

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

November 17, 2006 Vol. 33 No. 46 www.larouche.com \$10.00


Bursting U.S. Housing Bubble To Take 1.5 Million Jobs
Why Condi's Anti-Shi'ite Alliance Won't Work
Lorenzo Da Ponte: Mozart's 'American' Librettist

LaRouche on U.S. Election: 'Bush Sings His Swan-Song'



EIR Special Report

LaRouche's Emergency Infrastructure Program For the United States



The crisis of rail, air, and other vital sectors of infrastructure has come about as the result of over 30 years of disinvestment and deregulation. Join Lyndon LaRouche's mobilization for a policy shift to implement modern versions of Franklin D. Roosevelt's anti-Depression infrastructure programs.

Create millions of new, high-skilled jobs, new orders for inputs and goods, and the basis for restoring and expanding the world economy.

80 pages **\$75**
Order #EIRSP 2002-2

Order from
EIR News Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 17390
Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Toll-free: **888-EIR-3258**
(1-888-347-3258)

Or order online at **www.larouchepub.com**

Visa, MasterCard accepted

Shipping: \$3.50 first item; \$.50 each additional item.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Science and Infrastructure
by Lyndon LaRouche
Sector Studies

Rebuilding U.S. Rail System
Is Top Priority

States' High-Speed Rail
Plans Ignore Amtrak

Save Bankrupt Airlines, But
Re-Regulate Them

The Waterways Are Aging
and Neglected

Rebuild America's Energy
Infrastructure

A Meltdown-Proof Reactor:
GT-MHR

Rebuild, Expand U.S. Water
Supply System

Hill-Burton Approach Can
Restore Public Health

Resume Land Reclamation
and Maintenance

DDT Ban is a Weapon of
Mass Destruction

FDR's Reconstruction
Finance Corp. Model

The Brzezinski Gang vs.
Infrastructure—The
Biggest National Security
Threat of All

Campaign for Nation-
Building

President Must Act 'In an
FDR Fashion'

Italy Parliament
Breakthrough for
LaRouche's New Bretton
Woods Drive

The Emergency Rail-
Building Program in the
2002 Mid-Term Elections

Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Muriel Mirak-Weissbach, Antony Papert, Gerald
Rose, Dennis Small, Edward Spannaus, Nancy
Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Associate Editors: Ronald Kokinda, Susan Welsh

Managing Editor: John Sigerson

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS:

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg,
Michele Steinberg

Economics: Marcia Merry Baker,
Lothar Komp

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Law: Edward Spannaus

Russia and Eastern Europe:

Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS:

Bogotá: Javier Almaro

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Caracas: David Ramonet

Copenhagen: Poul Rasmussen

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Rubén Cota Meza

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maitra

Paris: Christine Bierre

Rome: Paolo Raimondi

United Nations, N.Y.C.: Leni Rubinstein

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly (50 issues),
by EIR News Service Inc., 912 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E.,
Washington, DC 20003.
(703) 777-9451.

World Wide Web site: <http://www.larouchepub.com>
e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com

European Headquarters: Executive Intelligence Review
Nachrichtenagentur GmbH, Postfach 2308,
D-65013 Wiesbaden, Bahnstrasse 9-A, D-65205,
Wiesbaden, Federal Republic of Germany
Tel: 49-611-73650.

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>
E-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Executive Directors: Anno Hellenbroich, Michael Liebig

In Montreal, Canada: 514-855-1699

In Denmark: EIR I/S, Sankt Knuds Vej 11, basement left,
DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark. Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40,
Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail: eirdk@hotmail.com

In Mexico: EIR, Manuel Ma. Contreras #100, Despacho 8,
Col. San Rafael, CP 06470, Mexico, DF. Tel.: 2453-2852,
2453-2853.

