way of subverting our Constitution, and bringing us under control of international bankers. Which has more or less succeeded, off and on. Roosevelt fought against this, but was not entirely successful.

So, we have been corrupted, and that comes to the economic question, as I shall show.

So, the problem is, we face an enemy within and without, which are called, in the United States today, "neo-conservatives," or similar types. They're determined to bring about a world order, of a certain type. They have certain military objectives in mind, to do this; these are already operational. If this succeeds, if Cheney remains in office—if Cheney remains in office through the coming election, next year, you must not expect the United States to survive: It will not.

So therefore, we are dealing with something in the continuation of the Hitler phenomenon, the so-called Synarchist phenomenon, whose origin goes back to the 18th Century. This has undergone changes over the period, but this phenomenon is continuing. Don't look for conspiracies, of any importance from other sources; they are all of this type. It is not a group of this; it is not a group of that. It's a group of private, financier interests, who, when a crisis comes, say, "We are going to collect on our debts—even if it means killing the people." That when government has to make a choice between collecting debts for bankers and protecting the people, this group has one determination: They're going to maintain the system under which they *create* debts, by which they enslave the population. And they're going to make sure that the debts are collected, for their benefit—promptly—even if it means killing the people.

And that's the fundamental issue that defines these kinds of things. That is why, every time, in the 20th Century and since, that you have a major, systemic financial crisis, or monetary crisis, the danger of something like Nazism, comes up again! Because some group of bankers, hiring thugs—like this thug Cheney, who's nothing but a thrown-away jock from a football field; but, he's a killer. He's been involved in secret intelligence operations, at a high level, since he served under Nixon, and since he served as Chief of Staff for Gerald Ford. He is a killer. He is not smart, but he represents killers. And, he is the kind of guy that will order you killed. And he has the people working with him, who will do the job. That's why so many politicians are afraid of him, and afraid to mention his name in public, today: because he's a killer. He's very bad tempered, among his other amiable qualities.

Now, let's go through these three issues, with that said. The beginning of the present form of military crisis, starts in about 1928, with the publication of a book by H.G. Wells, called *The Open Conspiracy*. This book was immediately adopted as a policy by Bertrand Russell, probably the most evil man living, during the 20th Century. These fellows developed—it started with Wells, who was the first one to get the idea of using nuclear weapons, as creating a weapon so terrible, that people would give up sovereignty of their national governments, for world government. This is a general outline of the objective of the group, in this *Open Conspiracy* book, published in 1928, by H.G. Wells.

Russell himself was instrumental in the development of nuclear weapons. It was Russell, for example, who wrote the letter, which was signed by [Albert] Einstein, but never delivered to Roosevelt, even though it was addressed to him; but, it was this operation, which started the development of nuclear weapons. People had ideas of the capability of nuclear weapons before then, but nobody had actually started, until Russell wrote the letter. Russell directed all the key people involved in developing the nuclear weapons—that is, the controlling people. And Princeton Institute became a nest of the control for this.

So, then, the war proceeded—World War II. It started with the idea of strategic bombing of civilian populations. That did not go on from the U.S. side, immediately; the British started it. A British scientist by the name of Lindemann was the key author of the policy. This was called the strategic bombing policy, of bombing harmless cities. Then, they added to that, of course, the idea of using nuclear weapons, rather than fire bombing of civilian populations, as a way of dealing with this.

Then, President Roosevelt died. At that point, the Mellons, the Morgans, the du Ponts, decided to get rid of the Roosevelt legacy. Roosevelt was in bad condition, because of his illness. He'd worked himself almost to death. He was expected to

die soon. They did not want Henry Wallace to be the living Vice President, when Roosevelt died. So, in the Democratic Party Convention of the Summer of 1944, Wallace was replaced by a stupid thug: a right-wing, racist thug, Harry Truman. And Harry Truman's onset into power, even as Vice President, signalled the unleashing of terror bombing—unnecessary terror bombing against civilian populations, such as the bombing of Tokyo; the planned bombing of Hamburg; the bombing of Dresden; the bombing of Magdeburg. And so forth, and so on, in Germany—other cities.

The American policy was precision bombing. Bomb meaningful [military] targets. But, the British policy was, mass bombing of civilian populations, a thing which prolonged the war, because the Germans, who were about to surrender, were not willing to surrender because of this terror bombing. They were not disposed to surrender, at that point.

Then, came the time, Japan was ready to surrender: By the spring of 1945, the Emperor of Japan had negotiated, through the Office of Extraordinary Affairs of the Vatican, through then Monsignor Montini (later the Pope Paul VI), had negotiated the terms of peace which he wanted. The only condition attached to this, was that the dignity of the Emperor would be maintained: That is, that the institutions of government would concede to almost anything, but they had to maintain the unity of the nation of Japan, which could only be done by keeping the Emperor in place. That was the only condition. Once that condition had been accepted, Japan would have surrendered.

But, the United States *refused* to make that condition—though after the surrender, they honored all those conditions! Japan was rebuilt. The Emperor was kept in place. Just exactly as it had been promised through the Vatican channel. Then, why did we drop nuclear weapons—the only two we had—on the civilian populations, of Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

[From the audience, arguing that Germany already had the atomic bomb.]

No, no, no, not true. Not true. That's a myth, it's not true.

**Audience member:** Not true?

**LaRouche:** Not true. Listen, be patient. That's wrong. But, your information is false. Okay? I'm an expert, your information is false. I know the area. I know the facts.

Okay, so we bombed it. So, what did this do?

The objective here—remember, we had defeated Japan. Japan is an island-nation, with a very small part of its territory that's habitable. A mountain island-nation. MacArthur's policy had been to totally blockade it, by air and by sea. This meant naval blockades. It meant submarine warfare blockades, and aerial blockades. Japan reached the point, it could no longer get the materials it required for the existence of the economy of the islands of Japan, from the continent of Asia. It could not survive; its only opportunity was to surrender. It had no military significance: It was a defeated nation, in fact. The question was, how to get the surrender through.

Well, some people didn't want the surrender; they had another idea. And, the idea was dropping those two bombs—which they had intended to drop on Berlin. But, the war in Europe was finished too soon. They couldn't get the bombs ready in time to drop them on Berlin, which was their original intention. So they said, "We'll do something else. We'll drop them on Japan." And they picked two civilian target cities, of no military significance, or very much significance: Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

This was done as part of a policy, devised by Bertrand Russell. It was called "preventive nuclear warfare." The policy, as Russell explained it, in September of 1946, in his magazine, published in Washington: The purpose of this was to use a

weapon so terrible—nuclear weapons—that nations would submit to world government, give up their sovereignty, rather than face the terror of nuclear weapons. That was the purpose of this operation.

Now, from that point on, from 1945 until the beginning of the 1950s, the United States' policy, was to bring the Soviet Union to surrender, by building up an arsenal of nuclear weapons, and planes to deliver these bombs, upon the Soviet Union. That a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, could cause the submission of the Soviet Union, to U.S. domination *and* world government. And, that would be the end of it, for the rest of the world.

Now, what happened was, that Truman was an idiot, among other things, his other excellent qualifications. And, he tried to bluff both the Soviet Union and China, with operations aimed at various points in Asia. He operated on the assumption, as the records of the time show, that the Soviet Union and China *would do nothing about it*. They didn't have nuclear weapons, and therefore, they would have to accept it, and they would not react.

They continued the operation. And then, as a result of that, North Korea, under Soviet direction, with Chinese Communist sympathy, invaded South Korea. The United States was stuck, with a few American troops—a Korean army which had been destroyed and a few American troops, in a small perimeter, around the southern tip of Korea, around Pusan. This changed, of course, when MacArthur did the obvious, when he assumed command: He outflanked the situation, outflanked the North Korean army, by an assault with the Inchon landing. That changed the situation. But then, it went on. We decided that, maybe that wasn't such a good idea, that war.

Then, it was known, that the Soviet Union had developed the first *thermonuclear* weapon, the first deployable thermonuclear weapon. Now, how can you have nuclear fission-weapon warfare, against a nation which has thermonuclear weapons?

So, this resulted in the dumping of Truman. They told him, "You're not going to run for re-election." And he didn't. It also brought Eisenhower into the Presidency, because Eisenhower was opposed to this, and represented those military officers, and others, who were opposed to this so-called kind of preventive nuclear warfare. So, we had eight years of relative stability, under Eisenhower. And the Democratic Party was not allowed to have the Presidency, at that time, because the Democratic Party had been contaminated by the Truman preventive-nuclear-warfare doctrine.

Then, Eisenhower retired. And people who represented the Russell conception of preventive nuclear warfare, the so-called "utopians," typified by Allen Dulles, and his brother John Foster Dulles, began to act. Kennedy had been elected; Kennedy was a very intelligent man—very capable—and showed his promise as he went along, in the few years he survived after that point. But, at the start, he did not know, really, what the game was! And, he was not a man respected in the military, in the way that Eisenhower was. Therefore, he could not have the influence on the professional military, that Eisenhower could, in dealing with these utopian warriors—the Air Force crowd, who want to bomb everything: Develop missiles and bomb everything, with nuclear weapons.

So then, we had the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. We had events, including the assassination of President Kennedy himself; we had then, the launching of the first official war in Indo-China—that is, U.S. official war in Indo-China. Now, again, the same mistake was made—by the United States, by these warriors—that had been made by Truman, on the question that led to the Korean War! They assumed, at that point, in going into Vietnam, they assumed that the Chinese would not actually intervene against an American attack on North Vietnam. Therefore, they went ahead, assuming they had an "easy job"! And it wasn't an easy job, because the Soviet Union, knowing that *it was under attack, too*—even though the Chinese *did not* support North Vietnam, or Vietnam in general; as a matter of fact, they didn't like the Vietnamese. The *Russians* intervened, and assisted to devise a strategy, under which Indo-China could defend itself, against U.S. occupation.

Now, this is what's called "asymmetric warfare." And it's asymmetric warfare, in the age of nuclear weapons.

The classic case of asymmetric warfare of this type, occurred in 1812-1813: Napoleon Bonaparte, with his Grande Armée, was about to invade Russia, occupy it, and thus subject all of continental Europe to Napoleon's own, personal domination. At this point, a section of the Prussians, headed by Scharnhorst, decided to assist the Russians in defending themselves against Napoleon's planned invasion. Incidentally Lazare Carnot, who was the greatest French military man of that period, told Napoleon, "Don't be stupid. Don't try it." He had a general understanding of what the problem was.

The Prussian military, which advised the Tsar, and helped him, proposed a policy, which was developed in the works of Friedrich Schiller. The point was: Do not try to engage the enemy at the border. He's got superior forces; he's got a half-million-man army, dragged up from all over Europe. If you try to have a decisive battle against him at the Russian border, you will be destroyed, and he *will* overrun Russia. So, what they said is, "Don't. Do a rearguard, withdrawal action. Trap him into Russia. And prepare to destroy two cities—Petersburg and Moscow—if Napoleon goes to either." So, Napoleon was put through a rearguard defense, by the Russians, which kept him coming on, and he decided to advance toward Moscow. He occupied Moscow; he was declaring and celebrating victory. Then the city blew up! It had been mined.

At that point, the Russian people, and the military forces which had been conserved, fell upon Napoleon, such that, when Napoleon was sitting, later, in Poland, waiting for the last of his army to come across from Russia, one man came across the border: Marshal Ney. And Napoleon said to Marshal Ney, "Where's your troops?" He said, "Emperor, *I* am your troops." All the rest of them were captured, or dead.

That was the end of the Grande Armée.

Now, in modern warfare, in a major nuclear war, when you engage countries at a distance and you can throw large weapons and weaponry against them, that's one kind of warfare. But there's another kind of warfare: Let the enemy invade; let him try to occupy the country. And, when he tries to occupy the country, *our people are going to be next to him*: At short-range, thermonuclear weapons don't work. And, that's what the Vietnamese did, against the American invasion in Indo-China.

That is what, in effect, is happening now; that's what's happening in Iraq.

The Iraqi people are a nationalist people. All this double-talk about Saddam Hussein being the big problem; this and that, and so forth; al-Qaeda, so forth—it's all junk! The Iraqi people have gone through occupation before. They were occupied—Iraq as a nation—under the Ottoman Empire; they were occupied by the British, during the end of the Ottoman Empire. They were occupied by the British after the First World War. They were occupied more recently. And the occupation of Iraq has strengthened the sense of nationalism.

Do not try to assume, that differences in religion define the way you can split up Iraq: It's not that simple. Iraqis include everything: You have Christians, of various varieties—Armenians, others, and so forth, Christians. You used to have some Jews—they got kicked out, in a way. You used to have all kinds of Arab religions, Muslim religions; they had Druze—everything there. But, they all lived together. They had a certain degree of amity among them. They all thought of themselves as Iraqis; they spoke with quite similar accents, and quite similar thoughts. And, they were concerned with Iraq, as a nation. Any fights they had, among these groups, were fights within the nation! They did not define a separate nation; they defined a fight within the nation. We have these things within the United States—as you may know, as well.

So, the Iraqi people are now reacting to the punishing, cruel, unjust war dumped upon them. They don't care who did it, in a sense. They are going to defend their nation.

Now, they are, also, in a sense, an Asian culture. In Asia, the ideas of life and death are somewhat different than they are in European civilization, and they are prepared *to die* for the future of their culture, for the future of their nation. That's where you get this suicide-bombing process, from that kind of culture.

So, now you have the American Army, vastly outnumbered by the population of the country it occupies, in a country which has over 2 million trained military fighters, who are trained as part of the Iraqi military capability. We have a couple hundred thousand-odd American troops—who are totally incompetent, most of the troops, for the job. These are point-and-shoot people, who can go out in the streets and shoot off a weapon, rapidly, at even a suspected target, like the Columbine killers. They're trained on video point-and-shoot methods. They don't know how to think; they haven't been trained; they're not qualified. They're not an engineering troop—they're not qualified for anything, for occupation work. And, they're sitting there, hopelessly. What are they? Are they occupiers, or targets? Increasingly, the shift from being an occupying force, to a targetted bunch of people—frightened, targetted, so forth—has occurred.

So, what we're dealing with now: When Cheney brought this policy back in, after Sept. 11, 2001, and had it sold officially to the U.S. government, as reflected in the State of the Union speech in January 2002, we've now entered a new phase in a certain kind of conception of strategic conflict. You have on the one side, what we used to call "conventional warfare"—pre-nuclear methods of warfare. You had, at the other extreme, what used to be called "Mutual and Assured Destruction"—the idea, if you go to thermonuclear warfare, full-scale, you probably will destroy most of the population of the planet, and most culture; so therefore, you can't go there. You can't conduct conventional warfare any more. It doesn't work, because you'll go to a threshold, at which some other kind of warfare, including the use of nuclear weapons, will break out.

So, the effort has been, to find a way to conduct wars, *between* the level of conventional warfare and general thermonuclear warfare. That's what Cheney is talking about: preventive nuclear warfare, in that dimension.

We do not, in the United States, have the ability to deal with the kind of reaction, that we are provoking, with our present forces and our present policy. The United States can not win the kind of war that Cheney is trying to launch. We'll lose it. Why? Because the reaction, especially in Asia, will be strategic defense, which they will call "asymmetric warfare." You're dealing with civilian populations, which are prepared to resist, in every way. Some of these people represent superior weapons capabilities: Russian weapons, technologically, are very interesting. Some Chinese weapons are interesting. Indian weapons are interesting.

But, the basic principle is population warfare: If the people of an occupied or threatened territory decide to engulf an occupying military force, at close quarters, *the United States is not capable of winning such a war.*

Therefore, you're stuck in a period, you either go to thermonuclear war, in which case the planet is generally destroyed; or, you don't, and you go into a process of attrition, through popular wars, in which *most of the world falls into a dark age.*

So therefore, on this kind of policy, by Cheney and Company, the military policies of Cheney and the Bush Administration, and the military policies supported by many Democrats—including Democrats who won't fight it—are bringing the whole planet toward an early dark age. If Cheney continues, in his position, with his policies, where the people around him are called neo-conservatives, with their policies—if this goes on, if there's an attack on Syria; if there's an attack on Iran; if there's an attack on North Korea—you will see the world is committed—with Cheney still having control over a puppet-President—the world is committed to a Dark Age for all humanity. Even on military grounds, alone.

And that's what we're up against.



We're in a situation, in which I know there are ways to bring about a general peace on this planet. It's available. It's available to the United States, with the right President. I can do the job. I know how to do it.

All right: Let's go to the second question, the economic question. As some of you recall, we came out of the Depression and war, and the post-war period, under Roosevelt's initiative, and even with the bungling we did after the war, we emerged as the most powerful, productive nation on this planet. And the most powerful nation on this planet. This continued up until after the Kennedy assassination.

What happened?

The shock of living under a threat of thermonuclear warfare, general nuclear warfare, which had gone on in one degree or another, since 1945, up until 1962-63, had produced a tension in the population. In the U.S. population, this tension had been increased by a right-wing turn under Truman. (It was not Joe McCarthy, who gave us McCarthyism—it was Harry Truman. And it started in 1945-46. It didn't start in 1947-48.) So, the typical American, who had returned from war, was terrified. He was terrified of going into a new depression. He was terrified of a new war. And they adopted the policy, "Keep your mouth shut. Say what's expected of you. Be careful what our children say. Be careful who you talk to." We lived under right-wing terror in this United States, and we came to call it McCarthyism. To a certain degree, Eisenhower liberated the nation from McCarthyism. To a certain degree.

But, the people who had been subjected to this immoral thing, this capitulation to terror, to Nazi-like terror—it wasn't like Hitler, yet, but in that direction—they lost their souls; they sold their souls. They wanted to get a job. They wanted to be secure. They didn't want to lose their job, because of security clearance problems. They went into suburbia, if they could. They told their children, "Be careful what you say; be careful what you say. What you believe is not important—it's what you're overheard saying, that's important. Saying the right thing, that's important. There is no truth—it's saying the right thing, that doesn't get you into trouble. Maybe get you a promotion. That's the right thing."

So, the parents, the veterans' generation, told their children, especially in suburbia: "Be careful." So, the children, born as what became known as the Baby-Boomers, were permeated with a great deal of immorality *worse* than in their parents' generation! Because they had been conditioned, that there is no truth. They had been conditioned in Dr. Spock; they had been conditioned in "touchy-feely."

When we were hit by the Missile Crisis—and some of you here were old enough to experience that—when we were hit with the Missile Crisis, for several days, people in this country were wandering around in barrooms looking for the church. Expecting the thing was going to strike, and we were going to be obliterated any morning, or any evening. Pure terror! This affected strongly, most effectively, the younger people, who were then in late adolescence, going on toward young adulthood. The result was a phenomenon, called, from 1964 on—from the time that the Beatles appeared on the Ed Sullivan stage, on CBS—this was called the cultural paradigm-shift. "Don't accept reality. Go into un-reality. We are leaving producer society! We don't want blue shirts any more. We want white shirts—or maybe multi-colored shirts. Or, maybe no shirts at all! Or, maybe no clothes at all!" Maybe, "We want pleasure! Wherever you can get it (from whomever you can take it)!" The Woodstock phenomenon, right?

So, we said, "Technology is bad! Production is bad! You've got to have the simple life. Get away from technology. Science is dangerous!" So, we began to shift, from a producer society, to a consumer society, and a pleasure society.

