

We must defeat what Prince Philip represents, LaRouche tells Croatians

The Croatian weekly Nedjeljna Dalmacija on Nov. 5 published an interview with American economist Lyndon LaRouche on the strategic situation and the war in the Balkans. The interview was arranged by a political analyst and journalist in Zagreb, Srecko Jurdana, a leading figure in the Croatian opposition movement "Libertas." The weekly is printed in Split and is associated with the publishing house which prints the leading Croatian daily Slobodna Dalmacija. It has a wide circulation both in Croatia and in the Croatian and Bosnian communities throughout Europe, especially in Germany. The interview is announced on the front page with a picture of LaRouche under the title "British Pan-Slavic Chess Game," and covers three full pages as the leading story of the week.

Jurdana introduces the interview as "a discussion with the extraordinary American intellectual Lyndon LaRouche, known worldwide for his opposition to the new world order, as the U.N. is trying to establish under the wing of British imperialism." The interview appears at a crucial moment in the political developments in the Balkans, when the Croatian Army, for the first time, is deploying its troops on the side of the Bosnian forces against the Serbian Chetniks of Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic and Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. The full text of the interview follows.

Q: What, in your view, is the "Contact Group" (United States, Russia, Britain, Germany, France) trying to achieve through its activities in Bosnia and Croatia? In light of sanctions being lifted against Serbia, and the newly constructed "animosity" between Milosevic and Karadzic, exactly how does the whole strategy develop?

LaRouche: To assess the activities of the "Contact Group," or related matters, it is indispensable to take into account seven intersecting factors which have determined the direction and evolution of the Balkan policies of the United Nations Organization [U.N.O.] and of the members of this so-called "Contact Group" since late 1989, and, more recently, since the beginning of 1993. One cannot explain the process from inside the regional situation on the ground, but only by considering as primary the impact of these seven interacting factors upon all the crucial decisions made respecting developments within that regional situation.

1) The intensity of the present world crisis: that is to say, the imminence of either a disintegration of the present global monetary and financial systems, or, in the alternative, action by several leading governments to put the world's present monetary and financial systems into government-conducted bankruptcy reorganization;

2) the geopolitical doctrine which has governed all of the Thatcher and Major government's policymaking since the closing months of 1989;

3) as a by-product of London's announced geopolitical doctrine of late 1989, London's revival of the 1904-40 "Entente Cordiale" between London and Paris, affecting Balkan and other matters;

4) London's effort to destabilize continental Europe through fomenting in Russia a revival of something like the pan-Slav policy which London and Paris used, 1904-14, to draw Russia into a Balkan trap like that of World War I;

5) London's continuing attempts to overthrow the present, Clinton government of the United States;

6) President Clinton's maneuvering attempts to establish several independent U.S. strategic policy initiatives, through which to outflank and possibly defeat the powerful combination of international forces aligned under London's influence and political direction, and also outflank problematic elements within his own administration;

7) The important, disruptive role of sundry Anglophile elements closely allied with Thatcher et al. within the U.S. establishment and government, such as those associated with former President George Bush.

Every action by the members of the "Contact Group" is determined primarily by the impact of those seven factors. In other words, the Balkans becomes, once again, the "cockpit" in which global games are played out, where the territory and inhabitants of the Balkans are bled like gladiators in pagan Rome's imperial arena.

The general pattern of interplay thus far, has been the role of both the U.N.O. and the revived Anglo-French Entente Cordiale as the consistent enemies of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina; the forces of Milosevic and his accomplices are more puppets of London than anything else. These Anglo-French-U.N.O. forces, including the IMF [International Monetary Fund], use their influences in the territories of the

former Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact to commit Moscow to the assistance of Milosevic, and to make Moscow's "historic pan-Slav interests in the Balkans" a condition of Moscow's willingness to cooperate with the Clinton administration on global issues outside the Balkans.

The most recent visible developments within the "Contact Group" conform to that pattern.

Q: How do you comment on something which is, to some analysts, the contradictory approach of President Clinton: the fact that he discreetly supports Muslims in Bosnia, and yet opposes the idea of lifting the arms embargo against them? In this connection also, Clinton's pressure on Croatia not to launch another liberation war against Serbian occupiers?