Copyright © 2006 EIR News Service. All rights reserved.
Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly
prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement #40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O. Box
17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

From the Associate Editor

Lyndon LaRouche's analysis of the Nov. 7 U.S. election and of President Bush's press conference the following day (see p. 4) is—as you might have suspected—quite different than that of the Democratic Party's Congressional leadership, and the “spin” that is dominating the U.S. media. *Go for impeachment now*, says LaRouche. *Let's be nice*, say Rep. Nancy Pelosi and Sen. Harry Reid. Bush himself declared, “The message yesterday was clear: The American people want their leaders in Washington to set aside partisan differences, conduct ourselves in an ethical manner, and work together to address the challenges facing our nation.”


Actually, the “clear message” from the electorate was a repudiation of the Bush-Cheney Administration's policies.

Rep. Charles Rangel, who will be the new chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, was on target when he informed Dick Cheney that the House office in the Capitol that Cheney has been using, but which has traditionally been designated for the chairman of Ways and Means, will be reclaimed. “I'm trying to find some way to be gentle as I restore the dignity of that office,” Rangel said. “You gotta go, you gotta go.”

Our news reports survey some of the areas of policy that show why nicey-nice cooperation with Bush and Cheney is impossible:

- The economic breakdown, as exemplified by the blowout of the U.S. housing bubble, and the pre-election faking of employment statistics;
- The Administration's continuing commitment to perpetual war in Iraq and an attack on Iran. Condoleezza Rice's courtship of Sunni Arab regimes, to provide backup for an attack on Shi'ite Iran, is elaborated in *International*. Cheney's office remains “Neo-Con Central,” and until he's out, the war danger grows.

Finally, I draw your attention to our *Feature*, on Mozart's librettist Lorenzo Da Ponte. LaRouche underlined the importance of two aspects of this work: its discovery of Da Ponte's American System connections; and its portrayal of the sophistry that surrounded the poet. It is “those features of the depravity of Venetian culture which are the root of the pro-oligarchical modes of sophistry reigning in Europe and the U.S.A. today,” LaRouche noted.



EIR Contents

Cover This Week

*LaRouche PAC
organizers in New
York City on Sept. 6,
2006.*



EIRNS/Gene Schenk

4 LaRouche PAC Reports: Bush Sings His Swan-Song

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. issued this statement on Nov. 9. "Impeach that worse-than-useless Bush-Cheney pair while we still have a nation which exists to forgive them for what they have done," he writes. "Let them go kindly; let them go humanely, but 'humanely' means that they must go, and that quickly, for the sake of our nation, and also for all humanity, too. Those who lack the political guts for that great send-off should not be treated as leaders inside the U.S.A."

7 Cheney Behind Press Campaign: Duggan Hoax Rewarmed Again

By Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

7 Election Upheaval Led by Youth Vote

National

10 UCI Students Join Fight Against Campus Gestapo

A LaRouche Youth Movement report from the University of California at Irvine, where the LYM and others confronted Ayn Rand Institute Director Yaron Brook, the crazed advocate of "killing hundreds of thousands" of Muslims.

11 Counterrevolution in Military Affairs Ambushes the U.S. Army

Feature

14 Anathema of Venice: Lorenzo Da Ponte, Mozart's 'American' Librettist

Susan Bowen reviews *The Librettist of Venice; The Remarkable Life of Lorenzo Da Ponte; Mozart's Poet, Casanova's Friend, and Italian Opera's Impresario in America*, by Rodney Bolt. In examining what Bolt's book *doesn't* say, she concludes that "Any truly authentic biography of this Classical scholar, arch-enemy of sophistry, and indefatigable promoter of creativity in science and art, must needs bring to light that truth which Venice, even today, would wish to suppress: that Lorenzo Da Ponte (1749-1838), like Mozart (1756-91), was a product of, and also a champion of the American Revolution and the Renaissance idea of man that it represented."

37 Mozart in Houston: Don Giovanni 'Stays the Course'

A review of the Houston Grand Opera's presentation of Mozart's *Don Giovanni*.