Then, Nixon, in 1971, sank the dollar, sank the international monetary system. The Azores Conference which followed, put us into a floating-exchange-rate system. And then we really got nasty: With our control over a floating-exchange-rate monetary system, under American and British control, we went to various nations, using the London market, we would run a currency down in value—say Mexico's currency, other currencies. We would then send a team into the country, having

collapsed the value of that currency on the world market by speculation, the way Soros did to Malaysia, in 1997. Now, we would have the IMF and World Bank come in, and "give you some advice, on how to solve this problem. And whatever they recommend, we'll support."

So, the IMF and World Bank would come in—both are the same, one or the other—and they would say, "Drop the value of your currency. Devalue your currency."

They'd say, "Okay. We might accept that. But, that means we pay our debts in our currency, right?"

"Oh, no, no, no! You don't pay your foreign debts in *your* currency! You pay your foreign debts in dollars!"

And, now, your currency just got devalued. So now, you have to accept *a larger debt, based on the difference between the old value and the new value*. Such that, for example, in Central and South America, if you look at what these countries owed, as of 1971-72, *they have more than paid every foreign debt obligation they ever incurred*. But they have a bigger debt, than ever before. A gigantic swindle.

So, on the basis of this, we go into a country—we say, to China and other countries, "Drop the value of your currency!" What does that mean? That means, you're going to collapse the internal economy of that country. You're going to collapse the infrastructure, you're going to collapse the general infrastructure. "But, you're going to work for us! You are going to be our market. You are going to be our market, for our industries! We are going to ship our factories, and our farms, from the United States, into your countries—and you're going to work for us, almost for free. And, we are going to get all this stuff from you—cheap!"

So, we say, "We can no longer 'compete' with China. We can no longer 'complete' with South America. They can produce too cheaply."

Why do they produce so cheaply? Because we stuck a gun to their head, and forced them to work cheaply, and give up their industries.

What happened to the jobs here? What happened to our industries? They're gone! Mostly gone. And what remains, is going fast.

So, we went, over this period of the past 40 years, we underwent a cultural paradigm-shift, a change in the character of our nation, from being the world's leading producer society, which was the characteristic of us, traditionally—the characteristic of our economy, from the time that Roosevelt assumed office, to the end of the war; which continued to be our characteristic of social values, into the time of the Kennedy Administration.

Then, we went through a change from a producer society to a consumer society, a pleasure society. We became like ancient Rome after the Second Punic War, where Rome was so powerful, and instituted *slavery* at home—and we've got conditions like slavery here, at home today. What about our homeless, and people like that? People who actually earn a living, but are homeless! They can't afford a home, at today's rent prices. So, Rome degenerated, because it ceased to produce for itself, and controlled its population through what were called "bread and circuses." What do we have in the United States? Very little bread, and a lot of circuses—television circuses; mass-entertainment circuses; sexual-fad circuses; anti-sexual fad pleasure-seeking; all kinds of things.

So, we have been destroyed as a nation: We no longer have the productive ability we had. We have vast nominal wealth, but it's basically what we can extract from other countries, which are now going bankrupt. Germany, right now, for

example, the leading economy in Western Europe, is disintegrating—at a rapid rate. (I could go into details, but I won't here.) But, that's the situation.

So therefore, we've come to a point, where we have this vast accumulation of debt. We have vast inflation in financial values. Financial aggregates are up, per capita. Monetary circulation—up, fast! We're printing money like crazy. We're printing it, not by the printing press: We're printing it, even electronically. Overnight! Vast amounts.

The physical output of the United States, per capita and per square kilometer, has dropped. That is, if you look at what the physical values are, of consumption: Look, for example, at the case of power generation and distribution. The power generation and distribution is collapsing! These industries are being collapsed! To maintain the standard of living and production we used to have, say in New England—you can't do it any more. The industry is collapsing. We now have a deficit in the United States, in terms of capital investment, in power generation, which goes into *trillions of dollars*. That is, to put things back, to the point that we can, today, assure communities and assure households and industries the access to power they once expected, we would have to invest trillions of dollars of capital investment, to rebuild the industry, and other things.

Our transportation system is collapsed. We would have to put in vast amounts of investment, to rebuild the transportation industry. Water management, pollution, things of that sort.

So, we have a ruined country. We no longer have the productive ability that we once had. We can no longer support ourselves by our own effort. We've become dependent, like the Romans, on stealing from their foreign victims. That's where we are.

So, eventually, that has to come to an end.

Now, what this produces, is the following: We've come to a point, where over the past 40 years—don't blame the government, alone. Blame the people: Because, who voted for some of these idiots? Who voted for persons who propose these kinds of policies? Who adopted the idea of post-industrial society? Who promoted it? Who promoted antipathy to technology? Who called for deregulation? Who supported deregulation? Who voted for guys who pushed it? Who voted and tolerated—or, didn't vote for anything at all? Just gave up? For all the bad things, that have happened to us, to destroy this economy, to lead it to the brink of a collapse: Who did it?

The American people!

How did it express itself? It expressed itself, as so-called "popular opinion"! How did it reflect itself? It reflected itself in voting patterns, and in *non-voting patterns*!

Over the past period, since 1977, the physical standard of living of the lower 80% of family-income brackets has collapsed at an accelerating rate. The homelessness, the vast homelessness, is only a part of it. The collapse of health care. The collapse of education. The collapse of essential services. The collapse in transportation systems. You can't afford to live in this society any more!

But who did it? Popular opinion!

Now, this is not unusual in history. See, mankind is generally ruled, or self-ruled, by popular opinion. People behave, generally, as was described by some sociologists, as "other-directed": They borrow their opinions from their neighbors, like cups of sugar. They say, "Well, what do you believe?" "Well, wha—, uh, whatever you say!" "Whatever the news

media says. I gotta go along with the news media. I gotta go along with the party." Huh? Other-directed.

Now, we have destroyed ourselves, not because some people have introduced bad policies, but *because we tolerated them*. Worse, we became *supporters* of bad policies, in the name of supporting public opinion. "I gotta go by what the newspapers report. I've got to go by what the neighbors tell me." And that's how we do it. That's called "public opinion." We're destroyed.

All right, so, what does this mean? This means, that in history, there are cycles, which occur over a period of generations—one generation, two, three generations. Cycles in which wrong opinions will build up, take more and more control, more intensely over a population and its behavior, and its leading institutions. The society then appears, like ancient Rome, to be in the process of destroying itself, as we are today. Then, what happens? Do we survive? Well, in 1933, we survived. In the 1932 election, we elected Franklin Roosevelt, who told the world pretty much what direction his policies were going to take. And, we had enough gumption left in us, after the shock of the Depression, to support him; at least, the majority of us did. He made a change, in our culture. He made a shift from the culture of the 1920s—the Flapper Era—to the culture of the 1930s and the 1940s.

So, we abandoned a *bad* kind of public opinion, came back to our senses, to a large degree; decided we had to have a healthy producer society—and it worked! It worked just fine, with all the flaws in it. We emerged, again, as the leading producer society, and the greatest power in the world, the greatest planetary power.

Now, we've come again to the point, we, out of stupidity, have destroyed ourselves; this has gone on for about 40 years, in particular. There were other things, earlier, but 40 years of this culture, the prevailing culture. That means that you are presented today, with politicians, in general, who, reading public opinion, *will always have the wrong response*. This means that the lawmaking process will usually give you the wrong law. The election will usually give you the wrong candidate elected. And that's more and more the case. Why? Because, public opinion.

But, what is this public opinion? It is the public opinion, which has developed and accumulated like an avalanche over the past years. And now, if the nation's going to survive, it has to change its public opinion. You have to introduce values, which are contrary to what is generally accepted. If you don't, the nation is not going to survive. If you don't, the same thing could happen here, as happened in Germany in 1933. That's the process.

This produces an interesting problem. The so-called Baby-Boomer generation, which has accepted this change, are now in their fifties. They are looking forward to comfort. Most of these comforts are illusions. I mean, you take a guy, say in Northern Virginia. A lot of areas of the country have been despoiled; it's not possible to live in these parts of the country. I was just looking at some of the parts of New Hampshire and Vermont, that I passed through in the past days. I mean, to call some of these things that people are living in "hovels," is like calling them "palaces." You have people, who are living in conditions of life, which are unbelievable, in the United States! You can see that, in those who occupy hovels off the road, in the backwoods of Vermont and New Hampshire, and elsewhere. That's the typical situation, throughout the country, one way or the other.

But then, there's a worse level: the homelessness. We're getting people—a quarter of the population is moving toward the direction of homelessness, or already there, now. Extreme poverty.

But, you have a population of the Baby-Boomers, the ones who are in the upper 20% of income brackets, or in that ideology, saying, "Oh, no, no! No, no. That could never happen! That could never happen." What is typical of this thing? You see somebody go out of these poor areas, where there are no longer any jobs, and they move into an area where jobs are available. This means, that in certain parts of the United States, we have housing booms.

Now, what is the housing? Look at it closely—some of you, who know something about construction. You put up something, which qualifies as a potential tarpaper shack, probably a little larger than a usual tarpaper shack. How do you hold the thing together? You wrap it, with shrink-wrap; it's called "insulation." How do you make this piece of shrink-wrap garbage look like a house? Well, you take some plastic exterior, about a one-sixteenth-of-an-inch-thick slab; paint it; paste it on plastic. Make it look like brick. Make it look like something else. When you get through with this process (maybe putting a couple of gold-plated faucets in the "luxury" version of this house, huh?), it goes up for a mortgage value of, say, \$400,000 to \$600,000.

And, some poor guy, who has moved in from a poor area of the United States, to get a job in these areas, probably in the IT industry, or something like that; and two members of the family, at least, are working—the house is very seldom occupied: They're all usually working on two or three jobs most of the time, when they're not just plain commuting, on these parking lots, called our superhighways, huh? And this is what's going on! In this country.

Now, the values of these houses, recently, became ridiculous, because people are not really getting by. Despite their high salaries, so-called, from IT and so forth; and despite two members of the family working all kinds of hours, and commuting all kinds of hours, they really can't make ends meet. So, along comes some real estate dealers, and along comes this man who should never be allowed out of his bathtub—that is, Alan Greenspan (he'd never come clean, otherwise)—come along, and they start pumping money into the Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac mortgage operation.

Then, you have real estate dealers, who are in on the racket. These real estate dealers then say, "No, the values of housing in this area have really gone up." Suddenly, the bankers call up the mortgagees, the people with mortgages, and say, "Hey! Your house has just increased in value. Why don't you re-mortgage it? You can get some cash." So, people in various parts of the country, *have been buying their groceries, from these areas, by "cashing out,"* based on an appreciation in the nominal value of the mortgages! Nothing actually happened. Someone said, in the real estate community, "These properties, here, are now increased in value in this area." So, the banker in the area, who is in on it, calls up the people bearing the mortgages, and tells them, "Well! You can get some money. If you just refinance your mortgage, you'll get an increase of several thousand dollars," or whatever, "and you can put that in your pocket!" And they use that to buy groceries, and things like that.

Now, what happens, when it goes the other way: You're turning homeowners into squatters, if they're lucky. What happens if you have a vast collapse of employment in these areas, which has been oncoming, since about March, or so, or April of the year 2002, in the IT industry?

So, we're in the process of a general collapse of the financial system, in which, suddenly everything hits, more or less at once.

We can survive. I know how to make it survive. Anybody who understands Franklin Roosevelt, knows what approach to take. We can intervene in a collapsed economy; we can keep it functioning. We can make it grow again, as Roosevelt did. It'll be tough going, but we can do it.

All right. But, the Baby-Boomer says, "No." The Baby-Boomer says, "I have things I have come to believe in, values I've come to accept, lifestyles that are important to me. I'm not going to give them up. And, it's not going to change—you're going to see! It's not going to change! Look, things have been going this way for a long time now—it's not going to change! People aren't going to change. You're wrong! You're wrong! It's not going to change." You think they're slightly hysterical? I do.

All right. So do their children. See, children in the university-age eligibility—18 to 25—never really talk to their parents much any more. They consider it a waste of effort. They won't listen. Because, the young people of that age—and they

have a lot of problems—but, the young people in that age, recognize that they have been given, by their parents and others, been given a society with no future to it.

All you have to do, is talk to young people. Talk about the drug problem in society—not the way the Baby-Boomers talk about drug problems, but the way these young people talk about drug problems. It's not somebody passing out drugs in their neighborhood. That's not the problem! That is a problem, but it's not *the* problem: The problem is, the country is saturated, and affecting these young people, with a drug-culture. Who did it? Well, what about the schoolteachers, who pushed Ritalin, in schools? Told parents they would have a penalty, if their "attention-deficit" child, didn't get Ritalin, in a compulsory way. Or, how about some Prozac, which can turn you into a vegetable, in a couple of years? How about other drugs? How about all the people, who are taking psychotropics, of one kind or another, "to manage their emotions"?

"I don't like my wife."

"Take the drug, you'll feel good."

This is the kind of story!

But, so, the young people are afflicted, not only themselves, but among the people they have concern for, of their own generation: younger siblings, friends, so forth. The drug problem is a threat to their lives, in ways that the Baby-Boomer generation, say from the '60s—the Woodstock generation—would *never* understand!

But, they see in other ways: They see a no-education system, called education. They see a no-future society. Therefore, these young people are ready to make a change.

Now, as you know, I built up the organizing of a youth movement. It started in California, and it grew. I was very careful about it; I kept the youth movement largely away from my older associates—not people older than I am, but people who are younger than I am—because I knew they'd make a mess of it, because they would try to impose *their* values, upon these young people. And, the point was, to find a context in which these young people would think for themselves, and work through problems for themselves, as if in a "university on wheels."

So, it worked. It started in California. We'd have these sessions, often by telephone, long cadre sessions, other arrangements. And we began to develop a movement. Then, a couple of years ago, in the sorting out process, we had a movement. It worked in California, and so I said, "Fine. We'll replicate it, and build it in the East Coast, too." And we started to do that.

Now, in the case of California, for example: As you know, there was a Recall election out there, organized by bunch of thugs. And it featured a certifiable thug, a monster called Arnie Schwarzenegger. He's a monster by profession. If you've seen his movies, you know that. We were determined to defend the state of California against the effects of this Recall election. Because Arnie was among the people who stole the money in California, and he was going to come in to fix things, after having stolen it. His friends were the big thieves, who raped the place.

But, the Democratic National Committee was of a different persuasion. They told Gov. Gray Davis not to really fight. He could have fought. He's the kind of candidate, the kind of politician who can win a fight like that. But, they told him, don't take my advice—and he backed off it, from that, though he was happy to have my support.

So we, with our youth movement especially, we concentrated on two areas—Los Angeles County and in the Bay Area. Now, in Los Angeles County, at the time we started the fight, the polls showed the vote going 60% for Schwarzenegger

and Company, and 40% for Davis. By the time the election happened, we carried Los Angeles County—not just us, but our role in there was crucial—we carried Los Angeles County, 51% against 49%. We did better in the Bay Area. In every other part of California, generally, the whole thing was a disaster. And Schwarzenegger became elected Governor.

But, nonetheless, we had demonstrated, that where our youth movement was deployed, and engaged with other political forces, that the addition of the youth movement to the combination of the political fight, meant you had a winning combination, as opposed to what you had otherwise, which was a disaster.

On the basis of what we did in California, Mayor Street's organization in Philadelphia, coming under attack from John Ashcroft, invited us to help them. So, I said, "yes," immediately. We put the forces in there. And, as a result of this combination, again—of our people, working with their people, to make a combination: The combination of the youth movement in the context of the other forces, meant we had a relative landslide victory, in something that was a cliff-hanger, at that point.

What I'm illustrating by that is, today, the young people, of the type represented by my youth movement, are the most powerful political force, per capita, in the United States. Why? It has to do with what I just told you: An older generation, now in their fifties, generally, has gone through a long cycle of corruption. They've become accomplices in the destruction of themselves and their society. They see no future. They don't have any sense of immortality. Their sense is, that when they go, they go. And, "If Grandma is costing too much money, because of her health-care problems, she should quietly go away—because it might take our money away, if we had to support her, in her sickness." That's the society! That's the Baby-Boomer society! The culture! The characteristic of the upper 20% of the Baby-Boomer population! Its indifference to life: This lack of sense of immortality—of the sense that, "Yeah, we're all going to die. But, let's be decent about it. Let's die decently. Let's make our lives meaningful, by giving something to future generations, and by honoring the best contributions from past generations, and seeing to it that they go on, and live on, and benefit future generations to come."

The Baby-Boomer generation, especially those in this upper 20% bracket, *do not have those values*. They lost them somewhere, between the Missile Crisis and some other things, and what's happened up to date. They are dominating government. However—they are still human. They are still worth saving. We're trying to do the best we can in that direction.

The best way to save them, is to have them meet young people, who represent the generation of people who would be their children. These young people typify, for anyone, the future. We're all going to die. So, what becomes of us? What becomes of our having lived, when we die? Can we hope that we have contributed something, which will live on, of benefit to future generations? Can we believe that?

Well, how can we believe it? Have we done something worth continuing? Number one.

Number two: Who is going to carry on? What do you do then? You're looking at these young people, with all their problems, their drug problems, all these afflictions—you look at them: This is your immortality! These young people are going to have children. Those grandchildren of yours: That's your immortality! It may not be your personal immortality, in one sense, but it's an expression of the fact, that you can commit your life, presently—even under great difficulties—to the sense that you're doing something, which will not be *wasted*, because there's someone coming after you, a couple of visible generations, which can carry on, and make the meaning of your life, something for the future of humanity; that you know something, that you can help transmit to these young people, something from the past, which is a treasure from the past, a cultural treasure. You pass it on—and they will see to it, that it's preserved for the future. And thus, you have a sense of immortality. You are openly in connection with the past of humanity; you're in connection with the future of humanity.

This gives you, not a sense of doing something, because you get a reward; because you get paid; because you get a benefit.

This gives you a sense of a *mission* in life. We're all going to die. We're all born, we're all going to die, eventually. And therefore, *what is important to us, in our life, considered from that standpoint?* What is important, is adopting a *mission*, and using this life we have, as a talent, an asset, we spend. For what, do we spend a life, that we're using up? What future purpose is served by our living? What is so important, that we can die with smile on our face, saying, we've defeated death? Because we have contributed something, that will live on, after us! And that the whole of our life *means something*.

See, we've become a society, a corrupt society, a pleasure-seeking society, which is looking for rewards; looking for gratification. "Well, you know, that was years ago. This is years down the line. I gotta think about *now*—y'know what I mean, buddy? I gotta think now. My community, now! Huh? I gotta think about what I feel, now?" "Look, this woman just left me! That's my problem!" (Maybe she was right!)

This is the problem—we have gone from a society from looking at what we get, what we desire in the short term; and what pain we're trying to avoid in the short term—that's been the way we've gone, the way this culture's gone.

What you need is a sense of mission, which understands the essence of human life: We're not animals. We're not beasts. We can develop ideas, we can make discoveries. No beast can do that. So therefore, we have the sense of having a *mission in life*: That we are going to use our life, and *spend it wisely*, for some purpose which is presented to us, as an opportunity. We're going to recognize that opportunity; we're going to devote our life, to that opportunity, to fulfilling that opportunity. And we're going to have a sense of *mission*, about what we contribute to the future of humanity.

