

to portend that one-world rule by the Anglo-Americans was now secure. This was George Bush's new world order, or his *pax universalis* as he preferred to call it on one occasion.

But at the very time that occurred, the Anglo-American system was collapsing from within, largely for economic and related reasons. Without a fundamental change in policy, eliminating the economic policies which have been characteristic of British policy for the entire period, including that of 1862 to the present, there's no possibility of an economic recovery in Britain, or in the United States or in North America generally, for the foreseeable future at this time.

We are headed into what is already the worst economic depression which the United States has experienced in the 20th century; and if the policies of George Bush or Democratic candidate Clinton and some others were to be allowed to continue, prevail, we would go much deeper—much, much, deeper; in point of fact, the United States as we know it today *might not even exist* by the end of this century. It might be torn apart and fragmented and virtually destroyed by internal dissension, riots, and so forth and so on.

So, we have come to the end of an era. It is not possible, despite George Bush's sometimes insane impulse to do so, to project the policies on which George Bush rode into the presidency, into the future. The economic policies, the foreign policies, and so forth; these policies lead to their own destruction, to their self-destruction. And thus, we assemble at a time at which either the United States and other relevant nations change their policies to conform to the alternatives we have projected, or the United States will be self-destroyed.

Now these policies are to be recommended, not because we have advocated them—they are not necessarily our policies, even though we have offered them (myself and friends have offered them); but rather because what we have done is more in the nature of a discovery, a recognition of those policies which are the required alternative to the catastrophe which is now about us.

However, even though all I have done and my associates have done, is to adopt what is the obvious alternative to George Bush's inherent failure, we have a certain authority. We have projected these kinds of difficulties, this kind of process, which has now engulfed the United States, for a period of more than twenty years—and especially, the past dozen or so. We have spoken, sometimes, it seemed, prophetically; our prophecies have been consistently correct on the economy and on other related matters. We represent the only force, however small, which enters the arena at this stage of crisis with a *vindicated* record of understanding this crisis, understanding its emergence, and devising policies which address that understanding.

### **My policies must prevail**

Therefore, we have a mission to perform. A mission to bring the majority of this and other nations rapidly, rapidly, into agreement around the kind of policy package which we

## **Schiller Institute vows to halt 'free trade'**

A resolution to defeat the free trade policies of the International Monetary Fund and to reassert the right of sovereign national economic development, capped a two-day conference held in Chicago on Feb. 22-23 by the Schiller Institute and its agricultural arm, Food for Peace. "We recognize that the propaganda for 'free trade' is a cover for total control of the world's resources by a few multinational corporations as part of the new world order, which use food and other resources as a weapon against nations such as Iraq, Liberia, Haiti," read the resolution, which was adopted unanimously.

A second resolution gave unanimous support to seven congressmen from Ibero-America who had traveled to the United States to demand that the U.S. Congress act on the LaRouche case, and who had also come to Chicago to address the conference.

The courage shown by these seven congressmen—some frankly acknowledged that they may go to jail soon for the stand they are taking—made a deep impression on the listeners, many of whom had long been in contact with the Schiller Institute, but had only just decided to become politically active, in view of the moral collapse of virtually every other institution around them. "Something inside just told me that this is the right place to be," commented one pro-life activist.

The chief obstacle to becoming politically active was taken head-on by the first speaker, civil rights leader Amelia Boynton Robinson. "The American people are fear

offer.

I am currently running a campaign to secure the Democratic Party presidential nomination for 1992. As to what my chances are by ordinary standards, I can say I have no idea, except they are better than George Bush's chances of reelection, which are zero at this point.

Unless a Democrat is elected who represents the kind of policy outlooks that I represent on foreign policy, on justice for developing nations, on cooperation with Europe, on fostering the Eurasian cooperation which Britain fought World War I to prevent; unless such a Democrat is elected, the United States is headed for catastrophe, Bush or no Bush in the White House, come 1993.