LaRouche: Remember, that President Clinton has been consistently and visibly committed to lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia since he was inaugurated President in 1993, up into the most recent round of "Contact Group" negotiations. Only the strongest pressures exerted, in concert, by U.N.O. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, by the London-Paris Entente Cordiale, by Moscow, and by Anglophile elements within his own State Department, did Clinton bend to [Russian President Boris] Yeltsin's public threat to open a new "Cold War" against the United States should Clinton insist on lifting the arms embargo from Bosnia.

Clinton left himself only one marginal option: the threat to make direct use of U.S. military force against Serbian aggressors. Whether he intends to use such force, I cannot know; I do know that the threat was intended to deter the Anglo-French and U.N.O. forces. I do not know what the President may have communicated privately to the government of Bosnia on these matters.

It should also be taken into account, that President Clinton would not be backed by any leading European government in taking on the U.N.O., London, Paris, and Moscow simultaneously on this issue at this time. Even large parts of his own government would work to sabotage any effort by the President to do so—at this time. It must be recognized, that although I would have acted differently were I U.S. President, no other actual or prospective head of state in any part of the world, outside the Balkans, would not have reacted as weakly as Clinton, or far worse.

Q: Can you define the general political position of President Clinton? Acting under constant British pressures, how effective is he going to be in the future?

LaRouche: Since the September 1901 assassination of U.S. President William McKinley, arranged by admirers of then-Vice President Theodore Roosevelt (e.g., Emma Goldman of New York City's Henry Street Settlement House), there have been only five U.S. Presidents who were not totally subordinate to the foreign-policy dictates of the British mon-

archy: William Gamaliel Harding (1920-23), Franklin Roosevelt (1934-45), Dwight Eisenhower (1953-60), John Kennedy (1961-63), and William Clinton. Paralleling former Presidents Franklin Roosevelt and Kennedy, Clinton echoes the world-outlook of the celebrated former Georgetown University Prof. Carroll Quigley, in his own commitment to reversing the British monarchy's 1964-92 control over U.S. economic, monetary, and foreign policy.

The British Crown has a clear understanding of this point. Hence, that British monarchy, and the circles associated with the Thatcher and Major governments, have worked closely with former U.S. President George Bush's faction inside the U.S.A. to attempt to overthrow the Clinton government.

For similar reasons, the British government, which is a deadly enemy of the Middle East peace process, is orchestrating bloodshed in the effort to destroy the peace process there. Clinton and London are virtually at war over peace in Northern Ireland, over Balkan policy, over Clinton's support for [President Nelson] Mandela's role in seeking social peace and cooperation in South Africa, and over Clinton's efforts to create an alternative to the dangerous Thatcher-Bush policy toward post-1989 eastern Europe. The two forces are also at war over the issues of economic policy: London and its partners are committed to increasingly drastic IMF austerity policies; Clinton is seeking to launch projects of economic growth.

Remember, that when the horrors in the Balkans began, this was a mark of the success of the leadership of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and President George Bush. The world is too much under the influence of the mass news-media's synthetic "public opinion" in shaping the use of "effective" and "ineffective" to describe governments and leading political figures. By early 1995, in virtually every part of the world, almost nothing will seem the same as it appeared during mid-1994. The international financial and monetary system will go through a new round of collapse, if not yet general institutional disintegration; the British royal family may be doomed, and the powerful "Club of the Isles," the international oligarchical constituency headed by the queen, will suffer ominous set-backs. If Clinton can continue and strengthen his present course, under those circumstances of crisis, he could emerge as very effective. That is a clear possibility; unfortunately, I would not say that that is a certainty. I can say that the rise or fall of President Clinton's star, will be mirrored by whether my own circumstances and influence improve, or worsen during the next few weeks and months.

Q: Will President Clinton win the next elections, or is Henry Kissinger going to determine their outcome? What are the possibilities for a "new George Bush" in America?

LaRouche: Henry Kissinger was never as powerful as the western news media have often represented him. As he

himself bragged loudly in a May 1982 public address at London's Chatham House, from the early 1950s to the present he was never more than a controlled asset of the British foreign intelligence service. Like a trained dog, he carried in his mouth many messages placed there by London.

Even the myth of Kissinger is no longer what it once was.

As of this time, President Clinton would probably be reelected in 1996. To win, he must contend successfully against one of the major political problems, internationally and in the U.S.A. today: the recent rise of the so-called "neo-conservative" political movement.