These young people, by representing that, particularly when they represent that in the way they approach life, become, in that way, an inspiration to the older generation, by giving back the older generation, access to a sense of this kind of personal immortality in society. This may not deal with the religious sense of the matter, but it does complement it. And, it does define the meaning of citizenship.

Think of the three principles of the Preamble of the Constitution: the sovereignty of our nation, the sovereignty of our republic; the general welfare of all of our living; and the security of our posterity. When we, in our own lives, are meeting the requirements of that Preamble, and understand political society, as something which should be ordered accordingly, and read the intent of the Constitution that way, you understand why this republic, until now, is the only republic whose Constitution has survived over the period from 1789 to the present, in the world: *No other nation, in the world, has a Constitution, which has lived as long as ours*. The vitality of our system of government lies in the principle and purpose of that Constitution: that we are committed to the sovereignty of peoples; that each nation should be sovereign. We are committed to the general welfare, of *all* people—treating none like human cattle; all are human, and their welfare is a concern of all of us. We are also concerned, about what we leave to posterity, not just to our present gratification.

This is the underlying moral strength of the United States. My mission, among all the other things I must do, is to revive that sense of mission of the United States, in as many people as possible.

Thank you.

## Latest From LaRouche

### New Hampshire, Vermont, and Massachusetts Greet Democrat for President, Lyndon LaRouche

Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche addressed a packed State Library in Concord, and 75 students at Plymouth State University, during his two-day trip to his home state of New Hampshire, last week. The impact of his Nov. 12-13 tour was amplified by significant media coverage in the major newspapers of the state.



In Concord, the state capital, on Nov. 12, LaRouche was introduced by State Representative Barbara Richardson, who spoke of his credentials. LaRouche then elaborated on three major topics: the global war danger, the economy, and the role of his Youth Movement in resolving the current "generation gap."

At Plymouth State, LaRouche gave a 40-minute speech, which was followed by 20 minutes of questions.

LaRouche is certified for the ballot in New Hampshire, and also filed his presidential candidacy in the State of Vermont.

Continuing the tour, LaRouche, who will be on the ballot on all the states of New England, except Maine, which is not holding a primary election, spoke at the Middlebury College in Vermont, before an audience of about 100 people, sponsored by the college Democratic organization. On Saturday, Nov. 15, LaRouche was in Boston, Massachusetts for a town meeting with campaign volunteer, citizens, and a large contingent of the LaRouche Youth Movement.

## **'We Have To Tell The Truth,' Says LaRouche, On The Role of the U.S. President**

Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche held a press conference in Concord, N.H. on Nov. 12, kicking off a major campaign swing through the Northeast and Midwest. Campaign spokesman Stuart Rosenblatt began by introducing State Rep. Barbara Richardson, a 12-year veteran of the Legislature. This is an edited transcript of their remarks, followed by excerpts from the question-and-answer period that followed.

*Rep. Barbara Richardson:* ...Lyndon LaRouche is a native of this state. He was born and raised in Rochester, New Hampshire. He's a Democratic Presidential candidate, but he has been denied access to the candidates' debates. Nationally, he is second in individual contributions to his campaign; sixth in the total money raised, nationally and in New Hampshire, and fourth in individual contributions raised in New Hampshire.

LaRouche has some excellent information and ideas. I believe it is important to listen to him, and consider his views for solutions to our faltering economy, and to the disaster we face in Iraq. He fought hard to keep the Washington, D.C. public hospital [D.C. General] open; he also worked in California, to defeat the Recall of Governor Davis.

Nearly half a century ago, I attended the Bretton Woods Conference as a college student reporter. LaRouche is promoting a similar conference, to deal with the many problems facing our country. I believe we will benefit from hearing his information and ideas.

*Lyndon LaRouche:* Essentially three topics, which I will just summarize here, at this time: First of all, the first issue facing the nation, prominent in the minds of most people, is the spreading war, now peaking in Iraq. We face not only that war, but we face the threatened spread of that, and similar wars, around the world. Were this process to continue, under the Cheney doctrine of preventive nuclear warfare, we could be assured that, in the coming Presidency, we would probably face a spread of wars, of nuclear-armed warfare among nations—major nations; of asymmetric warfare, of a type which the present ongoing Iraq War, like the Indo-China War earlier, represents.

At the same time, we have a second issue: the economy. The present world financial-monetary system is in the process of disintegration. We're enduring the last phases of a disintegration. Now, in such matters, you can not predict the exact time something will happen, because governments may print money, even at risk of hyperinflation, in order to try to postpone a financial collapse, for political reasons. We're already in that. The present Administration has given a new meaning, in its financial expectations, to what is called "a Snow job"—John Snow, our Secretary of the Treasury.

In the meantime, 47, at least, of the Federal states of the United States, are, in effect, bankrupt. That is, they could not raise tax revenues, sufficient to maintain the essential functions of government, without causing a negative effect on the population and the economy of the state itself.

Therefore, we must face this threat of financial crisis, using the precedent of what Franklin Roosevelt did, in facing the effects of the Coolidge and Hoover legacy, to bring the nation out of this financial crisis.

On the issue of the war and the crisis itself: My personal experience and involvement overseas, permits me to say, that we are at the verge where a President of the United States, approaching the problems today, as Roosevelt did in 1932-33, could bring about a general agreement on monetary and financial reorganization among major nations and others of the world. Therefore, the problem is intrinsically manageable. If we are willing to launch the kind of building program, and rebuilding program, which Roosevelt undertook—maybe not the same way, the same details—but, for example, in dealing with the shortage of generation and distribution of energy supplies, power supplies; the management of water systems; the collapse of our general transportation system, our public transportation system; rebuilding our health-care system, especially hospitals and clinics, which we're in short supply of; rebuilding our educational institutions, to adapt our population, coming out of the schools, to be qualified for the kinds of employment we should be creating. These measures will succeed, and could stimulate the economy in general.

## **The Generation Gap**

There's another problem, the problem of a generation gap. Some of you recall, that we went through the Eisenhower years with a certain sense of security. The horror of nuclear war had been put behind us, with Eisenhower's election. Eisenhower was opposed to these kinds of mad adventures; but then, he retired. And, a young President Kennedy, very bright, but not with enough of the right connections, was not able to do what Eisenhower had done: Eisenhower had the authority, as a commanding general in the previous war; he had other authorities and other influences, especially in the military; and could hold some of those things that he called, once, the "military-industrial complex," in check.

Once Eisenhower left office, what he called the military-industrial complex went rampant.

The first effect was international: The Missile Crisis of 1962, when people throughout this country sweated for days, in anticipation that they might be extinguished, by a general thermonuclear warfare, any day, at that point. This went on for a period of days. People almost lost their souls in terror. Other bad things happened in this period. And then, Kennedy was shot, and the mystery of his assassination was never properly addressed.

Then came the Indo-China War. And, with that, the country was terrified, especially people who had been born at the end of World War II, or about that time or later; they were terrified. And we had, in the middle of the 1960s, a cultural paradigm-shift emerging around campus youth, university campus youth. This gave us a shift, toward what was called a "post-industrial society," which meant, in effect, that in the course of the 1970s, we ceased to be the world's leading producer-nation, and we became a consumer-society, increasingly depending upon the cheap labor of other parts of the world, to provide the things that we used to produce for ourselves.

So, we have degenerated, into a pleasure-seeking society. In the meantime, the lower 80% of the family-income brackets of the United States, since 1977, have been in an accelerating decline, in their *physical standard of living*, not only in household income as such, but also in public services, basic economic infrastructure.

We are now a bankrupt society, living on virtual slave-labor rates of work in China and other parts of the world. We have destroyed Mexico as an independent nation, but we use its cheap labor: We use it *up*, both inside the United States and

outside the United States.

So, we've changed our character. We're in a period where, as many of you know, the generation that I deal with now, most actively, between 18-25-year age-group, is faced with a horrible situation: Ritalin, Prozac, a general drug culture, and the things that go with it. These young people, they come from all kinds of backgrounds, but of that age-group, share common problems. And, when they're mobilized—they don't trust the older generation; they don't trust their parents' generation—but, they will trust a good discussion, a frank discussion, of the issues. And they will respond to it.

The best chance for this nation, is that people of that age-group, 18-25 age-group, be organized in the proper way, as the way I've been trying to organize it, for the past several years: to give a kick in the pants to their parents' generation, to get some morality back in this country, and some confidence. We can face the crisis of war. We can stop the wars. We can deal with the financial crisis, there are measures. The older generation, those who entered universities, for example, in the middle of the 1960s, haven't got the gumption to do it by themselves. But their children's generation, faced with the prospect of no future for this society, and thinking about their future, thinking about the problems of drug culture, thinking about the problems of poverty, insecurity, are capable of inspiring their parents' generation to come back to life, and to mobilize and join them, in changing the character of politics in the United States today.

And that's what has to change.

The problem, as I see it, finally, is that, I saw these so-called debates, among the so-called candidates: I was disgusted. Because they're not discussing anything. When you consider the problems that are faced by the people in this country, especially the lower 80% of family-income brackets, when you look at the bankruptcy of 47 or so of the Federal states of the United States, and no solutions for this in sight, under present terms, somebody ought to be talking about it. Candidates ought to be speaking among themselves before the public, on these questions. Not with the shibboleths, with these simple slogans, and fads. The question of war: The war danger is serious; it's real. You can't say, "Be nice to Cheney." You can't say, "Let's be careful what we say in the presence of the President." We have to tell the truth.

And these young people will not believe any politician, who does not tell the truth. Any politician who tries to give out the guff, that I've seen from these candidates, in these public debates, *will not gain the confidence of the American people.*

The question, as I see it—looking at my Republican and Democratic competition—is not, who is going to win the next election, but which of these guys is going to lose it? Because one is as bad as the other, in terms of their present performance.

And, I think, perhaps, that by my kicking things—I think I should be the next President. I don't think anybody else is qualified, at this time, for the particular kind of job that has to be done. But certainly, I can't run the country alone. I would have to run it, with a government, which is capable of doing the job. As Roosevelt did, I would need teams. I would need good Democrats, with experience. I would need specialists. I would need some good Republicans, too. In order to put together, in the Executive Branch of government, the kind of team, that, when the President makes a decision, with their advice taken into account, that that decision will be carried out effectively. And that the major problems that we have to deal with, will be dealt with, as Roosevelt dealt with problems then, in the first hundred days of his Administration.

That's what we face.

And therefore, even though I think I should be President—I don't think anybody else is qualified, at this time, for the job, as it's defined now—nonetheless, we do need the kind of discussion, among candidates and people, which says, "Cut off the guff. Talk straight. No more slogans. No more party lines. We have well-defined problems. The American people want

to hear politicians running for office, discussing what they really think, about solutions to these problems in front of them."

And, I hope that we do some of that, today, here.

Thank you.

## Government for Human Beings

**Question:** I'm Kate, with the Associated Press. The Democratic Party says you're ineligible to run, because you're not a registered voter.... So you couldn't become President, technically, as a Democrat. Why not switch parties?

**LaRouche:** Well, they're not thinking clearly. First of all, none of them are going to make it, the way it's going now. They're all going to lose to even George Bush, who's a born loser.

And, first of all, they're wrong. The Constitution of the United States is absolutely clear: The United States was founded by a bunch of felons. Every leader of the United States was a felon. George III would have strung us all up! Right? So, when our Constitution was formed, with our experience, under British occupation, the British colonies and so forth—and looking at Europe—we decided to leave it to the people of the United States and their electors, to decide who is qualified to be President or not. And, who is qualified *to stand as a Presidential candidate*.

Now, a bunch of wise-guys, who have connections I know, such as former Democratic Party leader Don Fowler, who is one of the instigators of this whole thing—a South Carolina racist; I mean, he is not exactly qualified to speak to the state of New Hampshire about their choice of candidates.

We're going to run.

Now, what do you think—in terms of popular financial support—what do you think of a political party, which is in desperate straits, and does not recognize the existence of the number-two candidate of a pack of nine? And having debates that don't mean anything, and nobody's discussing anything of importance? Is that kind of side-show, supposed to be the election process?

That's why the polls indicated, that all of the above-mentioned candidates—not including me—would lose to Bush. But, an unknown candidate would win! And, the advantage of being unknown to these guys—they're going to have to sort it out, before it's over.

Look, the DLC, which is my main enemy, the Democratic Leadership Council, has disintegrated. The Democratic National Committee leadership, after what they did in California, on the Recall vote, which gave only bad advice and the worst possible advice to Gray Davis. And Gray Davis lost for only one reason: Because he was under Democratic Party leadership pressure, including many of the candidates who were out there, visiting, and told him, "Take it soft! Take it soft! Don't fight." Well, we fought! And, we fought the fight for California in Los Angeles County: We turned a 60-to-40 losing position, to a 51-to-49 winning position. We did a better job in the Bay Area. In the other areas, we weren't there—and they lost!

We went into Philadelphia, where Mayor Street wanted our help. And we had what was considered a tough election—we had a landslide victory!

So, how can someone, given this bunch of losers, exclude somebody who has the quality of a winner? Would you put a cripple on the football field, as a quarterback? They're crippled.

So, obviously, it's a bunch of foolishness. I know you get the stories that have been put out—but it's just foolishness. It doesn't make any sense, from the history of the United States.

## Who Supports LaRouche?

**Question:** Can you paint us a picture of the average person who's giving money to the LaRouche campaign?

**LaRouche:** There is no real average. What I tap into, is what you'd expect, if you think about the voting pattern. My support comes largely from people who have deserted the Democratic Party at the polls, because they're disgusted with it.

The Democratic Party, under the DLC leadership, especially over the last ten years approximately, shifted from a party of the people, to a party of the so-called suburbanites. That left about 80% of the family-income brackets of the United States in neglect.

Look at the situation with health care. Let's take Dean. Now, Howard Dean will say—for comparison purposes; he's not the only culprit in this—Howard Dean would say, he was part of a Vermont thing that raised some health care for children. But, children above infancy, have the lowest risk factor of any part of the population. You get to people over 50—now you're talking serious health problems: 45 to 50, they begin to onset, and they become more expensive.

So, what the problem is, he supports HMO! Now, HMO, which was enacted by the Republicans in 1973—it was a disaster.

We had, under the Hill-Burton Act, enacted in the immediate post-war period, we had a system of cooperation among state, Federal, local, and private institutions—hospitals, clinics, and so forth—which worked as a team in each county of the United States, to plan the capabilities of the county, for dealing with the anticipated health-care challenges of the coming year. They would look at the money that was coming in, from various funds, including private contributions, so forth—that is, paid-in contributions—and also would have these fundraising drives for the health program, which would try to fill up the gap. In some cases, in poor states, the Federal government would step in. In many areas, the state government would step in, at the county level, to assist the county in meeting these standards. When somebody fell on the street, under the Hill-Burton system, in any of these counties, somebody said, "Call a cop!" The police came, the person was taken to the emergency room, the so-called trauma unit. They were treated. If they required further treatment beyond the emergency treatment, they were bedded and put under observation. And, maybe a day or two later, somebody would come around and talk to the patient about money. But, whether they had money or not, they would be treated, and they would be treated with indifference to the amount of money they had.

It worked. It was a lot cheaper than the HMO system. Because, under that system, we didn't pay off stockholders who bought stock yesterday, in a financial company, to squeeze the victims—the patients—of their health care, in order to ensure profits for the stockholder, who bought in yesterday.

We're doing a similar thing with Social Security: We are looting the Social Security Fund, and then saying, there's not enough money to meet the pension requirements.

The philosophy is wrong. And Dean, who, of course, leads me, actually, in the number of contributors; but, Dean, who's a doctor by profession, supports the HMO system. And we will never have a decent health-care system for this country,

again, until we *repeal* the HMO system, and everything that goes with it. That's why it's one of the first acts I intend to implement as a message to the Congress, on becoming President.

So, these are the kinds of problems.

## The Real Estate Bubble

Or, take another one, a shocker—not as vicious in New Hampshire, as it in some other parts of the country: This country is based largely on a big swindle called a real-estate bubble. The real-estate bubble means that you get a shack, which is set up with shrink-wrap. You stick some plastic exterior on it, call it "housing." It looks like brick (one-sixteenth-of-an-inch-thick brick), pasted on the outside. These shacks are going in various parts of the country, at mortgages of \$400,000 to \$600,000 and higher. What are they worth?

Now, this thing is based on a bubble: It's called a mortgage-based securities bubble, which is funded largely by the Federal Reserve System, through Alan Greenspan—that great genius. We're on the edge, in which the crisis in the so-called financial derivatives, of the insurance and related categories—a crisis in that area, triggered by a rise in interest rates in international markets—could readily trigger a chain-reaction collapse of the real-estate bubble. Which would mean that some of these shacks that were listed at \$400,000 or \$600,000, will be down to a value of \$200,000 or less very quickly.

And, the people in them, will be turned from homeowners, into squatters, because nobody will want to kick them out of the houses. It'll be worse kicking them out, than letting them stay there.

That's the kind of situation we face. That's the kind of reality which hits the poor of this country. And the poor of the United States, are now actually, the lower 80% of family-income brackets. You have 20% are really in destitution. And the others are hit hard.

Look what people are doing, commuting—and, what kind of jobs are they getting? How many hours do they work? How many hours do they commute? What kind of family life do they have? What kind of situation do we have for the children, that are being raised by these families? These are the issues of the general welfare. Our system of republic is based on a dedication of government to efficiently serve the interests and promotion of the general welfare, as well as the sovereignty and posterity of our people. And that is neglected.

The Democratic Party, in the Roosevelt tradition—whatever criticism you might want to make of Franklin Roosevelt—Franklin Roosevelt, like Lincoln, was a person truly in the tradition of the general welfare principle. And defended the people, and took the side of the people. And, he was loved because of that.

And he was missed, as soon as he was gone, because of that.

But, in the recent period, since the beginning of the Indo-China war, and especially since the Nixon Administration, we've been going down a dark road. It's a *vicious* road. We've cared less and less for *people*: This is supposed to be a government *for the people*, of the people, by the people. The responsibility of government is to do what the people can not do for themselves. To organize them and their resources, so they can defend themselves; to create infrastructure; to make sure that power systems, generation and distribution are built; to make sure that water systems are maintained; to make sure that sanitation is maintained; to make sure that everybody gets an education; to ensure that health care is available, by making it possible for those who provide health care to do so.

That should be our commitment. A commitment to the people. And therefore, as a result of the fact that the people have

been *turned against*, by their government and by the leadership of the Democratic Party—and *the people know it!* The people sense they have no power, so they sit and cherry-pick on issues, or don't vote at all. They no longer have any sense of the party's loyalty to *them*, or of themselves to the party. They cherry-pick, when they vote; they don't vote out of passion, commitment for their party.

So, the party is sitting there, as a minority—a minority of the potential Democratic voters. They actually represent *almost no one!* They depend upon sharks like Murdoch and his Fox TV, to subsidize Democratic Presidential candidates! Controlled by one of the worst right-wingers in the world! And, that's called Democratic.

They have trouble: The Democratic National Committee's bankrupt. They go to George Soros! One of the centers of the international drug traffic! A major security threat to the United States. And they get their funding from him. Who's loyal to whom?

The American people, especially the youth, know the Democratic Party leadership, at present, is not loyal to them; nor is the Republican Party leadership. And therefore, that's why they vote for me the way they do. Because they know where I stand—they can smell it! And they know it! They've a lot of funny ideas; they need a lot of discussion, to clarify a lot of questions. But, they are the American people. And, *they are the people that any candidate has to deal with.*

A big change is coming. It's coming on fast. You should see the way our youth movement functions, the way it functioned in California, in Los Angeles County, in the Bay Area, in Philadelphia: We make the difference. And everybody who's smart in the Democratic Party *knows it. We make the difference.* My candidacy makes the difference. We're going to change the party's character.