Therefore, we *must* prevail. *How* we shall prevail, I don't know. I can tell you this, however. In response to a recent broadcast, we have received over a 1,000 letters directly responding to that half-hour broadcast on the ABC network

ful," she said. "Where are the people who want the nation to be freed, who want the chance to succeed, who want prosperity? They are afraid. They have been mentally imprisoned." She described fear as a sinful state of mind, stunting mental growth, creating confusion and hate. "A person who fears can be easily used by others, because they have no faith in themselves. There is no peace within." She contrasted this to her experiences with Lyndon LaRouche, whose peace of mind shines through his writings, even those from prison.

Following an audiotaped address by Lyndon LaRouche his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed the conference via videotape. Standing before a world map, she gave a panoramic view of the immense world strategic crisis now confronting humanity. "The world on a global scale has plunged into a very deep depression, which is already now much worse than that of the 1930s," she said. "The world is in this type of crisis, not because it *has* to be like that; rather, it is the result of deliberate policies, and the wrong monetary policies imposed by the Anglo-American Establishment. . . . Either these policies are changed in the immediate weeks ahead," she warned, "or we will enter, very rapidly, a period of chaos and collapse into developments which easily can lead to major wars like the two world wars in this century."

In her review of the growing resistance against the genocidal policies of the International Monetary Fund, she focused on the potentials, but also the great dangers, in the republics of the former Soviet Union. "Is there a danger that this will lead in the weeks ahead to a military coup? Absolutely. Which way that coup will go . . . is very difficult to say. But one thing is very clear: between now and April, something big will happen."

In conclusion, she recommended that the best thing Americans can do to avert a political disaster, is to help "put the man in the White House who represents the hope of all nations on this planet."

Other speakers at the conference included:

*Congressman Carlos Rivas Dávila* from Peru, formerly Peru's economics minister, provided a wealth of detail on why the IMF's policies are insane, and expressed deep appreciation for LaRouche's ideas. "These ideas, no matter how they are persecuted, will not die," he said.

*Webster Tarpley*, president of the Schiller Institute in the United States, presented the history of British efforts since 1815 to destroy potential "American System" collaboration between the United States, Germany, and Russia.

*Congressman Jorge León Díaz* of Venezuela gave a first-hand report of the recent failed coup against the IMF's toady President Carlos Andrés Pérez, and emphasized that the even today Pérez is hanging by a thread.

*Mustafa Sayam*, national president of the Arab-American Congress, reported on the results of an Islamic conference held in January in Baghdad, Iraq, which called for lifting the genocidal embargo.

*Srecko Felix Korpar*, president of the Croatian Cultural Club in Olympia, Washington, denounced the malthusian oligarchy in New York and London which is backing the Serbian communists against the sovereign nation of Croatia.

*Yue Wu*, vice president of the Chinese Autonomous Workers' Union, reported on his undercover organizing mission to the Chinese mainland, and thanked the Schiller Institute for helping him to get back out of that country.

—*John Sigerson*

on Feb. 1. The letters are diverse. They express the viewpoint of the writer, spontaneously; and yet despite the great diversity in the contents of the letters, on two points, the overwhelming majority—I can say fairly probably, while all are favorable, 90% agree on these two points: that they are grateful and relieved, that someone at last, as a presidential candidate, on national television, has stated clearly and comprehensibly, and intelligibly, that the United States is in the worst state of depression—not a recession, but a depression—and has been for some time.

Secondly, they are relieved that someone, instead of mealy-mouthed proposals for a tax gimmick on this, or a health insurance gimmick on this, or some other gimmick, or pair of gimmicks, that someone has directly proposed a general economic recovery program based on the number of jobs which government direct intervention will cause to come into existence within a specified period of time, by the mobili-

zation of national credit to do so.

The response to that typifies—and 1,000 letters from such a broadcast is extraordinary—typifies the fact, that there is a potential majority immediately out there, willing to support such a proposal. If we can realize that result—and it's feasible, despite the tremendous opposition from the White House and similar quarters—then we can select a candidate of the Democratic Party who will act upon the policies which I have represented, defended, put forward; and in that case, what we here aspire to realize, can be realized, despite the tremendous adversity confronting it, and despite the many obstacles which seem to prevent its success.

I regret that Fred Wills is not here to continue the fight for this cause; but I am glad that we assembled here have the honor of honoring his struggle in this behalf by continuing it, so that, in a sense, one might see a smile pass across his lips, even as he lies in the grave.