These neo-conservatives are a resurgence of that same "Conservative Revolution" which gave the world such assorted products as Adolf Hitler, the Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger, Friedrich von Hayek's Mont Pelerin Society, and the policies of Lady Margaret Thatcher. George Bush's career as a political candidate has ended; he is attempting to function as a behind-the-curtains power-broker, using candidate puppets which include two of his own sons and his famous international drug-and-weapons trafficker, Oliver North. The popular political base to which the Bush machine is seeking to appeal, is the influence of von Hayek's and Thatcher's co-thinkers within the U.S. electorate at this moment.

Q: Is it possible that London is waiting for the next elections in the U.S.A., in the meantime "freezing" the situation in the Balkans and saving Milosevic in power?

LaRouche: London's principal effort is concentrated on destroying the sovereignty of every existing nation-state on this planet, while transferring political power to the combination of U.N.O. bureaucracy and "pro-environmentalist" portion of the U.N.O.'s non-governmental organizations [NGOs]. The single most concentrated expression of the British monarchy's (and Club of the Isles's) global policy today is the World Wildlife Fund [now the World Wide Fund for Nature] and its numerous offshoots, headed by Prince Philip, the Royal Consort and Duke of Edinburgh. The original draft presented to the recent U.N.O. Population Conference in Cairo is typical of the numerous ventures which London is taking, through channels such as the World Wildlife Fund, to ensure that the sovereignty of nation-states is eliminated, and the world placed under U.N.O. supranational supervision by the time of the November 1996 U.S. general election.

However, in the meantime, Milosevic is a London-created British monarchy asset, shared with Paris, the junior partner in Lady Thatcher's revival of the Entente Cordiale. Milosevic has also the particular significance of being a pawn in Britain's "pan-Slavism" chess-game with her "useful fools" in Moscow.

Q: Exactly how dangerous is the Russian involvement in

the Balkan situation, with respect to the inner situation in Russia?

LaRouche: The best way to assess how dangerous this involvement is, is to examine the history of Europe from 1896 through 1918. When Russia's Minister Count Sergei Witte struck Eurasian economic development agreements with France's Minister Gabriel Hanotaux, Britain moved to organize what became known as World War I. Once the Entente Cordiale with France had been organized between Lord Grey and France's *revanchiste* Théophile Delcassé, over the years 1898-1904, Britain and France together set Russia's silly monarchy on the road to world war, and to the obliteration of that monarchy as well. The detonator of the war, prepared within Greece by the "Young Turk" revolution of the London-directed Saloniki freemasonic lodge, was the Balkan war. The result today would be different, but at least equally disastrous for all Europe.

Q: What are your present views on the prospects for global economic collapse, and how is the economy going to determine the general strategic development?

LaRouche: There exists today a single, global set of interconnected monetary and financial systems. The global system is now deep into a process of general collapse.

For the coming months, only two possibilities exist. Either some major governments place all of the existing central banking systems and financial markets under the supervision of bankruptcy reorganization, or, if that is not done, the entirety of the global system will disintegrate into what is described in technical language as a *reversed-leverage implosion*.

It is still a possibility that that disintegration could take place as soon as the end of this year, although I do not predict that. As one alternative, the implosion could occur during the spring months; or, it could erupt some months later. The only thing which I see as certain about the timing, is that either the bankruptcy or the disintegration will occur very soon. This global financial system is doomed, like the Lombard debt-bubble which collapsed during the middle of the 14th century. It is not possible that this system will ever recover in its present form.

The current figures show, that of more than \$1 trillion daily financial turnover on the London market, no more than 3% of the average daily total world financial turnover involves trade; the rest is simply financial speculation. Using technical language, what this figure shows, is that the world's monetary and financial systems have been "de-coupled" from real economy. The relationship of the world's financial systems to the real economy has become like a terminal stage of cancer to the body of the victim.

The causes for this crisis go back to about 1964-66, when certain international circles centered around Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund launched mass recruiting to their pagan cults of the so-called "rock-drug-sex countercul-

ture," "ecology," and "post-industrial utopia." The influence of this so-called Nietzschean "Age of Aquarius" counterculture caused a shift away from an increase of the standard of living of families, and even the institution of the family itself, into the so-called "post-industrial age."