## The Nature of Man

**Question:** Can you write a fourth edition to the "Children of Satan"?

**LaRouche:** The essential nature of government, or what government should be, is to liberate mankind from a long tradition of humanity in society, in which a few people treated most people as human cattle. They either hunted them down, for sport, as the Spartans did, and the Romans often did; or, *they herded them, and culled them, as cattle.* They treated them nice—they put 'em the barn, they put 'em in the field, and then when they didn't produce, they culled them, to save on medical expenses, because they weren't productive.

The system of government, of modern government, in modern European history, is based on the assumption that the government is responsible to the people: What's the difference between a man and an animal? How many people *know* the difference? The difference lies in the human mind, the difference between the quality of man and the beast. And when you have ideas like those of Hobbes, or Locke, which do not distinguish between man and the beast, what do you get? *Men treat men as beasts. And become beasts, themselves.*

So, the key problem here, is twofold: First of all, the task of government, the task of leadership, is to make the people aware of the nature of man as made in the likeness of the Creator. That man is not an animal. Therefore, man partakes of the divine. And secondly, is to create those conditions which are suitable, to a person of that nature. We don't want a dumb beast working in the field, like a cow! We want a human being, developing—developing ideas, transmitting those ideas to coming generations; human beings who have a sense of immortality; a sense of mission in life: not just a sense of obligation to do a job, but a sense that they are getting something from their previous generations; they're passing on something enriched to coming generations. That they come and they go. You live and you die, but in the time you're alive, *you do something.* You adopt a mission in life, or have one thrust upon you. And you do it for the benefit of future

generations. And you can smile at death, if you can do that.

That's been taken away from us.

People who take that away from people, people who destroy young people, with drugs, with these kinds of things: They are Satanic! Why? What do I mean, by Satanic? They are taking away the sense of humanity from the individual; and they're taking away the regard for the other person, as human, as in the image of the Creator.

And, that's what's wrong with us. If we had this kind of love, of human beings for human beings, which is described by Plato in his second book of *The Republic*, as *agape*; which is the same thing as in I Corinthians 13, the same idea, this idea of love of mankind: That, if you were devoted to that, as your fundamental interest in life, that service of that, government will work. And therefore, it's important to make that distinction, it's important for politicians to finally get the guts to make that distinction: It is wrong to do things, that correspond to looking at a fellow human being, as some kind of human cattle, or worse.

And therefore, I am writing more on it. And another piece is coming out, very soon!

## **Democrats Have Gone to Pot!**

**Question:** In running for President, what have you learned in your different campaigns? And, how has the Democratic Party changed, since you started?

**LaRouche:** Oh! The Democratic Party has gone to pot! It was much better, a long time ago. You know, Clinton was a nice guy, and that fooled a lot of people about the Democratic Party. He didn't always perform very well, but he was capable of expressing nice intentions, and he was a very intelligent President. He had some shortcomings, but they weren't in lack of intelligence.

What's happened to the Democratic Party, is the Democratic Party accepted the change. The Democratic Party was never a party of principle. It was pretty much a piece of garbage for much of its history, until Franklin Roosevelt came along, and he changed it. And the Democratic Party rose at the time that the Republican Party was really in its deepest decline. So, it was a change in the character of the Democratic Party. So, when you talk about the "Democratic Party," when you say, "What do you like about the Democratic Party, historically?" you say, "Franklin Roosevelt." Not that he's the beginning and ending of it, but that typifies, in our history, a Democratic Party as it should be.

When the cultural change occurred, in the middle of the 1960s, corresponding to the Indo-China War, Johnson's terror at thinking of what it meant to see his President shot—and that terrified Johnson, greatly. But, from that time on, we went downhill, morally. We no longer were the same people. And, it got worse and worse.

Now, history doesn't work in four-year cycles. It works in generations. It's been 40 years, approximately, since this change took over the United States. The Democratic Party has degenerated, as *most* of the political institutions, and other institutions, have degenerated over those 40 years.

I'm probably the world's best economic forecaster, at least on the record, in terms of what I've forecast and what has happened, and I've seen this coming. I saw the changes. I saw how they were going to occur. And I decided I had to do something about it. And, then, when I saw what was happening, with [Zbigniew] Brzezinski coming in with his Trilateral Commission, to take over the Democratic Party in 1976, I decided I had to do something. So, I got into politics at that point, for that reason: to stop what Brzezinski represented. It would be the death of the Democratic Party, and the death of



the nation, if it continued.

And, the things that I've warned against, have all happened.

Now, in the cycle of history, people develop bad habits. A cultural degeneration, such as the present one, develops as a bad habit. People pick up bad habits. And, they begin to say, "Well, these habits are the lessons of experience. Experience has taught us this. Experience has given us the following values." But, they're the wrong values! But, if the world doesn't come crashing down, because you accept the wrong values within three or four years, people say, "It's all right! It's all right! Cultural change, fine!" Then, you come along to something like a cyclical depression, as we saw back in 1928 through 1933. You should think about—remember, some people are old enough to remember, how people behaved—in New Hampshire, for example—in *the 1920s*. I remember. They behaved terribly! They were decadent! Terribly decadent—then, boom! 1928-29. You should see the *shock*, that people went through, from '28 through '33—the shock! You should see it in the state of New Hampshire—I saw in '28 to '32, in particular. The shock! People you know! They changed! They were terrified; they were frightened; they were despondent.

Then, Roosevelt came along, and people were willing to shuck the values of Coolidge and Hoover, the Flapper Era. They were willing to make changes—reluctantly, but they made changes. And, we survived! We developed a new paradigm.

But then, at the end of the war, we began to develop a contrary paradigm, an anti-Roosevelt paradigm. And we began to go down. We went back into the war business again! We went into thermonuclear and nuclear war. Went into these crazy adventures, that Eisenhower, in his own way, tried to stop. And, then Kennedy was killed; the Missile Crisis happened. And they were terrified again: So, people said, "Let's run from reality. Let's go into a post-industrial society. Let's get away from this technology—it frightens us! It frightens us!" We accepted new values, that we could do something else, apart from producing product. We would now *make our money*, or make our living, in some other way. And, we went along with it.

And so, now, 40 years later, the price has to be paid. And, history is often—if you look at the history of the Peloponnesian War, for example, which is often studied by scholars; look at the history of the religious wars, from 1511 to 1648 in Europe; look at many of these phenomena, these long cycles, cycles of more than a generation, which are characteristic of human society. And, humanity, in general, has progressed. The human species *has* progressed, in net effect, over time, despite all these things.

But, the reason we survive, is because, when a time of crisis comes, when bad habits have come to the end of their skein, then if people step forward, and provide the new ideas that are needed, then, maybe, the people in general will begin to accept those ideas. A person in politics, as I am, has to function that way: You function to win, because you're functioning to win a change. You're not functioning on the basis of running a popularity contest, though popularity is not irrelevant. You're running, to bring about a change. You're on a *mission*, to change the way things are going. And, you have to be patient. You have to wait, till the people are ready to make that change with you. And, that's what I've been doing, this past quarter-century.

## Improving Life in Africa

**Question:** I, myself, am African. I'd like to ask you, how do you see yourself improving life for vulnerable people, such as Africa, and elsewhere?

**LaRouche:** Well, Africa—sub-Saharan Africa in particular—has been a target, since the 1971-72 period, of genocide. The turning point was 1976: I sponsored, with others, an effort at the Colombo, Sri Lanka conference of the Non-Aligned

Nations, for a just new world economic order; my chief collaborator in that was Fred Wills, who was the Foreign Minister of Guyana, who was an activist in Africa, and had been very much involved in that.

But, since that time, especially since '75-'76, there has been in Africa, *deliberate genocide*, promoted by policies such as Henry Kissinger's NSSM-200. Which distinctly says: The Africans have too much in terms of mineral resources, which we want for our future. Therefore, we must not allow their population to grow. We must make it shrink. And above all, we must not let them enjoy technology, because they'll use up more of these mineral resources, that we want for our future.

So, genocide has been Anglo-American policy toward Africa, since that time. And what you're seeing is the orchestration, in the usual, customary ways, of genocide against Africa.

So, how do we do it? Well, you go back to what Roosevelt proposed in 1942-43, in the context of the invasion of Africa, by the U.S. forces, where he had this meeting with Churchill on these issues. He laid out to Churchill, and the others there, a map of what U.S. policy toward Africa would be, especially North Africa, in the post-war period—that is, the northern part of Africa. He laid out grand projects, of rail development, water development, engineering developments, to give Africans the basic, large-scale infrastructure, which would enable them—in a de-colonized world—to build economies. Now, that still is what has to be done today.

The point is a question of power: Where is the power going to come—first of all, to free the African, from this *genocide*, which is coming down on them, every day, increasingly right now? Secondly, where do we get the means? My view is that, if we organize—if the United States will work with Europe and Eurasian countries, in the direction which Eurasia is already going, to solve the problem of the crisis *in* Eurasia: that Eurasia, and the United States, together, will be sufficiently strong to provide the assistance to Africa, to:

Number one, eliminate this genocide process; that is, eliminate the elements of genocide, such as Museveni, for example, in Uganda; who's an Anglo-American agent, who is committing genocide against the people of his own country, and other countries. To eliminate that factor, of support for genocide.

And secondly, we should go in, with large-scale projects of infrastructure-building. We should do it, by sponsoring African corporations, which will take the development, and will own the development. We will go in, on a technology-*transfer* method, of putting our forces, our abilities in there, to assist them in getting started, and will continue to support them. It's the only chance.

Now, we have also, in Africa, we have another problem: Disease. These conditions produce disease, and they produce diseases which are dangerous to all humanity. The HIV case is only an example of this; it's only one of many. Therefore, we have to help Africa to deal with this tropical disease factor. I mean, if you're sleeping on a mat, if children are sleeping on a mat, in a tropical region of Africa, every disease-carrying bug in the world gets through that mat, and *bites them*: And, they get the diseases. So therefore, we have an epidemic problem that we have to control.

We have to have, now, a policy *toward* Africa, which is not one we need be ashamed of.

## **The Problem With the Supreme Court**

**Question:** Can you speak ... about your relationship to what kind of Supreme Court.... Could you tell us your views about jurisprudence?

**LaRouche:** Well, we got a problem in the Supreme Court, typified by Associate Justice Antonin Scalia, whom I do not

consider fully human. And, you have five judges on the so-called conservative side—that doesn't mean that the four judges who are on the non-conservative side, are perfect. But, there has been, obviously, a deterioration in the quality of the Supreme Court, since the middle of the 1970s. Which I think we're all aware of. When Rehnquist got in there, things began to get bad. Here is a man, a racist from Arizona, an open racist—and you put in an open racist in there, then promote him to Chief Justice—that's not good. But, he's not so smart. Scalia is a real slime-ball—really nasty. I don't think he's fully human.

But, so yes, we have a system of Constitutional government, where if two branches of government—the Executive and the Congress—can come into an agreement, we can control the problem of the Supreme Court. Our Constitution provides for that kind of structure, that interrelationship. There's a fourth branch of government, of course, not just the states. The fourth branch of government is the people. And, the people, if the people form a movement, and say, "*We are going to have this change, that change will occur.*" As long as at least two of the three Federal branches agree.

If an election, a President of the United States, a successful candidate for the Presidency, can carry the majority of the House of Representatives, and can shift the Senate—we're that close—a successful Democratic candidate, will carry the Congress and will carry the Senate. And therefore, we will have two sections of government, which can deal with the problem.

Also, the thing that has to be done, is, we have to lay before the American people, the question of the principles of our Constitution. People tend to think of a sort of a Ten Commandments, "do's" and "don'ts." And, our Constitution is not one of "do's" and "don'ts." Those Constitutions which are based on "do's" and "don'ts" don't survive. Ours is the only Constitution, which has survived, since it was created. Every other government in the world, has undergone radical changes in its Constitutions—or overthrow of its Constitution, since that time.

The durability of our Constitution lies, first of all, in the Preamble of the Constitution, and in the antecedent, the Declaration of Independence: two documents which were crafted under the direction of Benjamin Franklin, which represented the highest level of thinking from Europe. The Preamble of the Constitution is the essence. Three principles: the sovereignty of the nation, the general welfare, and posterity. And, if we read the rest of the Constitution from that standpoint, those three principles, we know what to do.

The problem is, as with the earlier question, men in this country, do not yet understand fully, the significance of the difference between man and beast, between human and human cattle. That should be the concept, which my campaign is pushing. The concept of what is human. What natural-law principles flow from consideration of the human being as human? What is right and wrong, from that standpoint? The same principles as I Corinthians 13—same principle: that, if people understand the law, as *natural law*, and understand our Constitution as a *reflection* of natural law, as a statement of intention, then, if the people are mobilized behind it, and if the Congress and the Presidency *understand* that's the rule of the game, and if enough people on the Supreme Court join us, we can control these problems.

The judgeship problem is, we are not getting good judges proposed. We're getting bad judges! So, you get a jam-up on bad judges. They're trying to pack the judges, the Federal court! It's bad. There's no principle involved. It's pure thuggery. So, that's our problem.

But, we have to look at it from a strategic standpoint: We must take the Presidency. We must carry the House of Representatives. We must carry a majority in the Senate. If we do that, we can deal with our problems. But, it depends on a conception of *natural law*, not so-called positive law.

**Links to articles from *Executive Intelligence Review*\*.**

## **Feature:**

### **Science and Economic Crises: The Pagan Worship of Isaac Newton**

**By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.**

"The most common source of the great, truly tragic failures of official society's attempted practice of physical science, are found in the chasm which separates science pursued merely as a professional occupation, from science pursued as a mission for discovery of truth. In the first case, the professional asks, 'Will it be accepted? Will it work?' In the second case, he asks, 'Have I proven that this is actually true?' "

---

## **Economics:**

### **U.S. 'Recovery' Was Debt Dressed Up for Hallowe'en**

**by EIR Staff**

The new hype about an American economic "recovery"—based on alleged GDP growth of 7.2% in the third quarter—is based on two pillars: fraud and debt. Preliminary figures indicate that in the third quarter, it required \$6-8 of new indebtedness, public and private, in the U.S. economy, to generate each new dollar of GDP.

### **Wal-Mart Collapses U.S. Cities and Towns**

**by Richard Freeman**

The case of Iowa shows how once Wal-Mart comes to town, a community's pre-existing retail stores are driven out of business, driving down wages and state and local tax revenues.

### **LaRouche Puts Spotlight On Veterans' Healthcare**

**by Carl Osgood and Linda Everett**

The Bush Administration's so-called war on terrorism, and its consequent military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq, have made its policies on the treatment of veterans, including veterans of its military actions, lightning-rod political issues on Capitol Hill, especially for Democrats.

### **India: Boost Infrastructure To Speed Up Growth**

**by Ramtanu Maitra**

...The failures of the BJP-led government's economic policies were not so much in what they did not do, but in what they could have, and should have, done. This is especially evident in light of the growing economic muscle of China. ..

---

## **International:**

### **George Soros Spreads Opium Wars Across the Americas**

**by Gretchen Small**

After the ouster of Bolivian President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada in Bolivia, it is now Colombia's President Alvaro Uribe Vélez, the one hard-line

anti-drug government left in the region, touted by the Bush Administration as its best ally in the Americas, which is on the line; and it is Washington's own policies that are bringing him down.

- **LaRouche: Combat Coca With Development**

**by Dennis Small**

With a diplomat from an Ibero-American nation, Lyndon LaRouche discussed how to fight the problem of coca in the Andes.

## **All-Out Political War Is On in Britain**

**by Mary Burdman**

Britain in the second week of November was in the throes of unprecedented political warfare. All parts of the establishment —the political class, royalty, the legal establishment, security services, and the financial sector—were in turmoil.

## **Anglo-Americans Dictate 'Peace' to Sudan**

**by Uwe Friessecke**

After meeting the peace negotiators for Sudan on Oct. 22 in the Kenyan holiday resort Naivasha, U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell declared he expected a comprehensive peace deal signed by the end of the year. Initially, government sources in Khartoum were quoted saying that nobody could dictate a deadline to the Sudanese government.

---

## **National:**

## **LaRouche Turns Up the Heat on Cheney**

**by Jeffrey Steinberg**

A million LaRouche in 2004 leaflets are circulating with the call, "Dump Cheney Now!" as the factional brawl in Washington intensifies, and Administration pragmatists weigh the option of sending the Vice President out to pasture.

- **LaRouche on 'Cheney-Gate'**

The Presidential candidate's political committee, LaRouche in 2004, released this actuality to the news media on Nov. 10; campaign radio ads based on it aired in Washington, D.C. beginning Nov. 13. LaRouche is on the ballot in the District's Jan. 13 Presidential primary.

- **Time Line:**

### **Moves To Shut Down the SSCI Cheney-Gate Probe**

This chronology of events in the weeks following Lyndon LaRouche's Oct. 22 'Preparing the Post-Cheney Era' webcast from Washington, builds up to Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist's shocking move to shut down the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on Nov. 7.

## **'Proud To Bring LaRouche to My Constituency'**

**An interview with Lamarr Lemmons.**

Democratic State Rep. Lamarr Lemmons hosted Lyndon LaRouche's Presidential campaign meeting in Detroit on Nov. 20. Lemmons served in the Michigan House of Representatives for six years until 2003, representing East Detroit. He was interviewed on Nov. 14 by **Marcia Merry Baker**.

## **Soros Has Dumb Dems Diving For Dope Dollars**

**by Scott Thompson**

At the bi-annual conference of George Soros' Drug Policy Alliance (DPA), speaker after speaker (when away from the cameras and the tape recorders) gleefully discussed how they would legalize drugs, all the time whispering that legalization has to be "kept separate" from Soros' latest

front-end operation: the takeover of the Democratic Party.

## U.S. Economic/Financial News

### Trade Deficit Surge Reflects Dying Wal-Mart Economy

The U.S. trade deficit in goods and services grew to \$41.3 billion in September, as imports rose to \$127.4 billion—a record monthly high, the Commerce Department said Nov. 13. For January-September, the trade gap was a staggering \$366 billion, up 21% from the level during the same period last year.

The goods portion of the deficit rose to \$46.5 billion in September, as imports jumped to a whopping \$106.3 billion—proving the U.S. can no longer produce the physical means to survive, and depends on virtual slave labor around the world for its goods. Through September, the goods deficit was \$410 billion.

Under the Wal-Mart "model," manufacturers have been forced to move operations, and shut down plants in the U.S., once the world's leading producer economy. Imports from China hit a record-high \$14.8 billion in September, thanks to imperial Wal-Mart, resulting in a record trade deficit of \$12.7 billion.

### Personal Bankruptcies Hit a New High in FY03

Personal bankruptcies rose 7.8% in fiscal 2003, to 1.63 million—another record high, due to a surge in consumer debt and rising unemployment. Overall, there were 1.66 million bankruptcies, both personal and business, filed in Federal court between Oct. 1, 2002 and Sept. 30, 2003, up 7.4% from the level in fiscal year 2002, according to the Administrative Offices of the U.S. Courts. This is the highest-ever total of bankruptcy filings. In fact, since 1994, bankruptcies in Federal courts have soared a whopping 98%—nearly double in 9 years.

