

## Zepp-LaRouche: 'I Know What Has To Be Done!'

*This is the text of the one-and-a-half-minute television ad by BüSo chairwoman Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who is running for Chancellor in the Sept. 18 Federal elections. The ad, which the government will run four times, was first aired in prime-time on Aug. 24.*

Back to the D-Mark! [Footage shows BüSo deutschemark leaflet and LaRouche Youth Movement banner]

Germany has no chance to overcome its mass unemployment of 10 million jobless, as long as we stay with the euro. For, a state that does not control its currency, controls nothing at all.

So back to the D-mark! We will be facing the greatest financial collapse of all time, when the global real estate

bubble bursts or the oil price hits \$80 to \$100 [per barrel].

This collapse is also the real reason why the Cheney-Bush Administration is holding "all options open" vis à vis Iran. But a new war, with the deployment of so-called "clean nuclear weapons," would trigger a global asymmetric war.

We must remove the war danger and overcome the world financial and economic crisis through a new financial architecture: a New Bretton Woods system in the tradition of Roosevelt and his New Deal.

For this, we need a new transatlantic partnership between Europe and the United States. This is not impossible, because a positive shift in Washington can emerge very quickly.

Therefore, back to the D-mark! Vote me in as Chancellor, and I will activate the Stability Law from 1967 and implement a state investment program, to create 10 million new productive jobs.

Trust me: I know what has to be done!

and similar slanders, against the BüSo, and then had the gall to recontact Zepp-LaRouche for an interview. "So we are dealing not only with a press blackout," she said, "but a targeted slander." She urged supporters to contact the press to force honest coverage.

To deal with the corruption of the press, especially in the United States (which Zepp-LaRouche compared to the Goebbels press under Nazism), she said one has to develop true citizens, "who not only go to vote, but who qualify themselves to be able to conduct foreign policy, as if they were to become ministers in government." It is fine, she added, that Chancellor Schröder has picked up on the Iran war danger, but that is not sufficient. Unless he also denounces the plans to orchestrate a terrorist incident, this is too little, Zepp-LaRouche said.

Hübschen also denounced those who remain silent in such a crisis, saying "to be silent is to play along." He further stressed that it is not enough to be "against" something, but one must also be "for" a positive alternative.

What the positive alternatives are, to Cheney's spoonbenders' fanatsies, were laid out extensively by both speakers. For Zepp-LaRouche, the underlying cause of war, the financial breakdown crisis, must be removed, by introducing a worldwide monetary reform (New Bretton Woods), parallel to which Germany must restore the D-mark, and with it, re-acquire sovereignty over its economic, financial, and monetary policy. These monetary measures she envisions as part of a new, worldwide Peace of Westphalia, in which the commitment of each is to promote the advantage of the other.

Hübschen's term of reference for a new ordering of world

affairs is a "code of conduct" among nations, whereby differences among nations and cultures are respected, and no pre-established models are imposed on others. He stressed the importance of eliminating the double standard, for example, whereby Pakistan, India, and Israel are allowed to have nuclear arms, without signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty, whereas Iran, which has signed the NPT, is denied fuel-cycle technology.

### German Foreign Policy

As for the specific tasks of German foreign policy, Zepp-LaRouche recalled the missed opportunity of 1989-91. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, she recalled, there were two options for German foreign policy. One was proposed by LaRouche, in his 1988 Berlin speech, which was echoed by Deutsche Bank chief Alfred Herrhausen in 1989, for Germany to launch East/West development through credit allocation and cooperative industrial growth of Eastern Europe, beginning with Poland. That option was killed with the Herrhausen assassination in November 1989, and the "Soros" option of looting the East was imposed instead. As a condition for German reunification, then-Chancellor Helmut Kohl was forced to accept the European Monetary Union, Maastricht, and its austerity prescriptions.

This development perspective must be revived, she said, by reversing the Maastricht Treaty and other monetarist measures imposed on Germany, which are thwarting growth. The broader perspective for development is the Eurasian Land-Bridge, which has been progressing across the continent.

