

Oct. 19, 2000: Italian Sen. Riccardo Pedrizzi and other 24 Senators of several parties, both of the opposition and of the government coalition, present a second motion to the Senate, calling for a New Bretton Woods. The next day, the same motion is presented to the Interparliamentarian Group for the Jubilee 2000, the main organizer of the Assembly of the Members of the Parliaments of the World, held in Rome on Nov. 4-5.

Nov. 4, 2000: The Italian Catholic daily *Avvenire* publishes an article, titled “25 Senators of the Opposition Say: We Need a New Bretton Woods.”

Feb. 26, 2002: Nine Italian Senators introduce a motion calling for a New Bretton Woods conference, citing the crisis in Argentina in particular: “The monetarist policy of the IMF toward the so-called developing countries such as Argentina has been directly responsible for the worsening of the situation in those countries, to the point of bankruptcy, forcing the payment of high interest rates and cuts in spending and productive investment which have seriously affected the domestic output of the real economy of those nations.” The Senators aim to get 50 signers for the motion, and to get the same motion introduced into the lower house, the Chamber of Deputies.

July 2, 2002: Sen. Riccardo Pedrizzi, president of the Senate Finance Committee and member of the government coalition party National Alliance (AN), issues a statement calling for a New Bretton Woods conference. Facing a “global crisis,” he says there is only one answer: “To organize at the international level the necessary forces for a reform of the global monetary and financial system, a New Bretton Woods, determined by the governments that can, through continental great projects of economic development, relaunch the world productive economy, and renew dialogue, peaceful cooperation, and employment.”

By now, more than 100 members of both chambers of Parliament have signed the resolution first presented by Senator Pedrizzi on Oct. 19, 2000.

July 3-5, 2002: Lyndon LaRouche visits Italy, speaking at three events promoted by the Italy-Russia Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Commerce of Vicenza, and the Milan-based Association for the Development of Banking and the Stock Market Studies.

Sept. 25, 2002: Italian Chamber of Deputies votes demanding a new international monetary system.

Italy ‘Domino Effect’: Who’s Next for NBW?

A source in the City of London told *EIR* on Sept. 30 that the most likely immediate impact of the Italian Parliamentary resolution calling for “a new financial architecture” will be in Brazil. “In Brazil, more than in any other significant country I am aware of, influential people are raising the question, whether the system really works,” he said. With the failure of the International Monetary Fund’s \$36 billion bailout package for Brazil (see article in this issue), and the deepening of the financial crisis globally, the stage is set for a new breakout toward Lyndon LaRouche’s New Bretton Woods.

LaRouche visited São Paulo, Brazil in June 2002, where he was awarded honorary citizenship in the city, and where he addressed numerous audiences on the need for a new world financial and monetary system. One of his hosts, Dr. Enés Carneiro, former Presidential candidate of the Party for the Rebuilding of National Order (PRONA), is a prominent organizer for the call for an Ad Hoc Committee for a New Bretton Woods, a call which was also signed by former Brazilian President João Baptista Figueiredo.

Elsewhere in Ibero-America, a “Declaration of the Sovereign Nation-State: March To a New Bretton Woods” was issued on Aug. 22-23 by the conference in Guadalajara, Mexico, titled “Mexico-Brazil-Argentina: The Hour of Integration; March to a New Bretton Woods,” and sponsored by the Ibero-American Solidarity Movement (MSIA). The meeting was attended by nearly 300 continental activists. Former Mexican President José López Portillo, who endorsed the call for a New Bretton Woods in 1998, sent written remarks to the conference. And in Colombia, a chapter of the Ad Hoc Committee for a New Bretton Woods was formed on Aug. 17, 2000, at a conference convoked by former Labor Minister Jorge Carrillo.

Milestones in the U.S. Fight

During the 2000 Presidential campaign in the United States, Lyndon LaRouche’s Committee for a New Bretton Woods, his Presidential campaign committee, made the fight for a New Bretton Woods a national issue—despite the heavy-handed illegal delegate-stealing by Al Gore to shut LaRouche out of the Democratic Party’s primaries and nominating convention. The LaRouche movement’s work over more than five years has created the potential for a breakout now.

During 2000-2001, resolutions calling for a New Bretton Woods were introduced into the state legislatures of Alabama, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Virginia, as well as the National Conference of

★ LAROUCHE IN 2004 ★
www.larouchein2004.com

Paid for by LaRouche in 2004.

State Legislatures.