Personal bankruptcy filings grew by 7.8% during the 12-month period, to a record 1.63 million. Business filings declined by 7.4% to 36,183 in the year ending September 30, 2003.

### Wal-Martized Maytag Threatens Move to Mexico

Maytag, under pressure from Wal-Mart, is threatening to shut its Hoover Vacuum factory in Ohio, and move production to Mexico. the *Akron Beacon Journal* reported this month. The appliance-maker is demanding cuts in health insurance and other benefits, plus changes in job-security rules for production workers at its Hoover vacuum manufacturing plant in North Canton, Ohio—or else, it will shut down the factory by 2005. The current union contract stipulates that two vacuum models be made in Ohio. Production would be moved to El Paso, Texas and Juarez, Mexico, where wages are lower, if the cost-cutting measures aren't approved.

Wal-Mart's power in dictating prices to suppliers, such as Hoover (whose parent company is Maytag), reportedly has already forced Hoover to shift some production jobs from Ohio, to areas with lower labor costs.

Hoover blamed its 20% decline in vacuum sales, during the third quarter, on other companies' \$79 models—made in Asia to meet Wal-Mart's price demands—which are outselling Hoover's \$100+ vacuum cleaners produced in the U.S.

Previously, Maytag had said that it would close its refrigeration manufacturing plant in Galesburg, Ill., by the end of 2004.

Meanwhile, Whirlpool has announced it will shift some refrigerator production from a plant at Fort Smith, Ark., to a new facility in Mexico, according to the *Arkansas Times Record* Nov. 12. The move would affect 2,700 Arkansans employed by Whirlpool suppliers in the Fort Smith area, as well as 1,500 workers at the refrigerator factory itself—the largest employer in Fort Smith.

## **Washington, D.C. Faces Drastic Shortage of Hospital Beds**

Hospital beds in the nation's capital have been cut by 41.6% since 1994—from 4,741 acute-care beds in '94, to only 2,767 today, according to the D.C. Hospital Association(DCHA). The numbers, alone, however do not convey the full calamitous nature of the crisis in Washington, D.C. today. As the District of Columbia Hospital Association reports (Oct. 20), the lack of beds has caused ambulances, filled with patients needing emergency care, to line up at hospital emergency rooms, waiting for beds. Hospitals are on bypass or diversions for hours, that is, they are forced to close to ambulances for hours because there are no beds available. As the DCHA reports: "Without keen attention to this critical situation, emergency department care will remain on the edge of disaster."

The LaRouche political movement warned of exactly this crisis when the genocidal decision was made to close D.C. General Hospital in 2001. The lack of adequate bed capacity—including quarantine beds—puts the region's population in immediate danger, whether from the possibility of the resurgence of SARS (Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome), or some other new, infectious agent, as the Centers of Disease Control and the World Health Organization recently warned, or, from an accidental or intended biochemical incident.

## **'Unprofitable' Power Plants To Be Shut Down**

Just as an unseasonal series of hail storms in California, and wind storms in the Midwest and Atlantic Coast, have left more than 1 million people without power, unregulated independent power producers are shutting down electric-generating plants, because they are "unprofitable." Due to "low wholesale prices,"—meaning prices that have been squeezed from their inflated, Enron-style speculative frenzy down to traditional levels, older power plants are "too expensive" to run, compared with newer gas-burning plants. Producers also complain that there is "excess capacity."

International Power Plc, located in London, is considering mothballing some of its seven U.S. power plants in Massachusetts, Texas, and Georgia, which generate 4,700 MW of power. American Electric Power has mothballed nine plants, and expects to close another one this month. Houston-based CenterPoint Energy's subsidiary Texas Genco Holdings will mothball almost 3,000 MW of gas-fired plants, due to low wholesale prices. Deregulation has taken responsibility for ensuring reserve margins for power out of the hands of state regulators, and left such decisions to "the market."

## **Governator Arnie To Borrow \$20 Billion from Banker Pals**

California's Gov.-Elect Arnie Schwarzenegger plans to borrow a whopping \$20 billion, to paper over the state's budget deficit. Since the state's credit rating is just above junk level, lenders will require guarantees, and high interest rates. State Treasurer Angelides predicted this will cost as much as \$20 billion in interest, on top of repayment of principle, and would severely damage the state's ability to borrow in the future.

## **Home-Mortgage Refinancing Fever Continues**

Americans continue to refinance their homes, at unprecedented rates, although statistics are that "only" 32% of refinancings were for cash-out reasons in the third quarter of this year, as compared with the 60% cash-out proportions

prevailing in the refinancing boom of 2001 and 2002; and the all-time record of 93% set in mid-1989, the *Washington Post* reported Nov. 8. Refinancing, which Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan likes to call, home-equity "monetization," represents half of all current U.S. mortgage activity, which means half of an estimated \$3.3 trillion volume this year alone.

## World Economic News

### Wal-Mart Drives Down Jobs and Wages in China

Wal-Mart's "brutal" low-price demands are even forcing China's factory managers to slash jobs and wages, as well as devastating communities in the United States, the *Wall Street Journal* wrote Nov. 13. Wal-Mart and other retailers, says the *Journal* in a front-page article, are "demanding rock-bottom prices and forcing factory bosses to cut costs any way they can in order to remain in contention for export orders." "It's the survival of the cheapest."

This forces wages, which are already low in China, even lower. For example, Ching Hai Electric Works in Shanjing has cut its workforce by a whopping 50%, to 1,500 employees, even while maintaining the same level of orders for small appliances. In addition, its starting salary is \$32 per month—40% less than the local minimum wage. Workers face up to 18-hr days.

Pressure from Wal-Mart has already forced U.S. manufacturers to close U.S. plants, and move production to China. In Shanjing alone, a southeastern city of 600,000, there are 1,200 factories.

Wal-Mart denies driving the cost-cutting, saying it only capitalizes on it. "As things get more competitive, the pressure that comes along with that—yeah, we try to take advantage of it," says Gary Meyers, a vice-president in global procurement at Wal-Mart.

Wal-Mart expects to purchase \$15 billion of goods from China this year, up from \$12 billion last year.

In 1996, buyers representing Wal-Mart wanted to place a massive order of electric fans with China Hai. Plant manager David Liu, distressed by the low price being demanded by Wal-Mart, turned down the order. Wal-Mart claims there is no record of purchases in its database. Meyers insists, China Hai "doesn't ring a bell."

### German Exports Eastward Growing Steadily

The German office of statistics reported Nov. 11 that exports to Russia, Eastern Europe, and China are increasing steadily, while exports to West Europe and the U.S. are stagnating. August official statistics show that German while exports to eastern countries showed some considerable increases, exports to western countries decreased generally, with the United States and non-eurozone European countries showed the worst declines. The following, cited figures are comparisons with August 2002.

Exports to Russia: up 12.6%; China: up 7.7%; Hungary: up 7.4%; Czechia: up 6.4%; Poland: up 5.0%.

Exports to the 12 Eurozone countries: down 3.1%; non-Eurozone countries: down 6.8; USA: down 19.1%.

### Chavez's Venezuela Now Most Depressed Economy in South America



Venezuelan purchasing power has fallen as much as 7.3% below what it was 50 years ago, according to a study just issued by the UN Development Program (UNDP) and reported in the daily *El Nacional* Nov. 10. According to a report by the Venezuelan Teachers Federation, the average family income only covers 39.7% of the requirements for indispensable food, and other goods and services.

On-the-scene reports also contradict claims by the Chavez government that the health of the population has improved as the result of his "import" of Cuban doctors (the majority are paramedics, in fact). Medical services, in particular, are collapsing, residents say, to the point that patients at public hospitals are forced to bring everything with them, from cotton pads to blood to syringes.

A recent study prepared by the Venezuela Council of Industries reported that 60% of the industries in the country have disappeared over the last four years. That is, 4,611 out of the total 11,198 which existed in 1999, have shut down. Those that remain active, are using only 44% of their machinery and equipment. This is due to two causes, primarily: the deep collapse of internal demand, and the government's utilization of exchange controls to shut down industry. Venezuelan industries are highly dependent on imports, given that nearly 60% of the raw materials they use is imported from abroad. Yet, over the nine months the exchange controls have been in effect, the government had released only \$2 billion to industry, whereas previously, businesses spent more than \$500 million a month on imports.

Thus, it is not surprising that, according to a report by the UN's Economic Commission on Latin America, Venezuela's economy contracted 27.6% in the first quarter of this year, helped along by the effects of the nationwide strike, in early 2003, which attempted, but failed to oust dictator Hugo Chavez from office. The economy fell an additional 9.4% in the second quarter, putting Venezuela ahead of Argentina as the Ibero-American economy with the severest recession on the continent.

### **Free-Traders Meet in Miami; Counter-Assault Threatened**

Ministers from the 34 countries of the Western Hemisphere are meeting in Miami Nov. 17-21, to try to set the rules for the final negotiations of a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA). A pre-meeting was held this past weekend of Nov. 8-9 at a conference center in Leesburg, Virginia, attended by U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick, and by ministers of 16 of the 34 countries, including Brazil's Foreign Minister Celso Amorim, described as one of the spokesmen for the developing-sector "bloc," which has, up till now, resisted U.S. pressures to capitulate.

According to web sites run by the various Jacobin operations regularly launched against IMF and WTO meetings as provocateur side-shows, the Miami meeting on the FTAA will be a definite target of these networks. One such outfit, comparing itself to the coca-growers in Bolivia, put out the following alert: "For those of us who can attend, now is the time.... In Cancun, we derailed the WTO; now we have a crucial opportunity to carry the momentum forward and derail the FTAA... We are calling for massive non-violent direct action in Miami.... Our direct action—following in the footsteps of resistance movements in Bolivia, El Salvador, and elsewhere in the Global South—can take many forms...."

## **Ibero-American News Digest**

### **Alliance Formed to Block Energy Privatization in Mexico**

The presidium at the front of Mexico City's Camino Real Hotel ballroom too small to fit all the dignitaries present on Nov. 7, when PRI Senator Manuel Bartlett, PRD leader Cuauhtemoc Cardenas, and the PRI Governor of the state of Oaxaca, Jose Murat, announced the formation of an alliance to stop the energy "reforms" demanded by foreign financier interests. Many trade union leaders and PRI and PRD Congressmen attended, and organizers reported that ten Senators and 32

Federal Deputies had signed the statement supporting the alliance. A mobilization for a mass demonstration on Nov. 27 was announced, which, organizers said, should become "the most important in recent times."

Those present acknowledged that many among them have had deep and abiding conflicts with each other, but these must now be pushed aside "in the interest of the nation." This was most evident in the case of Manuel Bartlett and Cuauhtemoc Cardenas. (Bartlett was Secretary of Government in 1988, when an election day "computer failure" ensured the PRI's Carlos Salinas de Gortari defeated the PRD's Cardenas in his bid for the Presidency.) Bartlett, who has spearheaded a national campaign to defend Mexico's energy sector, was the more dramatic of the two, speaking of the urgency of "protecting the Fatherland," of a "brutal threat to the nation," and "the importance of our uniting to stop the country from being handed over." Cardenas, for his part, said "there is no forgiving, the past is still present," but that at this time, "the issue of electricity demands the alliance."

A document drafted by Gov. Jose Murat was read, denouncing the Fox government's "Goebbels'-like lies" that the Federal Electricity Commission (CFE) is bankrupt, and argued that there is no technical reason to hand the CFE over to private, multi-national interests; the CFE's financial problems are due only to the government's over-taxation of the company. The Mexican State must continue to be "the promoter of development," and, therefore, it must keep control over strategic sectors such as electricity, and energy in general.

The increasing isolation of the Salinas-allied leadership of the PRI party machine, which promised President Fox it could deliver PRI support for Wall Street's privatization plan, was further demonstrated on Nov. 11, when a meeting was held at the national PRI headquarters itself, to release a document from the Colosio Foundation opposing electricity privatization, under whatever guise. Amongst the signers were two former Secretaries of Finance, and three former leaders of the PRI—including such familiar names as Mario Moya Palencia and Mario Ramon Beteta, PRI officials whose terms in office in the 1970s and 1980s were not marked by any great nationalism.

## **Foreign Hand-over of Mexican Energy Stalls**

Halliburton, along with several other foreign oil companies, have pulled out of bidding for the exploration rights over the next block of Mexico's gas-rich Burgos basin in the north. The state oil company Pemex announced on Nov. 5 that it had cancelled bidding on its planned 20-year exploration concession for the Carindon-Pandura block, because of the number of companies which had pulled out. This was the largest and most profitable of the exploration licenses for the Burgos basin to be put up for auction yet, granting access to 36% of the giant gas reserves in the basin, which extends over parts of the states of Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, and Coahuila. There have been similar earlier pull-outs in bidding for other blocs.

The foreign oil companies have a problem: the contracts being offered by Pemex are unconstitutional, and could be overturned at any point in the future, unless Mexico is politically broken. PRI Sen. Manuel Bartlett, who has spearheaded the fight to defend the country's energy resources, warned foreign interests in a press conference last June 25, that, should they violate Mexico's laws by investing along the lines the Fox government is proposing, sooner or later, they would face criminal charges. Bartlett's warning was issued as he announced that he and PRI Congressman Salvador Rocha had filed a well-documented suit, seeking that the Mexican courts cancel 44 unconstitutional licenses granted in the electricity sector, and bring criminal charges against those parties found to be in violation of the law.

## **Will Schwarzenegger Be Declared *Persona Non Grata* In Baja California?**

The PRD party bloc in the state legislature of Baja California Sur is proposing that California governor-elect Arnold "The Terminator" Schwarzenegger be declared *persona non grata* in their state, due to his xenophobic and racist campaign against Mexican immigrants. According to the head of the local PRD bloc, Elsa de la Paz Esquivel Amador, Schwarzenegger's racist campaign, "reminiscent of the KKK," violates migration treaties between Mexico and the United

States.

De la Paz Esquivel was responsible for getting the Baja California Sur Congress to declare George Bush *persona non grata*, and to demand an international trial for war crimes against the U.S. President, when he made the decision to invade Iraq.

## **Dominican Republic Strike Worsens Political and Economic Breakdown of that Nation**

A 24-hour national strike against miserable living conditions in the Dominican Republic on Nov. 11, resulted in the death of at least six people, and the wounding of another 60, when the government called out the military to impose "order," as protestors pelted security forces with stones, burned tires and cars, and, in several provinces, set fire to the offices of the government sanitation authorities and ruling party. Most of those killed were youths, in their early twenties.

The strike, organized by labor unions, demanded a halt to medicine and gas price hikes (inflation is expected to top 35% this year), an increase in wages, and that somebody do something about the power outages which leave large parts of the country without electricity for 12-20 hours a day. The government, expecting an IMF mission to arrive this week in the country, took a hard line, arresting close to 800 people on various excuses in the run-up to the strike, and ordering the military and police to do whatever is necessary to control protests — thus the killings.

The underlying issue, is the disintegration of the nation's financial and physical economy, the latter most visible in the breakdown of the national electricity capacity, resulting from its privatization. The national banking system de facto collapsed last May, when the country's second largest commercial bank, Banco Internacional (Baninter), went under. At that time, the IMF, World Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank came in with a two-year loan package, so the government could bail out the bank. The IMF suspended the accord, and thus the promised loans, however, when the government re-purchased two power companies from their Spanish owner, an expenditure not approved by the IMF. That left the government without the cash to pay subsidies to energy distributors, who in turn have not paid the generators.

The government is so desperate, that it announced in early November, that it would fundraise "donations" from businesses, to come up with the money to cover the deficit over the next six months. It had lined up \$54 million from hoteliers, exporters, and the duty-free zone, so far.

The president of the Dominican-American Chamber of Commerce, Jorge Ivan Ramirez, told the *Financial Times* that businesses were chipping in, because "if the government does not manage the situation in a more disciplined and equitable manner, there will be a breakdown in social order and political legitimacy."

## **Bolivia Asks For Debt Forgiveness**

The new Bolivian government of Carlos Mesa drew up a ten-point "anti-crisis" program to be presented to the summit of Ibero-American nations that began in Santa Cruz on Nov. 14. The President Pro Tem of the summit, Gonzalo Montenegro, said that Mesa government hopes that the gathering will approve the program, which includes a call for debt forgiveness, as well as plans to bolster the tourism and export sectors. The government also needs an immediate infusion of cash to deal with a fiscal deficit of eight million dollars. The Ibero-American leaders are said to be planning to call on the IMF and Inter-American Development Bank, to find ways to ease the foreign debt burden of member nations.

The summit includes the heads of state of Spain and Portugal.

Frightened by how precarious Bolivia's situation continues to be, and the great possibility for its crisis to spill over onto its

neighbors, Ibero-American governments, particularly Argentina and Brazil, are mobilizing to come up with aid, and offering a number of bilateral cooperation agreements. Brazil has already forgiven Bolivia's \$47.5 mn. debt, and has said that there will be no conditions attached to any aid offered. Mesa was scheduled to meet with his Argentine counterpart, Nestor Kirchner, November 15-16, to work out details of cooperation programs, and Argentine ambassador Horacio Macedo is emphasizing that Brazil and Argentina together will take major responsibility for getting Bolivia back on its feet.

George Soros's cocalero leader, Evo Morales, is meanwhile organizing the "Alternative Social Gathering" in Santa Cruz, in opposition to the Ibero-American summit, support for which is coming from Cuba's Fidel Castro and Venezuela's Hugo Chavez. Brazil's Lula da Silva has been invited to join the group, but his attendance there is not confirmed. President Carlos Mesa does intend to attend the alternative conference.

## **Soros' "Harm Reduction" Advances in Buenos Aires**

George Soros's "harm-reduction" policies—drug legalization—are being aggressively pursued by the City government of Buenos Aires, Argentina's capital. Buenos Aires, is now the "autonomous city of Buenos Aires," an enclave of Argentines who work closely with the continental narco-terrorist association, the Sao Paulo Forum. The drug legalizers are using the fact that Argentina now has the highest rate in Ibero-America, of people who become infected with HIV through drug use and shared needles, to demand drug legalization, in order to "reduce the harm" done to addicts. Buenos Aires Health Ministry AIDS Coordinator, Claudio Bloch, told *La Nacion* Nov. 7 that the high rate of HIV infection via drug use, "poses the necessity of developing policies of harm reduction in the city, which we are carrying out, orienting them toward promotion of lower-risk consumption" (free distribution of needles, safe sex, condom distribution, etc.). Bloch insisted that these kind of policies have had great success in Brazil and Australia.

These policies were the focus of the conference "Porto Alegre/Buenos Aires. Prevention of HIV-Aids in drug-users: Two Cities, One Policy," which began on Nov. 6 in Buenos Aires, and in which "specialists" from both cities discussed how to coordinate their efforts. Porto Alegre is famous as the Brazilian city in which the Jacobin World Social Forum was founded, run by the worst elements of the ruling Workers' Party (PT), which have imposed fascist decentralization, and encouraged legalized drugs and prostitution. Buenos Aires Mayor Anibal Ibarra, who sympathizes with the Sao Paulo Forum, opened the Buenos Aires conference, asserting that the priority must be to "prevent greater problems, before eradicating unlawful drug use." (See [InDepth](#), for two articles providing the background on the Soros drug legalization offensive generally.)