This collapse was brought upon the world by the intersection of two fundamental changes in policy which began over the 1964-72 period. The first, was a change in economic policy as such, away from capital-intensive, energy-intensive forms of investment in the increase of the physical-productive powers of labor. The second, was a sweeping change in the world's monetary and financial policies.

Beginning with the Wilson government in Britain, and the 1966 policy-shift inside the U.S.A., the rate of real economic growth slowed down over the late 1960s and early 1970s. At least, that is the picture if one measures net investment in infrastructure and production of goods per capita, per household, and per square kilometer. From about 1970-72 onward, using the same measurements, the world economy as a whole began to contract. Since 1972, the increasingly depressive influence of Prince Philip's so-called "ecology movement" upon productivity, combined with the effects of radical changes in financial and monetary institutions, have brought the world to the point of the worst collapse Europe has experienced since the mid-14th century "New Dark Age."

The mid-1971 monetary crisis was used as a pretext for ending the Bretton Woods system of relatively fixed parities. At the Azores conference and, again, at the 1975 Rambouillet IMF conference, a so-called "floating exchange-rate system" replaced the former system of parities tied to a standard price of gold monetary reserves. The manipulation of valuations of national currencies by the highly corrupt London financial market was used to loot national currencies and their economies, creating a self-feeding monetary spiral of national indebtednesses created by such fraudulent devices of market manipulation and IMF complicity. The London-rigged petroleum-price hoax of 1973-75 and the ensuing speculation in so-called "petrodollars" was superseded by U.S. Federal Reserve System Chairman Paul A. Volcker's October 1979 launching of measures which Volcker had described as "controlled disintegration of the economy." Over the 1979-82 interval, massive "Thatcherite" deregulation of financial markets and institutions plunged the sinking world economy into the greatest orgy of parasitical financial speculation in history.

The great financial bubble now threatening to implode is maintained only by increasing the looting of the real economy. This shrinks the real economy at an accelerating rate, while infusing the super-inflated bubble of financial speculation with ever-greater implosive potential. There is no solution, except to put all of the central banking systems, and all major financial markets into government-regulated financial-bankruptcy reorganization. Without such bank-

ruptcy-reorganization, the world will be plunged into chaos and a New Dark Age early during the months ahead.

Q: As you perhaps know, Croatia itself is living under the very ugly pressures of the IMF, which is now planning to close down 19 of its key factories. Is this "policy" of the IMF typical, and what are its possible consequences?

LaRouche: Such policies are typical of IMF actions to destroy the economies of nations in the developing sector. The calculable and intended effect is to create the conditions for drastic reduction of the living standard and population of Croatia—among other countries targeted by the IMF bureaucracy for the same intended results.

Q: How do you see the territory of "former Yugoslavia" in terms of European infrastructure projects?

LaRouche: On page 71 of the Executive Intelligence Review Nachrichtenagentur's 1990 proposal, "The 'Productive Triangle' Paris-Berlin-Vienna," there is a map of proposed railway lines, including one line leading from Munich through Vienna into Zagreb and into the Middle East. I would prefer that this line through the Balkans be of the magnetic levitation, rather than friction-rail type. There is also the effect of the linking of the Danube to the North Sea (via the Rhine-Main-Danube system) on the development of inland-waterborne freight throughout Southeast Europe. Such expanded and modernized arteries of movement of freight serve as the conduits for building up other essential elements of improved modern infrastructure, such as power systems, creating the setting for modern industrial production and for enhancement of facilities and markets for agricultural products.

Such development is to the advantage of all Europe and of the eastern Mediterranean region, and represents an economic development project of the sort which, like present attempts to establish Arab-Israeli peaceful cooperation, is a part of the measures indispensable for treating the cruel wounds which British geopolitics has brought once again upon the Balkan region.

Q: You have envisioned a stable peace between East and West through the Strategic Defense Initiative project, which was later killed by Henry Kissinger and replaced by the strategy of general destabilization. Now, what are the chances today that this Kissinger strategy grows into World War III, even if in a limited form?

LaRouche: On the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] itself, one should emphasize that Kissinger acted solely in his capacity as an asset of London's foreign-policy agency, Chatham House; his actions against me were little more than running errands for his London superiors. For balance, it should be noted that Vice President George Bush's man in the White House, James Baker III, played a key role, in collaboration with Yuri Andropov's Moscow, in the efforts

to prevent President Ronald Reagan from announcing the SDI.