Alabama: The State House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 422 on May 4, 2000, "Calling for a 'New Bretton Woods' Conference for International Monetary System Stability." Sponsored by State Rep. Thomas Jackson (D), the resolution described the positive contributions of the 1944 Bretton Woods mechanisms; the explosion of a global financial crisis since 1997; the malfunctioning of the international monetary and financial institutions, and proclaimed: "*Be it resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, both Houses thereof concurring, that we call for the convocation of a new conference, similar to the one at Bretton Woods,*" with the goals of "creating a new international monetary system to gradually eliminate the mechanisms which have led to the 'speculative bubble,' " establishing new credit lines to foster growth of the real economy, and "defining infrastructure projects of continental dimensions."

Kentucky: State Rep. Perry Clark (D) on Feb. 16, 2001, introduced House Concurrent Resolution 84, along similar lines. The resolution also noted that "American economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has consistently warned of this crisis, and there is significant international support for a solution based on Mr. LaRouche's 'New Bretton Woods' economic policy."

Maryland: In January 2001, House Joint Resolution 5 was introduced by Democrat Clarence Davis of Baltimore. The first reading of the resolution took place in the Economics Matters Committee Jan. 29, and at a hearing in committee on Feb. 22, testimony was heard from Davis himself, from LaRouche associate Lawrence Freeman, and from Dave Brode of COPE and the AFL-CIO.

Pennsylvania: State Rep. Harold James (D-Phila.), a leading member of the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, introduced a resolution to his state legislature in March 2001. Explaining his forthcoming action at a town meeting in Baltimore, James said: "I believe that that standard of truth and honor also means that we should frankly acknowledge that Lyndon LaRouche was right about the economy, and that everyone who talked about the great 'prosperity,' and 'economic boom,' including some of us, were wrong. Accordingly, I will be introducing a resolution in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, 'Calling for a New Bretton Woods Conference for International Monetary System Stability and Development of the Real Economy.'

"I believe that this resolution is urgent, not only for the sake of our own people, who are suffering from rapidly declining economic conditions, but for the sake of people around the world, many of whom, such as those living on the continent of Africa, are victims of genocide, often with the active complicity of our own State Department, the British Foreign Office, and others."

Virginia: Delegate William P. Robinson (D) introduced House Joint Resolution No. 856 for a New Bretton Woods on Feb. 3, 2001, citing the "significant international support" for the New Bretton Woods.

States' High-Speed Rail Plans Ignore Amtrak

by EIR Staff

While Congress—looking at a \$200 billion war on Iraq—is cutting the nation's spending on its Amtrak passenger railroad system to \$700 million, the two largest states have introduced plans for their own high-speed rail networks. Rather than fight to save and expand Amtrak on the Federal level, as part of an infrastructure reconstruction solution to the economic collapse, officials in California and Texas are pursuing local high-speed rail plans which are important, but whose funding mechanisms make them unlikely to be built at all in an economic depression.

Lyndon LaRouche, in his "November emergency program" of infrastructure rebuilding—the alternative to President Bush's indifference and incompetence in the face of economic collapse—emphasized that the national Amtrak rail system, for passengers and freight, must be expanded with new high-speed rail corridors, and magnetic-levitation transport brought in as soon as possible.

Officials in California in particular, certainly know that LaRouche was 100% right in warning that energy deregulation would be a disaster, there and nationally. On the rail crisis, he is opposed nationally by the same Heritage Foundation-Mont Pelerin Society "free-enterprise" freaks who insisted on electricity and gas deregulation. Neo-conservative guru Paul Weyrich has taken over a so-called "Amtrak Reform Council," and along with war-monger Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), is demanding that Amtrak be sold off. A Wall Street-Heritage Foundation coalition, joined by the *Wall Street Journal*, is vehemently calling for the break-up of Amtrak, America's only national intercity passenger rail system, and its replacement by private investor-state rail partnerships. Weyrich, in addition, insists and that only "light rail"—i.e., modernized trolleys—be developed.

An Amtrak-killer funding bill was marked up on Sept. 26 by the House Appropriations Committee, under circumstances where fiscal year 2003 began under "continuing resolutions" and "continuing impasse," with no Federal budget passed due to the depression-collapse of revenues. The Republican bill would give \$760 million in Federal funding to Amtrak, leaving the passenger system \$500 million short of the \$1.2 billion-plus Amtrak requested just to keep "stable."

This level of funding—an 8% cut even from last year, when Amtrak nearly shut down entirely—could lead to the loss of all long-distance passenger corridors now operating. In particular, six routes would go: the Three Rivers, from Chicago to New York; the Pennsylvanian, from Chicago to