## **Western European News Digest**

### **Zepp-LaRouche's Schiller Tribute Echoed by German President**

On Nov. 8-9, in Berlin and Wiesbaden, Germany, the Schiller Institute held its annual *Schillerfest* events celebrating the Nov. 10 birthday of Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805), the Poet of Freedom and of the American Revolution. The events continue the tradition begun in 1984, when Helga Zepp-LaRouche founded the Schiller Institute, as an international organization of statecraft, culture, and dedicated to building a new renaissance. In Wiesbaden, 120 people attended; parallel events held in Berlin and other cities, were attended by many members and contacts of the LaRouche Youth Movement.

Zepp-LaRouche has long insisted that Friedrich Schiller can uniquely provide the insights needed to defend a true republic, and that it is especially relevant today, in the face of the U.S. unilateral war in Iraq. Right after Zepp-LaRouche's event, German President Johannes Rau, perhaps reflecting how far the international crisis has gone, on Nov. 10, for the first time,

took up exactly this issue of Schiller. Apart from being the first speech on Schiller by a leading German politician in decades, Rau's Marbach speech (see next item) also reflects the massive impact which the LaRouche movement and the Schiller Institute, have had on the issue of the German Classics. And some of Rau's remarks sounded as if copied from the Institute's celebration events in Berlin, Wiesbaden, and other cities, during the days before.

The unique presentation, in which Zepp-LaRouche provided selections of drama, poems, and the essays and letters of Schiller, through narration, mostly by youth, "brought every aspect of Schiller's work to life for today," reported one member of the audience, especially because of the LYM members, who moved the audience by demonstrating "how deeply they all had captured the complex Schiller thoughts."

The full presentation by Zepp-LaRouche will appear in an upcoming issue of *EIW* as a feature.

## **German President Says 'a Bit of Schiller' Is Good**

President Johannes Rau, in a speech delivered Nov. 10 at Marbach, the birthplace of Friedrich Schiller, recalled the Schiller celebrations in 1955, but even more those of 1905 and 1859, as showing an adoration of Schiller throughout the nation, which is difficult to understand today, when the great poet seems almost forgotten. The first big celebrations in 1859 showed Schiller as a positive idol of the middle class and educated people; the celebrations of 1905 also showed Schiller as an idol of the working classes—all 89 Social Democratic journals and newspapers had articles on Schiller, he said.

But even in 1955, Schiller's reputation as the great poet of freedom was indicated by the fact that an audience of several thousand attended the central ceremony in Berlin. Goethe's statement after Schiller's death that "he was ours," was an appropriate description of how much appreciation there was for Schiller, in former times.

Today, people are running after all kinds of idols, none of them of the greatness of Schiller, most of them not even knowing about him, Rau said, but adding, that the previous support for Schiller is gone forever, cannot be revived anymore. But "a bit of Schiller" would be good for contemporary Germany.

## **Cynicism About Iraq War Is Tangible in British Isles**

A Scottish journalist told *EIR* Nov. 11, that the depth and breadth of cynicism about the Iraq war is growing by the day. There is "extreme cynicism about the rationale" for the war. This comes out in casual conversations with people, as well as in political discussions.

On the fights within the Labour Party, he said that the Tony Blair-Gordon Brown rift has been "patched up a bit," but it is uncertain how long this will last. Blair realizes that he cannot afford to move Brown out of the Treasury position at this time: "It would spook the markets." Brown has been responsible for the "stability" of the British economy since new Labour came to power in May 1997, the journalist noted. "This is not the time to be axing your Chancellor."

As to the woes of the royals, there is a "big popular cynicism about the Windsors, especially in places like Scotland, where there are strong republican sympathies," he said. The revelations by Paul Burrell and others, have not done the worst damage, he noted. Some two-three years ago, the *Daily Telegraph*—the "heart of the establishment"—brought out a series by Graham Turner about the Windsors. This "friendly fire" was most damaging, and that is when the rot really set in. Since then, it has been "drip, drip, drip," and you wonder how much longer this can go on.

## **Bush Not Welcome in Britain**

Huge demonstrations are planned for George W. Bush's Nov. 20. visit to Great Britain, the first official visit by a U.S. President since Ronald Reagan in 1982, and the first-ever "State" visit (meaning his hostess is the Queen). This is causing enormous tension for Prime Minister Tony Blair. The Stop the War Coalition" and the Muslim Association of Britain, who organized the huge pre-war protests, expect 100,000 people to rally in central London; in response, U.S. authorities are getting very nervous, and demanding that a big "exclusion zone" be set up wherever the President goes, in effect banning demonstrations in Trafalgar Square and Westminster, the seat of the British government.

London Mayor Ken Livingstone is insisting that demonstrators be free to stage their protests against the war. The Metropolitan police are cancelling all leave, but Londoners are demanding that the national government, not the city, pay for all the security costs.

"It is an outrage that the most unwelcome guest this country has ever received will be given the freedom of the streets while a movement that represents majority opinion is denied the right to protest in ... the heart of government," said a spokeswoman for the Stop the War Coalition.

### **U.S. Neo-con Richard Perle Threatens Germany**

Addressing the annual *Welt am Sonntag* (*Sunday World* newspaper) forum in Berlin Oct. 31, top Cheneyac neo-con Richard Perle declared: "There are common values that we have to defend, there are apparently common interests which should be utilized for their protection. But one concept does not fit in: namely, the idea of a Europe as a counterweight to the U.S.A. We should not fool ourselves: there are members in our [NATO] alliance that really believe that Europe should be positioned as counterweight to the U.S. Chirac, for example; Dominique de Villepin, for example. And others in Europe think alike, too, it seems. That has to be clarified in Europe. Europe has to decide whether it wants to become a counterweight or remain an ally. These two exclude each other.

"If Germany supports the French concept, it is the end of NATO. If, however, Germany realizes that Europe should not be a counterweight to the U.S., that the community of interests and values is so important that a European counterweight were the last thing we would want, it would be the beginning of a new NATO.

"Too many in Europe, too many Germans, too many French and others believe that the Franco-German relationship is crucial for peace. And that the essence of that relationship is agreements between governments, in the last instance. I think that is a misinterpretation of history. Peace on this continent is not secured by talks between Chirac and Schroeder, not by agreements between these two either, but by millions of Germans electing their government in a democratic way. That is the key to peace and security in Europe, rather than pure diplomacy."

### **Italy Hit by Political Firestorm After Nassiriya Bombing**

Italy's Defense Minister Martino declared the bombing of the Italian headquarters in Iraq, which killed 19, and injured more than 80, "our September 11," which is likely to trigger a political "seastorm" in Italy. Former Premier Giuliano Amato said in an interview with *Corriere della Sera*, Nov. 13, that even though the opposition praised Martino for his report to Parliament on the attack, the *Corriere* interviewer questioned whether the situation didn't "look very much like the lull before the storm.

"Maybe," Amato answered. "It is being reported ... that Saddam Hussein, from the beginning, decided to avoid an open battle against the U.S. and Great Britain. If that is true, it is clear that the army has disappeared, in order to appear again in the form of a guerrilla force. It is the same technique used by the Russians with Napoleon's armies two centuries ago, and

with the Nazis during World War II."

While Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi's official line was that Italy, the nation with the third-highest deployment of troops, at about 2,600, will not pull out, another reality may be setting in. After the Italian headquarters bombing, Japan informed the U.S. that it will *not* be sending troops, and South Korea is reportedly reducing its troops to 3,000, from the 5,000 pledged—and none of them will be combat troops.

### **Leading Italian Daily: Does U.S. Have Iraq Exit Plan?**

Senior commentator and former diplomat Sergio Romano raised sensitive questions about Iraq in his Nov. 13 column in *Corriere della Sera*. Theoretically, Romano posits, the only way out for the U.S. in Iraq would be "the solution adopted by Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon in Vietnam in the Sixties." "This is possibly the solution which many members of the Bush Administration have in mind ... but in Vietnam, there was a southern government which could resist for a couple of years, and give the Americans the possibility to abandon the stage. In Iraq, there is nothing; and Iraq, after an American withdrawal, would immediately collapse into chaos." America's allies in Iraq are uneasy, Romano writes. "They cannot leave because it would be interpreted as a betrayal. But they start to ask the question whether their ally has, what in American political jargon is called, an 'exit strategy.' "

### **France's Stand on Iraq No Longer Taboo in Washington**

*Le Monde* correspondent Patrick Jarreau, writing in the Nov. 13 edition, implies that a process of a change of mind is beginning in the U.S., toward the French stand before the Iraq war, due to the problems the U.S. has met on the ground. Jarreau points to Philip Gordon of the Brookings Institution, who has said, "since the Americans began to meet problems in Iraq, the French position is seen in another way."

Another indication of a change in tone is given in weekly *National Journal*, under the headline: "The French were right." According to the *Journal*, Chirac was right on three points: There was no immediate threat from weapons of mass destruction; the Americans were not welcomed as liberators; and the Muslim world sees this intervention as an aggression.

Jarreau speaks of a "French Caucus" which was created by Republican Congressman Amory Houghton (N.Y.) at the end of October, during the visit of the chairman of France's National Assembly Foreign Affairs Committee head, Eduard Balladur, in Washington. Members of the Senate's "French Caucus" are bipartisan: John Warner (R-Va), Chuck Hagel (R-Neb), Joe Biden (D-Del), and Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif).

### **Germany, France Consider New Prospects on Cooperation**

Following the publication of a prominent article in *Le Monde* on Nov. 13, headlined, "Paris and Berlin reflect on a common French-German Union," the paper carried a short interview with the former foreign-policy speaker of the German CDU/CSU faction Karl Lamers, in which Lamers definitively agrees that, "today, there exists a kind of French-German union," and that both countries have to present a "unified" political view, to "serve as a model for the type of European union which Jean Monnet had conceived of, as a contribution to a better world." This means that the two countries must be at the same time the "magnetic core for a big Europe."

Lamers sees the significance of this alliance as necessary for coordination and consultation on objectives in the domain of finance, defense, foreign, and European policy. Lamers proposes this could begin with closer coordination between high-level officials in the respective ministries of the two countries. For example, the National Assembly and the Bundestag could constitute a common parliamentary commission, composed of several representatives from different sectors, whose

function is "to accompany the executive decision-making process."

The governments should likewise make regular reports on their political cooperation, and once or twice a year, report on the status of their cooperation before the plenum of the respective national assemblies in presence of the ministers of the other country. France and Germany should have a leading position in Europe, but not dominate it, says Lamers.

As for NATO, Lamers speaks of the need for a renewed alliance, which is neither vassalage for Europe, nor one in which the U.S. alone would make decisions.

### **German Chancellor Pays Tribute to Key Advisor**

In numerous news dailies of Germany, Nov. 13, Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder published an official obituary for Brigitte Sauzay (55), his chief adviser on relations with France for five years, who died in Paris, on Nov. 11.

The text stated: "Mrs. Sauzay has, as my adviser at the Chancellery for German-French relations, helped to shape cooperation between Germany and France to a special extent. The fact that our two countries—40 years after the signing of the Elysée Treaty—are close to each other as never before, is also owed to her."

Schroeder added that for Sauzay, the promotion of relations between Berlin and Paris also was, beyond her official duties, a "matter of the heart," and a deep personal commitment. Associates repeatedly pointed out that Sauzay helped prepare the historic Paris-Versailles Summit in January 2003, in her own way, for example, through ironic cultural-historical memos called "notes d'humeur," which gave insight into the sentiments on each side, and into ways of dealing with that.

## **Russia and Central Asia News Digest**

### **Vajpayee on Strategic Visit To Russia**

Before his arrival Nov. 11 on a state visit to Russia, Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee spoke of the potential for cooperation among Russia, India, and China. Asked by *Rossiskaya Gazeta* about the proposed Delhi-Moscow-Beijing triangle, Vajpayee said: "There are several issues on which the three countries share views, and can consult each other. The creation of a just, multi-polar world is one such issue." Russian and Indian press reported that cooperation in the defense and space sectors would lead the agenda of Vajpayee's talks with Russian President Vladimir Putin. Vajpayee's visit to Moscow, includes his fourth meeting with Putin this year.

Ten bilateral agreements were to be signed during the summit. Included among the economic ones, Vajpayee stated, would be establishment of a task force "to work out modalities of utilizing the remainder of Rupee-Rouble debt funds [worth about US\$3 billion] for investment in both countries," with an emphasis on high-technology areas. A special rupee-ruble exchange agreement dates from the Soviet period. Another key issue was the two countries' views on Central Asia. Indian Ambassador K. Raghunath to Russia stated: "We have a lot to say, on our immediate neighbor Central Asia." Russia has indicated that it would welcome a greater involvement of India in Central Asia. Foreign Secretary Kanwal Sibal announced beforehand that a Declaration on Global Challenges would be signed, regarding security and stability issues, and defense ties between the two would be reviewed at the highest level.

On Nov. 8, Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko said that Russian and Indian "relations make a steady progress toward strengthening the strategic partnership." He added that their joint naval exercise held in the Indian Ocean this last May "marked a new stage in the strategic partnership." The two countries "are looking for ways to boost



trade and increase the share of high-tech and science intensive products in it." Russia also welcomes New Delhi's initiatives to improve relations with Pakistan, he said.

## **New Delhi Analyst: Russia-India Summit Is History-Making**

"This is how history is made," said a well-connected Indian analyst on Nov. 13, about the just-ended India-Russia summit. There is a "big change" in the way the joint statements are made, he said, a "very firm and clear message, that 'we will fight terrorism with all the might at our command, everywhere.'" This is not just a message to al-Qaeda, he said; it is also a message to Washington and its allies. The message is, from India and Russia, "we are now together," and there also is China. India and Russia not only agreed to major defense cooperation, and joint production of technologies, they are also committed to a multi-polar world.

Most important, was that Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee brought with him a group of 100 leading Indian industrialists and businessmen, the New Delhi source said. This was a very important event, amidst President Putin's troubles with the Russian oligarchy and its international supporters. "Russia can now say, 'We have friends all over the world,' who want to work with us economically. The oligarchy has been told that they must behave. There was a lot of discussion of expansion of trade, and joint investment in strategic areas, including in oil."

## **Nuclear Power, Space Cooperation Between Russia and India**

The Russian Atomic Energy Ministry called for lifting the sanctions against supplying India with nuclear technology, as India and Russia begin discussions on cooperation on the peaceful use of nuclear energy. On the eve of the summit last week, Indian National Security Advisor Brajesh Mishra, in Moscow since Nov. 8, met with Atomic Energy Minister Alexander Rumyantsev. The Russian Ministry announced: "It is high time to review bans on nuclear cooperation with India imposed in 1992 by the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG)." Before the Russian announcement, Indian First Deputy Foreign Minister Kanval Sibal had told reporters in New Delhi that India was interested in buying more nuclear-energy reactors from Russia. He said that India realized that Russia was bound by its participation in the Nuclear Suppliers Group. Russia is already participating in building two light-water reactors at India's Kudankulam nuclear power plant in Tamilnadu state.

Russian Space Agency head Yuri Koptev announced Nov. 13, after a government meeting to discuss Russia's budget for next year, that "India has drawn up a Moon-study program, and Russia, with its long-time experience, is in favor of participating in it." The Indian government approved a mission for a lunar satellite in September. This, and other space cooperation, was discussed with Russian officials during Prime Minister Vajpayee's trip to Moscow. Koptev recalled that Russia's cooperation with India in space began more than 30 years ago.

## **Central Asia Transport Boosted**

India will participate with Iran and Uzbekistan in building trans-Afghanistan road and rail links between Termez, Uzbekistan, and Chahbahor port in Iran, Indian External Affairs Minister Yashwant Sinha announced in Tashkent on Nov. 8. Sinha, on a three-day visit to Uzbekistan, said that the trilateral Indo-Afghan-Iranian accord on building the road would reduce the distance from India to Central Asia by 1,500 km. "We have also decided to add a rail link too," he announced. The 200 km Zaranj-Delaran sector of the proposed transport corridor is already complete.

In Tashkent, Sinha reached agreement with the Uzbek leadership to build a highway linking the Afghan port of Khairaton with Herat, and India would negotiate with Kabul to extend the Zaranj-Delaran sector to Herat in western Afghanistan. After Kabul agrees, finances would be worked out. Uzbek Foreign Minister Sadiq Safayev said that "India will be a major

player in this transport project," and indicated that Tashkent has shifted its focus in finding an access to world trade, from the big Pakistani port of Karachi to India's huge port, Mumbai.

Sinha's delegation also let it be known, that "unexpectedly wide-ranging issues" were discussed when he met Uzbek President Islam Karimov, including closer defense and security cooperation.

## **India Gets Military Base in Tajikistan**

In advance of Indian Prime Minister Vajpayee's Nov. 14 visit to Tajikistan, the Indian Defense Ministry's Military Engineering Services (MES) finished preparing an air base at Ayni, 10 kms northeast of the Tajik capital, Dushanbe. This will be the first official Indian military base in a foreign country. The facilities at Ayni, according to press reports, consist of runways to handle fighter aircraft and heavy-lift transport aircraft and steeling up existing hangars to house them. The MES is also building housing to station Indian troops, to train Tajik troops, and keep an eye on Indian interests in Central Asia.

India's interests there, in physical terms, consist of Indian Oil and Natural Gas Corp. Videsh Ltd.'s tie-up with Kazakhstan for oil exploration in Alibekmola and Kurmangazi fields, which straddle the Kazakh-Russian borders. India and Tajik special forces held joint exercises in February this year. In April, Defense Minister George Fernandes paid a visit to Dushanbe to sign the India-Tajik defense pact.

## **Georgia Regime in Crisis After Elections**

The immediate threat of violence in downtown Tbilisi, Georgia, abated on Nov. 15, but the political crisis continued, when some 15,000 demonstrators surrounded the main government building, demanding the resignation of President Eduard Shevardnadze. Armored vehicles of the Internal Affairs forces were in the street. One protest leader, former Justice Minister and now Tbilisi City Council head Michael Saakashvili, was talking in terms of a "Milosevic" or "Ceaucescu" scenario for Shevardnadze, i.e., his ouster.

The crisis built up quickly after Parliamentary elections, held Nov. 2, but it is not simply the result of dissatisfaction with the economic collapse and hardships. The parties most committed to reversing the submission to foreign takeover of Georgia's key infrastructure, and opposed to subservience to outside geopolitical interests—namely, the Labor Party and the Industry Will Save Georgia party—are not even involved in the demonstrations. The fact that Saakashvili's National Movement and the Burjanadze/Democrats bloc of Nino Burjanadze have taken the lead, has prompted many in Georgia to suspect that the sudden confrontation is an American-run provocation by circles interested in regime change. The opposition, especially the National Movement, reportedly enjoys broad financial support from foreign organizations like the American National Democratic Institute, an arm of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Meanwhile, Saakashvili and Burjanadze charge that Shevardnadze has conspired to rig the elections with the regionally based Renaissance bloc, headed by the leader of Ajaria, Aslan Abashidze. Ajaria accounts for about 20% of eligible voters, borders on Georgia's top trading partner, Turkey, and is the location of a Russian military base.

According to the latest preliminary results (wildly fluctuating returns have been released daily over the past two weeks), the pro-government bloc For A New Georgia was ahead, with over 22%. Next was Renaissance, the Ajarian party, with 20%, Saakashvili's National Movement—18%, Labor Party—14%, Burjanadze-Democrats bloc—8.5%, Industry Will Save Georgia—7.2%. With votes still being counted, the Saakashvili and Burjanadze camps launched demonstrations, demanding that the election results be overturned, and citing exit polls—by foreign NGOs, that give different counts from the preliminary official ones.