Hübschen's recommendations for German foreign policy contain concrete proposals, especially regarding Iraq and the

region. Calling for a “road map for Iraq,” he outlined steps to be taken as a precondition for re-establishing Iraqi independence and sovereignty: withdrawal of foreign forces, first to outlying areas, or for border protection; settlement of border questions with neighbors; elimination of military checkpoints; separation of the Iraqi government from the occupying powers; abrogation of economic contracts made under occupation; and a vast program of economic and technological help through “sponsorships” by various cooperating countries.

One point both speakers converged on, although from different points of emphasis, was the need to distinguish between a political regime (be it Saddam Hussein’s or Bush’s) and the country and people involved. “Saddam Hussein is not Iraq,” said Hübschen, and “Bush is not America.” He pointed to LaRouche as a “patriot” representing the best American tradition and referenced his own years-long experience of fruitful cooperation with the American military.

In this context, he also drew a devastating picture of the degeneration of the U.S. Army, in particular, as a result of the unjust war in Iraq. He compared the American system to the German system, whereby the American soldier is loyal to his President, regardless. “Such a system requires total trust in the President,” he said, “and now that trust has been shattered because of the fact that the President lied.” The case of war protester Cindy Sheehan, camping out at the President’s Crawford ranch, demanding to know the reason for the war in Iraq in which her son died, is becoming a cause célèbre, and the attempt to hide the growing number of casualties is failing, Hübschen said.

### ‘These Are Not Ordinary Times’

One participant raised the eerie contrast between the image of the United States in Europe 60 years ago as the “liberator,” to the image of America of Bush and Cheney today, whose crimes are threatening to surpass those of the Nazis.

Zepp-LaRouche developed this theme, in terms of the two historical traditions in America, “something which most Europeans do not undersand.” She traced the history of the conflict between these two traditions, from the successful, unprecedented American Revolution against the British oligarchical system, through the centuries, to the present, showing how the British continuously intervened, with wars and assassinations, in order to re-establish imperial control. The continuing fight for the American System, as seen in the 20th Century achievements of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Martin Luther King, and the LaRouche movement today, is what gives hope that the spirit of the American Revolution can be restored, and prevail.

Again, referring to the role of small political movements in this history, she said, “in times of crisis, these movements, like our own, can win. I, as Chancellor candidate, in ordinary times might have as much of a chance as a snowball in Hell,” she quipped, “but these are not ordinary times.”

---

## Interview: Anton Giulio de’Robertis

---

# FDR Wanted UN To Ensure Rule of Law

*Anton Giulio de’Robertis is Professor of History of Treaties and International Relations at the University of Bari, in the southern Italian region of Apulia, and senior analyst at the National Research Center (CNR) in Rome. He has been a consultant and Italian representative in various international institutions for security and foreign relations, such as the Atlantic Council. De’Robertis is the author of several books on the role played by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in shaping an international agreement for peaceful coexistence and cooperation. This discussion with EIR correspondent Paolo Raimondi took place in late July in Rome. It has been translated from Italian.*

**EIR:** I see that you have recently given interviews to some Italian dailies in which you raised a number of important issues related to the system of international relations. You say international relations have changed dramatically and in a dangerous manner, particularly in the past 10 to 15 years, after a long period of relative stability after World War II. Can you explain your thoughts a bit further to our readers?

**de’Robertis:** My concept is the following: During the so-called Cold War, in the Western world we followed a path in international relations, and in the orientation of our democratic political forces, that conceived of the international system as basically peaceful, facing the Soviet threat which was very effectively contained by the deterrence strategy put in place by NATO.

In the Western world, international relations were to follow a path coherent with the principle of democracy which was present in society. That means that relations among states, in a certain sense, had to adapt to the structure that was characteristic of the relations among citizens in democratic countries. In other words, the use of force in international relations was considered a very negative approach, and the rule of law was active, not only in domestic affairs, but also in international affairs.

War was considered the absolute last resort; the use of force was considered something to be avoided in all cases, apart from cases in which the international community, as a whole, considered the basic elements of international law to have been violated. In that case, military force could be used to contrast an action considered to be in contradiction with the rule of law. In that situation, we would not be faced with an act of war, but rather an act of military force carried out to