To borrow an image from Charles Dickens's famous English novel *Oliver Twist*, Kissinger's role is like that of the character named the "Artful Dodger," who runs errands, stealing at the behest of the master-criminal, named "Old Fagin," the latter a role played in today's real life by London's international financier oligarchy. "Old Fagin" is Prince Philip and other powerful oligarchs typified by the "Club of the Isles" backers of the World Wildlife Fund and its offshoots.

We must defeat what Prince Philip and his oligarchic confederates represent; we must overturn the "Aquarian" counterculture, and return to a world based upon investment in the scientific and technological progress. If we fail to do those two things, our planet will have begun its descent into the nightmare of a "New Dark Age" before the close of the century, perhaps the worst "Dark Age" in history. If we fail, then what has already occurred in former Yugoslavia is but the beginning of a form of global warfare which the recently deceased Prof. Friedrich von der Heydte identified in his *Moderne Kleinkrieg [Modern Irregular Warfare]*. That is the kind of warfare, the ugliest imaginable, which would confront us globally if we failed in our present duty to defeat the evil which has been wrought by Prince Philip et al.

We must mobilize men and women of good will from around the world for a global program of large-scale projects of development of basic economic infrastructure. This is the only available means by which an economic renaissance might be set into motion. In a time when existing central banking systems and financial markets are already bankrupt, no economic renaissance is possible without eliminating the presently existing type of monetary and financial system, and replacing it with a system of national-banking systems organized around state credit.

The transition from the parasitical present monetary and financial order, to a sane one, can be accomplished only by putting the existing systems under government-directed bankruptcy reorganization of existing monetary institutions and financial markets. The new credit system must use large-scale infrastructure programs as a way of stimulating the private entrepreneur's economic growth, as vendor to either these infrastructure projects or as supplier of the needs of persons and firms engaged in work on such projects.

In other words, we must rescue the contributions of post-14th-century, modern European Christian civilization from the evil and follies of that decadent, parasitical, usurious international oligarchy presently rallied around the British royal family. If we can muster the courage to do that, the danger of a "New Dark Age" can be avoided. Otherwise, if we fail, it will be because too many of us lack that moral fitness which any culture requires to survive. Therefore, I am optimistic, but also vigilant.

Interview: Mustafa Effendi Cerić

'When you think of Bosnia, think of yourself'

Dr. Mustafa Effendi Cerić, the head of the Islamic community of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, was interviewed in Los Angeles in October during his tour of the United States presenting the case of Bosnia to the American people. Dr. Cerić, a highly respected religious leader and scholar, is Sheikh Reys Ul-Ulema, the supreme Muslim leader in Bosnia. Dr. Cerić, who gave this interview to David Kilber, afterward expressed his appreciation for the efforts of the Schiller Institute and EIR, which have led the international fight to halt the Serbian war of aggression against Croatia and Bosnia.

An important event in that effort was the "Bonn Declaration," approved by a Schiller Institute conference on June 4-5, 1993 in Bonn, Germany. Over 100 parliamentarians and former government officials from 20 nations endorsed the Schiller Institute call to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and Croatia. That conference, organized on the theme, "Toward a Durable Peace in Europe," took up the issue of rebuilding the war-torn economies. Among the myriad array of Schiller Institute and EIR initiatives, were two fact-finding delegations to Croatia, one led by the Rev. James Bevel and one led by Amelia Boynton Robinson, which received widespread publicity.

EIR: The British and the Serbs have been attempting to create religious conflict, to turn Bosnia into a religious war. They did not succeed because of the work of the Schiller Institute, the attitude of the Bosnian government, and the strong stand by the Vatican led by the pope, who wanted to come to Sarajevo but whose visit was sabotaged by the United Nations. And we know of the role of British intelligence in fomenting clashes between Croats and Muslims. In opposition to the recent U.N. population conference in Cairo, we saw a very important strategic alignment forming, involving associates of LaRouche, the Muslim community internationally, and the Catholic Church, which was described in the press here as a Muslim-Christian alliance against the genocidal policies being pushed at Cairo. The Schiller Institute has put forward a proposal for a global development conference for economic development and growth of population. I would like to ask you if you would comment first on the attempts to foment religious war and your reaction to a development conference in opposition to