Shevardnadze warns that the radical opposition is threatening to launch civil war. He also lashed out against the Soros Foundation, charging that its Georgia office was crudely interfering in the internal affairs of a sovereign country, financing the opposition. Shevardnadze was on the telephone with Russian President Putin Nov. 14 and 15, but there was no official announcement of a Russian mediation effort. Very visible in Tbilisi, however, is U.S. Ambassador Miles, running back and forth between the radical opposition and the authorities, calling for the leadership of the country not to use force, while also holding lengthy, confidential discussions with the rally leaders.

On Nov. 15, Saakashvili and Burjanadze called for the demonstrations to be suspended until Nov. 17, allowing time for talks with Shevardnadze and the regime. Burjanadze says the protests will stop, if the elections are annulled and new ones scheduled. Saakashvili continues to demand that Shevardnadze step down.

## **Pope Thanks Putin for Stance on War**

Receiving Russian President Vladimir Putin at the Vatican on Nov. 5, Pope John Paul II thanked the Russian leader for his work "in favor of the rapprochement between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches," and for Moscow's stance against the Iraq war, and its support for the Road Map in the Middle East, the Pope's collaborators report. The Pope showed Putin the icon of the Virgin of Kazan, a highly venerated image in the Orthodox community, which he hopes to bring as a gift to Patriarch Aleksii II, whenever a Papal visit to Moscow will be possible.

At the end of the meeting, the Pope said to Putin, "I expect good news from you." A spokesman for the Moscow Patriarchate, Vsevolod Chaplin, said he was very satisfied with the Putin-John Paul meeting, which "will have positive effects on the Catholic attitude towards the Orthodox Church."

## **EU and Russia Agree on 'Common Economic Space'**

At the European Union-Russia summit in Italy Nov. 6, a declaration on the definition of a "common economic space," and the scope of Russia's future economic integration with the EU, was signed. Agreement was found also on three more "common spaces," already discussed at a previous meeting in St. Petersburg: internal security, external security and culture. Russian President Vladimir Putin, in his speech to the summit, stressed that Europe's global political, economic, and commercial weight, as well as its influence in the security sphere, will depend on specific coordinated actions. Putin voiced hope that Russia and the expanding EU could guide the process of establishing a new world order, as well as forging common values and interests, but only by acting together.

Following the Russia-EU meeting and Putin's bilateral talks with Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, the Italian oil company ENI signed a deal with Gazprom that is a first: it allows ENI to re-export Russian natural gas. Putin said of the revolutionary decision, "New horizons and prospects are opening up here. This decision is a step to meet Italy." Putin cautioned, however, not to link the fuel prices to the ongoing talks on Russia's entry in the World Trade Organization. "Russia can talk prices both on the bilateral and multilateral basis, but not as regards entry into the WTO," Putin said.

## **Iranian National Security Council Chief to Moscow**

Hassan Rowhani, secretary of the Supreme National Security Council of Iran, the man who negotiated the nuclear agreement with the Europeans in October, left Tehran for Moscow on Nov. 9. Rowhani had been scheduled to visit Moscow a week earlier but, perhaps due to the presence there of Ariel Sharon, his visit was suddenly postponed. Having completed talks with Mohammed ElBaradei of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Rowhani went to Moscow to discuss the issue of nuclear fuel for Iran's nuclear plant at Bushehr, which the Russians are completing. Russia wants Iran to return the spent fuel.

Before leaving, Rowhani reiterated that Iran's commitment to sign the additional Non-Proliferation Treaty protocol does not limit its right to use nuclear energy, nor its right to enrich uranium. He stressed the priority of preserving Iran's sovereignty, independence, and national dignity.

## **Russia Will Build First Floating Nuclear Power Plant**

The State Chief Export Commission of Russia Nov. 10 recommended a Rosenergoatom design for a prototype of a floating nuclear-power plant, to be constructed off the coast near Severodvinsk in the Arkhangelsk region. The project is to improve and secure the energy supply in the regions along the Arctic Sea route, and, as Rosenergoatom said in a press release, the price of electricity generated by such a floating plant will be half of the price to be paid for electricity generated by a conventional thermal plant using organic fuel.

The Rosenergoatom release says that the cost of the prototype of the floating plant will be about \$150 million, and the payback procedure will be stretched over a period of 13 years. Two other designs for floating plants exist and have to be authorized: 1) in the Kamchatka region, 2) on the Chukotskoi peninsula. A miniaturized model of the floating plant is displayed at an ongoing Russian high-tech exhibit that Mayor John Street has helped to arrange in Philadelphia.

## **Mideast News Digest**

### **Suicide Bombing in Riyadh Residential Compound**

Terrorists, driving a jeep filled with explosives, shot their way into a walled housing compound west of Riyadh, Saudi Arabia's capital, Nov. 8, and then, blew up the jeep, killing 13 people, and injuring as many as 200 others. The impact of the powerful bomb was felt miles away. Those killed, including four children, were from Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Lebanon, and Egypt. More bodies may be found under the rubble of the wealthy, 200-residence compound, which housed many nationalities, including many Arab expatriates, but also Americans, Canadians, Eastern Europeans, Asians, and Africans.

The incident came just after the U.S. closed its Saudi Embassy the same day, and closed consulates, after having received information of possible attacks. An Embassy spokesperson said that all Embassy personnel were accounted for, and that the Embassy would remain closed until further notice.

A Saudi official told AFP that the attack bore the hallmarks of the Osama bin Laden network. "The method in which the bombing was executed is similar to that used in the May 12 bombings" of three expatriate residential compounds, said the official, on conditions of anonymity. "This confirms that those who carried out the bombing belong to the al-Qaeda movement," he said.

### **Two Istanbul Synagogues Bombed**

Two Jewish synagogues in Istanbul, Turkey were bombed on Nov. 15, within minutes of each other, killing at least 20 and wounding more than 257 people. An official of the Jewish community in Istanbul told Reuters that six of the dead, and up to 80 of the wounded were Jews, the rest being passers-by or nearby residents. Interior Minister Abdulkadir Aksu said police were still investigating whether the attacks were suicide bombings, or set off by a timer or remote control.

A group calling itself the Great Eastern Islamic Raiders' Front claimed responsibility for the attack, but police reportedly said that the attack was too sophisticated to have been carried out by that group. Turkish Foreign Minister Abdullah Gul

said, "It is obvious that this terrorist attack has some international connections," meaning, of course, al-Qaeda.

## **New Government To Take Control of Iraq by June**

All 24 members of the Iraq Governing Council have accepted a plan presented to them by U.S. proconsul Paul Bremer, that will have the U.S. occupation authority turning over sovereignty to a transitional government by next June. The Council's acceptance of the plan was announced in a press conference in Baghdad, on Saturday, Nov. 15, after Bremer met with the full Council. Ahmed Chalabi, Donald Rumsfeld's boy on the council, said that the selection of the transitional government will be completed by May, and that it will be "internationally recognized" and will have "full sovereignty." IGC President Jalal Talabani said the new government will then negotiate a role for U.S. troops in the country after the hand-over of power. The transitional government would also then begin the process of choosing delegates to a constitutional convention.

The plan came about amidst panic in the Bush Administration over the deteriorating situation in Iraq, and the impact it might have on the 2004 Presidential election. When Bremer returned to Iraq from Washington on Nov. 14, he outlined the plan to the nine presidents of the IGC, who expressed strong support for it. Adel Abdel-Mehdi, the director of the political bureau of the Supreme Council of the Islamic Revolution in Iraq, said he met with Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani, one of Iraq's most influential Shi'ite leaders, who gave his blessing to the plan, in spite of his disagreement with Bremer over the selection of delegates to a future constitutional convention. Sistani issued an edict, earlier this year, insisting that delegates be chosen by a national election, rather than by the town hall meetings favored by Bremer and the U.S. Administration.

## **U.S. Casualties in Iraq Exceed 9,000**

UPI reporter Mark Benjamin, who earlier broke the story of the warehousing of reservists at Fort Stewart, Ga., has calculated the total number of American casualties in the Iraq war, including non-combat evacuations, to exceed 9,200. According to figures provided by the Army Surgeon General's office, 6,861 troops were evacuated from Iraq for non-combat medical conditions between March 19 and Oct. 30. This compares to a figure of 3,915 released in early October. The new total represents a 57% increase in only a few weeks, but the Army offered no explanation.

## **Abizaid To Hold Strategy Meeting**

The *New York Times* reported Nov. 14 that U.S. Central Command chief Gen. John Abizaid has summoned all of his senior commanders, including Lt. Gen. Ricardo Sanchez, to Centcom headquarters in Tampa, for a one- or two-day meeting this week, to discuss strategy in Iraq. Pentagon officials insisted that the meeting was scheduled some time ago, but it comes at a time when the insurgency in Iraq is becoming increasingly intractable.

Abizaid's summoning of his top commanders also follows an order he issued recently, moving hundreds of his staff to Centcom's forward headquarters in Qatar. This shift reportedly reflects the military's view that large-scale operations in Iraq are expected to continue for some time. The shift also comes at the beginning of the phase of turnover of forces in Iraq. Over the next few months, 85,000 Marines and regular Army troops, plus 43,000 reservists, are to replace the troops currently in Iraq. During this turnover, the number of U.S. troops in the country could reach 180,000 to 200,000 before declining.

Congressional sources warn that this major buildup of U.S. forces, under the cover of the troop rotation, signals plans for a significant counterinsurgency program—to bring the rapidly deteriorating situation under some American control, before major force reductions, being promised by the White House begin in spring 2004.

## **Shi'ite Leader in Baghdad Assassinated by U.S. GIs**

The top municipal official of the Shi'ite neighborhood of Sadr City in Baghdad, Mohammad Ghazi al Kaabi, died, after being shot Nov. 9 by U.S. troops, when he supposedly refused to follow security procedures as he tried to enter his municipal offices. Al Kaabi was fluent in English, and had been appointed to his post by the U.S. occupation forces. U.S. troops broke up a brief demonstration of 200 Shi'ites protesting his killing in Sadr City Nov. 11, but the reverberations from this atrocity have only just started, and could draw the large Shi'ite majority of Iraqis into the resistance.

## **Four Retired Shin Beth Heads Denounce Sharon**

Four former heads of Shin Beth, the Israeli security service, warned that there will be a "catastrophe" if a peace deal is not reached with the Palestinians. This comes just after the swearing in of a new Palestinian government, and after Israeli Defense Forces Chief of Staff Moshe Ya'alon accused the Sharon government of bringing down the former Palestinian government of Abu Mazen (Mahmoud Abbas). The daily paper *Ha'aretz* called this Nov. 11 joint statement, made to the Hebrew-language *Yedioth Arahanoth*, an "unusually brazen criticism" of the government.

Excerpts from the statements of the four:

**Yaakov Perry, Shin Beth chief, 1987-93:** "If ... we go on living by the sword, we will continue to wallow in the mud and destroy ourselves.... We need ... to leave Gaza ... and to dismantle the illegal settlements."

**Ami Ayalon, Shin Beth, 1996-2000,** called for unilateral withdrawal of troops and settlers from Gaza, saying, "We are taking sure, steady steps ... where the State of Israel will no longer be a democracy." Ayalon has organized a peace letter with Palestinian intellectual, Sari Nusseibeh, and the two of them recently toured the United States.

**Avraham Shalom, Shin Beth, 1980-86,** said, "We must admit ... we are behaving disgracefully," and that the violence is "the result of the occupation."

**Carmi Gillon, Shin Beth chief at the time of the Rabin assassination, till 1996,** said the government is "short-sighted" and ignores the question of "getting out of this mess."

All four said that Israel also has to withdraw from the West Bank, even if it means a clash with settlers.

## **Geneva Initiative Peace Drive Accelerates**

With ads in the leading newspapers of Israel Nov. 14, the Yossi Beilin-Abed Rabbo proposal for a mutual peace agreement between Israel and Palestine, known as the Geneva Initiative, is announcing that, in the next few days, every Israeli household will be mailed the full text of the initiative's memorandum.

The memorandum will be distributed in 1.7 million copies in Hebrew, plus another 200,000 each, in Russian and Arabic. An official signing ceremony is scheduled in Geneva on Nov. 20, and is expected to be attended by representatives of the Quartet (United Nations, European Union, Russia, and the U.S.)—possibly excluding the U.S.—and by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter.

## **One-hundred Thousand Israelis March for Peace on Rabin Anniversary**

Israel saw its largest pro-peace demonstration since Ariel Sharon came to power and the current Intifada began, when on Nov. 4, more than 100,000 people gathered in Tel Aviv to honor former Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on the eighth anniversary of his assassination. Picket signs at the non-partisan rally, which reflected the increasing despair at Sharon's war policy, read, "Leave the Territories" and "Sharon Go Home!"

## **Israelis, Palestinians Rally Against 'The Wall'**

Thousands of Israelis and Palestinians demonstrated against Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's "apartheid wall" on the 14th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, Nov. 9. The demonstrations, organized by "Citizens of Israel Against the Fence," were held in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and the West Bank.

What the Israeli government describes as a "fence," "is actually a system of cement walls, electric and barbed wire fences, trenches, patrol roads, trace paths, guard towers, lookouts and cameras. The average width is 60 meters and the length is 590 kilometers, with an estimated building cost of 7 billion Israeli shekels [\$1.5 billion]," stated the leaflet distributed by the marchers. The wall "dissects the West Bank and puts the Palestinians in a pressure cooker: without agriculture, without trade, without water sources, without freedom of movement and without educational, health and welfare services."

One of the organizers of the march, Khulood Badawi from Taayush, the Arab-Jewish Partnership, said that they marched to show the world that "unlike what the Israeli government claims, there is no general consensus in Israel about the wall."

## **Qureia Sworn In as Prime Minister of PA**

Ahmed Qureia, aka Abu Ala, who has been the long-standing Speaker of the Palestinian Legislative Council, was approved by the Parliament as Prime Minister, and his Cabinet was accepted. After some disputes over control of security forces, Qureia formed a Cabinet that puts security under a National Security Council that the President chairs. Qureia also said, in his opening speech as Prime Minister, that the Palestinian Authority would hold elections by June 2004, a development that is called for in the Road Map. Some commentators said that this is an effort to force some movement in Washington to implement the Road Map, over Sharon government objections.

## **Qureia Seeks Ceasefire From Hamas, Islamic Jihad**

Hamas leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin told reporters, on Nov. 15, that his group is willing to talk to Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Ahmed Qureia's government about a possible ceasefire. "We have no objection to dialogue, and we are ready to listen to what he has got," Yassin said. "But under present circumstances, we have no room for a truce. We have given a cease-fire in the past, but it failed because Israel did not want peace or security for the Palestinian people."

Qureia has also reached out to other Palestinian militant groups, including Islamic Jihad, which he said has also welcomed an offer to talk, but no date has been set, yet. Palestinian President Yasser Arafat said that Egyptian intelligence chief Omar Suleiman, who has played a crucial role in previous attempts to mediate a truce, will arrive in the West Bank on Nov. 17 to meet with Arafat and Qureia. "We welcome any dialogue" between the militant factions "and us," Arafat said. He added that Suleiman "will come with many ideas."

## **Likud Defense Minister Threatens Iran and Syria**

On Nov. 12, Israeli Defense Minister Shaul Mofaz met with U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in Washington. Mofaz reportedly focussed on the dangers of a nuclear-armed Iran. Mofaz insisted that, within one year, Iran will have nuclear weapons that would threaten Israel. Mofaz also told Rumsfeld that Israel would attack Syria again, if they don't

shut down Hizbollah camps.

## **Gulf Council Project Echoes LaRouche Eurasian Land-Bridge**

Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries (Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates) have launched a project for a regional transport network, coherent with Lyndon LaRouche's Eurasian Land-Bridge idea. According to Arab sources in Dubai, the nations' ministers made a decision in October to go ahead with linking existing rail networks, and building new ones, across the GCC. The plan fits LaRouche's proposals to link the region's railways with the Eurasian Land-Bridge. In May 2002, LaRouche laid out his idea of the Mideast as a crossroads and transportation hub of Eurasia and Africa in a speech at the Zayed Centre in Abu Dhabi, UAE.

## **Asia News Digest**

### **India and China Complete Historic Naval Exercise**

As a definite step towards developing the much-discussed Asian Security, the two most populous nations in the world—China and India—conducted their first-ever joint naval exercises off Shanghai's coast on Nov. 14.

Three Indian ships—a guided-missile destroyer, a guided-missile corvette, and a supply tanker—arrived in Shanghai on Nov. 10, and remained docked off the Bund, Shanghai's riverfront financial district.

The naval exercise has been hailed as a major development in the improving economic and political relations between the two Asian giants. The naval exercise is of particular significance because of the intensity of interactions and high-level meetings in recent months, particularly following Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee's visit to China in September. Very high level negotiators met last month to discuss the disputed boundaries between China and India.

"We believe that the cooperation will further enhance friendly relations and improve further understanding between the two sides," said the Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Liu Jianchao on Nov. 13.

### **Sri Lankan Crisis Continues**

The direct talks between the Sri Lankan President Mrs. Chandrika Kumaratunga and the Prime Minister Ranil Wickremesinghe on Nov. 10 failed to break the deadlock around the crisis in that nation. Although the two have agreed to meet again, it is evident on the ground that the peace talks to settle the two decades-old ethnic hostilities between the majority Sinhalas and the minority Tamils, are off. It is not clear yet whether the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) will escalate the crisis by enacting another round of violence.

The crisis broke open earlier this month when the Sri Lankan president, citing the unconstitutionality of the LTTE counter-proposal, sacked the Defense Minister, and two other Cabinet Ministers, and imposed a state of emergency. Although the state of emergency was lifted within 24 hours, it is a moot question whether the old parliament would remain in force, or fresh elections would be necessary to put the house back in order. The crisis was particularly severe since the Sri Lankan prime minister was in Washington, getting an endorsement to his peace talks with the LTTE from the U.S. President George Bush, at the time Mrs. Kumaratunga made clear she is not supportive of the way talks were going.

Subsequently, Norway, whose advocacy on behalf of the terrorist group, Tamil Tigers, during the 20-month long talks, stood out like a sore thumb, and came under severe criticism from Sri Lankan and Indian analysts, announced on Nov. 14



that it is pulling out of its role as mediator in the Sri Lankan peace process, citing the power struggle between the president and the prime minister as the sole reason. The Norwegian delegation had arrived in Colombo a day after the emergency was lifted expressing confidence that the talks would begin soon. What is evident from the Norwegian Deputy Foreign Minister Vidar Helgessen's statement prior to the delegation's departure from Sri Lanka, is that the Norwegian pressure on the Sri Lankan prime minister to ignore the president and continue with talks, has not worked. It is clear that New Delhi also pulled strings to see that the talks do not begin against the wishes of the president.

Meanwhile, to up the ante, the LTTE supremo, V. Pirbhakaran, told a team of Norwegian facilitators on Nov. 13 that the political stalemate between the president and the prime minister, has "undermined the trust of the Tamil people" in the process. He also sought guarantees from the Norwegians that the Sri Lankan government "will continue with its commitment to the ceasefire agreement" that was established just prior to the beginning of talks.

The LTTE had unilaterally pulled out of the talks in April, and subsequently demanded a politico-administrative interim administration. On Oct. 31, it submitted proposals for an Interim Self-Governing Authority for the north-east. This is the gross violation of the country's Constitution in the proposal, which forced the Sri Lankan president's hands and made her to move quickly. Her objective was to scuttle any endorsement from abroad to the proposal which, if implemented, could lead to the dissection of the island-nation.

## **Putin And Vajpayee Critical Of U.S. Sincerity In Fighting Terrorism**

During his three-day (Nov. 11-13) visit to Russia, Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, during his talks with the Russian President Vladimir Putin, had reportedly criticized the U.S. for its 'double standards' in the war against terrorism. This view was expressed in the joint declaration of Nov. 13, which specifically cites the lack of U.S. cooperation in the ongoing investigation of the hijacking of the Indian Airlines flight IC-814 to Kandahar in 2001. Indian intelligence officials have indicated that the U.S. is showing little interest in finding out who was behind the hijacking, because it could disrupt the U.S. protection of the Taliban and Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) officials.

The Indian intelligence officials claim that the key to the investigation is the interrogation of the former Taliban Corps Commander, Akhtar Muhammad Usmani. Usmani, according to some reports, was later named as the heir-apparent to the Taliban supremo, Mullah Mohammad Omar. The Indian intelligence officials claim that New Delhi could not get access to Usmani, because Usmani is not in jail, and has been in the quasi-custody of the United States for several weeks. A senior Indian intelligence official told the *EIW* that the U.S. relationship with Usmani is "the kind a kite has with the hand that holds the string." New Delhi considers that the lack of interest of Washington in the Indian reports about Usmani and his links to the hijacking, is itself a tacit admission of the protection Washington is giving to Usmani, the official said.

An Indian investigating team was in Kabul to interrogate former Taliban Foreign Minister Mullah Wakil Ahmad Muttawakil. Muttawakil admitted that Usmani was key to the hijacking, but did not divulge any further new information. Subsequently, Muttawakil was released. Indian intelligence is now in the process of making a formal request to the Afghan government for the arrest and interrogation of Usmani.

The Indians also claim that they were trying for a while to get the log book seized by the Taliban from the aircraft. However, New Delhi is certain that this log book is now in the possession of U.S. intelligence officials. Despite repeated requests by New Delhi to Washington, requests for this material have been stonewalled.

See the [\*\*Russia Digest\*\*](#) for full report on Vajpayee visit to Russia.

## **Chaos In The Philippines**

Philippine President Mrs. Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo made a call on Nov. 12 for "total reconciliation" with all political parties, following the crisis created by 10,000 people taking to streets in the financial center of Makati in Manila earlier during that day.

The demonstration took place in the same location where the mutinous troops had seized a building complex last July. At that time, the protestors were against the corrupt links between the Defense Minister and the Military Intelligence chief with on-going terrorism in the country. The protests led to the resignation of both.

The latest protestors, on the other hand, called for the president to step down. This was triggered by the recent Supreme Court ruling (ostensibly with presidential blessings) that the impeachment by the Congress of the Chief Justice, Hilario Davide, was illegal on technical grounds. The Constitutional crisis created by the showdown between the Congress and the Supreme Court has been temporarily postponed, but is not solved.

The demonstration in Makati on Nov. 12 was brought to an end by police with water cannon and tear gas soon after the permit time to demonstrate had expired. The event followed a bizarre takeover of the Manila airport control tower last week by a former military and political officials, complaining about corruption within the military and the entire economy.

But it seems that President Macapagal-Arroyo wants to go beyond that particular issue, and work her way towards a national reconciliation of various power-bases within the country. It is for this reason that she said she wanted, by 2004 and "beyond," to mend fences with the Marcos family, with deposed President Joseph Estrada, with business tycoon Eduardo "Danding" Cojuangco, with the Communist Party of the Philippines and the New People's Army, with the Moro Islamic Liberation front, with putschist elements within the Philippine military, and with opposition political leaders.

She has asked Archbishop Fernando Capalla, incoming president of the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines, and Jesuit provincial superior Romeo Integen, to serve as her "negotiators" with various groups. Capalla has accepted the request, but Integen has refused.

## **Afghan Ups Pressure On Pakistan As Taliban Gains**

Afghan Foreign Minister Abdullah Abdullah, while visiting Washington, said on Nov. 10 that Afghanistan needs "meaningful help" from Islamabad on Taliban and al-Qaeda insurgents believed to be mobilizing within Pakistan along the Afghan borders.

"There is one clear fact, that the Taliban will not be able to operate outside Afghanistan without some support from some elements outside Afghanistan," the Afghan Foreign Minister said in his speech at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "They have found it easy to operate outside Afghanistan, to hold meetings, to incite instability, to call for jihad in Afghanistan," Abdullah Abdullah added.

The Afghan leader is correct about the Pakistani support lent to the al-Qaeda and the Taliban against the Afghan government and the U.S., and there are also reports of the Taliban helping to loosen control of seven districts in Zabul province. Available reports indicate that the Taliban and some of the warlords have gained control of these districts by pushing out the Kabul forces.

Fears are rising within Afghanistan of a Taliban takeover of the country. Taliban forces are now regrouping and reorganizing their ranks inside Afghanistan, and outside as well. Many of the aid agencies have left Afghanistan fearful of Taliban attacks.

Meanwhile, the Taliban spokesmen, who have maintained contact with news agencies, such as Reuters, have reported that the Taliban chief Mullah Mohammad Omar, despite being hunted for almost two years, is still very much in control of the outfit. "Since the council was set up, the Taliban jihad has much improved. Mullah Mohammad Omar is still in charge and head of the Taliban, and all our jihadi activities are being carried out with his permission and consultation," the spokesman said.

On Nov. 11, the U.S. began a new campaign, Operation Mountain Resolve, starting in Nuristan province in the northeast of Afghanistan. According to available reports, Arabs, Chechen, and Maghreb Arab members of the al-Qaeda and some of the Taliban have moved northwards to engage, disrupt, and destroy the coalition forces protecting the Afghan government. It is a strategy to thin out the coalition forces in southern and southeastern Afghanistan where the Taliban forces are very strong. Troops from the U.S. 10th Mountain Division are now battling opposition Taliban and al-Qaeda militia, which have the advantage of moving in and out of Afghanistan into Pakistan.

### **Thailand Hosts "Pagan" Pact With Indochina Neighbors**

Thailand's Prime Minister Thaksin Shinawatra has initiated the Pagan Pact on Nov. 12, named in honor of the historic capital of Myanmar (nee' Burma), with neighbors Myanmar, Laos and Cambodia. The concept behind the pact is summed up as: "four countries, one economy."

The idea is to increase growth within the region based on an "economic cooperation strategy." Central to the idea is that Thailand would provide grants and loans to its three neighbors, which are among the poorest in Asia and the world, to help with national development and boost investment in border areas.

The four countries are working together on trade and investment to achieve a smoother flow of goods, to lift cross-border tariffs, and simplify customs procedures and visa requirements, while promoting joint projects, including creation of a regional business advisory council. The context of such cooperation also lays the groundwork, as the Thai premier has implied, for responding to Myanmar's political/economic solution in the so-called "Burma Road to Peace." Thaksin Shinawatra has indicated a forum will be held in Bangkok before the end of the year. Already at the Pagan summit, the Thai premier indicated he expected several detained opposition activists to be released soon, and expressed confidence in coming national conciliation.

"Burmese officials sent a strong signal about national reconciliation," said Thaksin.

### **Mahathir Warns of War On Syria And Iran**

Recently retired Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad of Malaysia told a forum in Okinawa Nov. 11 that the invasion of other nations by powerful nations had not reduced the number of terrorists, but has worsened the global situation.

Dr. Mahathir gave the keynote address to the 1,000-strong "Globalization Forum 2003" in Okinawa Nov. 11, co-funded by the Institute for International Socio-Economic Studies, the Gorbachov Foundation, and the Ryukyu Shimpo newspaper. Speakers included Michael Gorbachov and Zbigniew Brzezinski on the theme of "Democracy and Security in the Globalization Era."

Dr. Mahathir told the forum, "It would seem that the greatest powers of the world have got no capacity to learn from the past, from their own recent experience even. The lessons of Vietnam have been forgotten and, more recently, lessons of Afghanistan and Iraq have taught them nothing."

If previously foreigners were safe in Iraq, now even the Red Cross and UN staff were not. "Yet there is now talk of extending the war to Syria and Iran. Do we really believe that the Syrians and Iranians would behave differently from the Iraqis if their countries are invaded and occupied?"

Dr. Mahathir said smaller nations no longer feel secure, as powerful nations interfere in their domestic affairs, and the UN is no longer free to decide to act or not. "But worse things have happened lately. Powerful nations have ignored the UN altogether and invaded and occupied countries under false pretexts. In other words, the neo-colonialism President Sukarno used to talk about is real."

## **Africa News Digest**

### **VaxGen HIV Vaccine Fails**

VaxGen's vaccine against HIV has clearly failed in tests in Thailand, the Brisbane-based company announced Nov. 12. It had reported the failure of its North American trial in February. Meanwhile, the number of people infected with HIV will increase from more than 42 million to more than 87 million by the end of this decade, a BBC News story asserted, also Nov. 12. The story recalls that the AIDS epidemic is taking hold in India, Russia, and China. Together, they make up half of the world's population. The epidemic is already raging in Sub-Saharan Africa, which has most of the existing 42 million cases, with infection rates above 30% in some countries.

"Now that VaxGen's vaccine has failed," writes Associated Press reporter Paul Elias in a Nov. 13 story, "attention has turned to the two dozen other experimental vaccines now being tested on 12,000 human volunteers in experiments around the world. But none of those are as advanced as VaxGen's two failed experiments and any successful candidate is years away."

### **Mbeki to Address French National Assembly**

South African President Thabo Mbeki will be addressing the French National Assembly during his state visit to France, Nov. 17-19. As *EIW* reported earlier this year, President Mbeki played a leadership role in both all-Africa leadership organizations, and in the Non-Aligned Movement, in opposing the Iraq war, in collaboration with the unified position developed by France, Russia, and Germany.

### **U.S. State Department Denounces Bounty for Kidnapping Charles Taylor**

The U.S. State Department has denounced the Cheneyac Bush Administration offer of a bounty of \$2 million for the kidnapping of former Liberian President Charles Taylor from Nigeria, where he has been given asylum (see last week's Digest); now, some in Congress want to squeeze Nigeria to release him, even if it means the resumption of war in Liberia. State Department spokeswoman Susan Pittman said Nov. 12 that "We strongly oppose any violent or other illegal actions against Nigerian authorities aimed at obtaining custody of Charles Taylor," and that the State Department would keep the \$2 million bounty money. The bounty was allotted as part of the \$87 billion Iraq-Afghanistan emergency funding act.

Before Taylor was forced out of the Presidency of Liberia, Northbridge Services (UK) had offered to snatch him for the same sum of \$2 million, according to the *Vanguard* newspaper of (Lagos) Nov. 12.

With the State Department balking, the Cheneyacs, i.e., the anti-Islam neo-cons in Congress, and the Executive Branch, especially the NSC, State Department office under John Bolton, and the Defense Department, are planning a follow-up

move in Congress, to cut off possibly tens of millions of dollars of annual aid to Nigeria unless it surrenders Taylor. A provision to that effect is included in the Senate's version of the foreign operations appropriations bill, now in conference committee of the two houses. Senate supporters claim to have some bipartisan backing in the House, according to the *Financial Times* Nov. 11. The State Department opposes this also.

An adviser to Nigerian President Obasanjo, Femi Fani-Kayode, pointed out that, "If you take [Taylor] out in any way, harass him, or remove him from here, you jeopardize the peace process," according to the *FT*.

A committee chairwoman in the West African (ECOWAS) parliament, Hawa Yakubu Ogede, a Ghanaian, made the point clearer to the press in Abuja Nov. 11: that trying Taylor at this time would likely cause his loyalists to take up arms again. Taylor, she said, was not the only evil President to ever appear in West Africa, the *Daily Trust* (Abuja) reported.

Dr. Emmanuel Kwesi Anning, described as a "senior security expert at African Security Dialogue and Research," warned that putting Taylor on trial now would threaten the entire West African political process, according to the *Ghanaian Chronicle* (Accra) Nov. 11.

The Presidents of Nigeria, Ghana (as chairman of ECOWAS), and South Africa escorted Taylor to Nigeria in August.

## **U.S. Embassy in Khartoum Closes Over 'Terrorist Threat'**

The U.S. Embassy in Khartoum announced it would suspend operations for one week, due to a "specific" threat again American interests in the Sudanese capital. "The U.S. embassy will suspend normal operations as of November 12," the Embassy said in a statement, noting it would also be closed on Nov. 11 for the Veterans' Day holiday in the United States. "This action is the result of a credible and specific threat to U.S. interests in Khartoum," it said, without elaborating. The mission also advised U.S. nationals to be cautious and avoid gatherings of foreigners. "We urge all U.S. citizens in Sudan to exercise extra caution and to avoid gatherings of foreigners that may attract outside attention," said the Embassy's statement, again without elaborating. "The Embassy hopes to be able to resume normal operations next week," it added, specifying that the Sudanese Foreign Ministry had been informed of its decision. "The U.S. Embassy wishes to express its appreciation for the strategic support provided by the Sudanese authorities in confronting the present threat," the statement added.

Recently, the U.S. closed its Embassy and consulates in Saudi Arabia, just prior to a massive bombings in Riyadh.

See this week's [\*\*InDepth\*\*](#) for what's behind the Sudan "peace" negotiations.

## **South African Cabinet Approves Massive Public Works Program**

In an address to the National Council of Provinces Nov. 12, South African President Thabo Mbeki announced that his Cabinet had approved a business plan for the promised public-works program that is to create 1 million jobs. He said the plan would be implemented in phases.

Mbeki said the program "will draw significant numbers of the unemployed into productive employment, so that workers gain skills while they are gainfully employed and increase their capacity to earn an income once they leave the program."

Workers in the program will "upgrade rural and municipal roads, municipal pipelines, storm-water drains and paving, fencing of roads, community water supply and sanitation, the maintenance of government buildings, housing, schools, and

clinics, rail and port infrastructure, and electrification infrastructure," according to *Business Day* Nov. 12.

The government first announced the program at the Growth and Development Summit in Johannesburg on June 7, responding to the pressure of the Congress of South African Trade Unions.

## **Cote d'Ivoire Headed Toward Permanent Division**

Cote d'Ivoire is headed toward permanent division into two parts. In the latest move, a three-hour, regional heads-of-state summit in Accra, Ghana Nov. 11, was intended to induce the two sides to take steps to bridge the political gap; it failed.

The recent background is that rebels appointed to Cabinet positions left their posts on Sept. 23, and headed north to rebel territory, charging that President Gbagbo was not allowing them any authority. Gbagbo's Prime Minister Seydou Diarra agreed, an indication that the charge was very possibly true.

In response to the failed Nov. 11 summit, the Deputy Secretary General of the New Forces (combined rebel movements), Louis Dakoury Taley, said on Nov. 12 that "Those who talk of secession are right, from now on, because we cannot expect anything further from these [Marcoussis] accords." He was speaking at the conclusion of a forum in the rebel capital, Bouake, on Nov. 8-12, on making the impoverished, rebel-held zone more economically self-sufficient.

As an afterthought, on Nov. 13, the rebels issued a call, asking the international community to "invite" Gbagbo to step down and accept exile. They do not expect it to happen.

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, in a report to the Security Council on Nov. 11, said that the peace process is in "serious difficulty." The Security Council discussed the report in closed session the same day, but issued no statement.

## **Uganda in Talks To Extend Rail Lines to Sudan**

The government of Uganda is beginning talks with Sudan to extend rail lines from Uganda into Sudan.

*EIR* notes that Uganda is the hub of the developing U.S. control over the region, and the U.S.-driven "peace process" in Sudan is bringing that country under increasing U.S. influence.

## **This Week in History**

### **November 17 - 22, 1963**

November 22 marks the 40th anniversary of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. This is a murder which has, to this day, shaped the decline of our nation. Combined with the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, the post-Kennedy escalation into the Vietnam War, and the subsequent assassinations of Malcolm X, Dr. Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy, the JFK assassination delivered a shock, from which our republic has not yet recovered, primarily because the full truth has never been told.

This column is not the place to try to tell that full truth, which has, in fact, never been uncovered. What can be said, with confidence, is that the assassination involved a conspiracy coming from the very highest levels of British intelligence, as well as sections of U.S. intelligence, the mafia, and perhaps other foreign intelligence services; that the inquiry into the

murder was a total, almost laughable, coverup; and that, as a result of the elimination of JFK, the policy posture of the United States shifted sharply, particularly in foreign policy, putting us on the road to Synarchist domination under which we live today.

Let's touch briefly on each of these points:

1) As *Executive Intelligence Review* has most thoroughly documented in other locations, including the world-famous book *Dope, Inc.*, and a widely circulated *New Federalist* pamphlet from 1994, entitled "Why the British Kill American Presidents," the agencies involved in ordering, and deploying, the assassination of John Kennedy reached up into an international network, that was also documented to be involved in the attempted assassination of French President Charles de Gaulle, and the murder of Italian energy industrialist Enrico Mattei. This network can be identified with two named organizations: the Permanent Industrial Expositions (Permindex), and a shadowy organization called the "1001 Club," which was founded by Prince Philip Mountbatten, the Duke of Edinburgh, and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. While the 1001 Club was not officially founded until 1971, those who surfaced as members, were notably involved in the circles which carried out the assassination. The key intersection point of both of these networks was Maj. Louis Mortimer Bloomfield, a Canadian, who worked closely with the FBI and the World Wildlife Fund-1001 Club group.

2) The official Warren Commission investigation of the JFK assassination is, even today, an international laughing stock, for its conclusion that President Kennedy was the victim of a "lone assassin," Lee Harvey Oswald. From the contorted attempts to show that one "magic bullet" succeeded in tearing through numerous places in the President's body, to the trashing of the competent investigation of a conspiracy including Oswald, by New Orleans District Attorney Jim Garrison, the official story is a blatant cover story.

3) As in the case of any great crime, the crucial evidence lies in the evidence of the *intention* to create a certain result. In the case of the Kennedy assassination, the shifts in policy are telltale evidence of the authorship of the deed. Most straightforward was the shift on policy in Vietnam, from President Kennedy's stated intention to begin withdrawing troops from Indo-China, per the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, to the rapid moves for increased troop deployment, toward the disastrous colonial war that it became. This decision, in turn, had broad implications for the relationship between the United States and Russia, as well as other sections of the world.

More broadly, one sees in the post-Kennedy era, a dramatic shift in national mission, or, one might better say, the lack of one. Whereas President Kennedy had initiated an Alliance for Progress approach of joint development with South America, subsequent Administrations turned more in the direction of out-and-out power politics. Within the United States, the mission-orientation of the Moon-landing, as an appropriate scientific frontier for the United States and all mankind, although it was accomplished after President Kennedy's death, was dropped. We headed straight into the "consumer-society" mode, as opposed to producing scientific breakthroughs.

Our task as a nation today, indeed, our very survival, depends upon reversing this post-Kennedy paradigm-shift. After 40 years in the wilderness of decline, the task is more than urgent.

All rights reserved © 2003 EIRNS

[top of page](#)

[home page](#)