Economics

40 Bursting Housing Bubble To Take 1.5 Million Jobs

The housing bubble created by Alan Greenspan to prop up the U.S. economy is rupturing, bringing the speculative frenzy based on housing to an end. Up to 1.7 million workers, directly or indirectly involved in building new houses, are beginning to be thrown out of work, and the majority will go within the next year.

43 Election 'Job-Growth' Fraud Turning To Plunge

44 German Power: Back to Nuclear, or Blackouts

The combination of Mother Nature and Germany's foolish greenie policy of installing windmills everywhere, produced an electricity blackout for millions of households.

47 Business Briefs

International

48 Why Condi's Anti-Shi'ite Alliance Won't Work

The neo-cons are now getting Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to push a lame-brain scheme to create an anti-Shi'ite alliance in the Middle East to wield as a weapon against Iran.

51 Cheney and Neo-Cons Plotting More Wars

52 Bush-Cheney Policies Proliferate Hotspots

A Strategic Map.

54 What Is Really Behind the Crisis in Darfur?

The reality is different than the propaganda barrage aimed at providing Cheney and Bush with a pretext for intervening militarily against Sudan.

56 LaRouche: Bush and Cheney Plan a New Iraq in Darfur

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., at his Oct. 31 webcast, explained how the problem in Sudan was caused by the United States.

57 Beilin in Washington Pushes for Peace Plan

59 The Poet and the Slain Statesman

The commemoration of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin on the 11th anniversary of his assassination, was delivered by poet David Grossman, whose son was killed in the invasion of Lebanon by Israel.

62 Beijing Summit Puts Spotlight on Africa

63 Mexico: Calderón Has That Old Sinking Feeling

Interviews

58 Yossi Beilin

The head of Meretz Yachad, the leading pro-peace opposition party in Israel, spoke with *EIR* following his speech at the New America Foundation in Washington, D.C., in which he presented his perspective on a peaceful solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the larger Middle East crisis.

Book Reviews

45 Senator's Shot at Free Trade Misses Its Core

Take This Job and Ship It: How Corporate Greed and Brain-Dead Politics Are Selling Out America, by Senator Byron Dorgan

Editorial

64 It's the Economy, Stupid!

Correction: The article "Fusion Torch Can Create New Raw Materials" in the Oct. 20, 2006 *EIR* contained an error in describing the isotopes of hydrogen. The first sentence on page 56 should have read, "The ordinary hydrogen nucleus has one proton; deuterium has one proton plus one neutron in its nucleus, and tritium has one proton plus two neutrons."

LaRouche PAC Reports: Bush Sings His Swan-Song

Leading Democrat and statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. issued this statement Nov. 9.

Yesterday, President George W. Bush appeared somewhat humbled, but still wildly insane, in his internationally televised delivery to an East Room press audience. The impressive voter turnout for the election itself, had a great deal to do with causing what was in fact the Bush Presidency's electoral defeat; but the greater part of the credit for that belongs to the combination of an energetic minority fraction among Bush's Democratic and non-partisan opponents, as among youth associated with LPAC. It was also the result, very significantly, of the effects of a revolt from among the patriots within the permanent institutions of the Federal government, as signalled, conspicuously, by outspoken leading figures of the U.S. military.

Bush's already somewhat impressive defeat would have come in the form of a crushing landslide victory for Democrats, but for the sloppy behavior of those opportunistic Democratic Party leaders who, throughout most of 2006, have been more concerned with financial campaign contributions from right-wing financier circles, such as far-right Felix Rohatyn, than the welfare of the nation and its people. In some cases, Democratic candidates earned their victories; in other cases, they won despite their opportunistic lack of response on precisely those issues which remain, now as then, of the most crucial importance to the nation and its people.

Democratic candidates had better learn now, that, in the end, especially under conditions of global economic breakdown-crisis, as today, performance on the real issues of a terrible world crisis will be more important than a pretty face or flashy wardrobe. Such artifacts do not cut a favorable impression among those crucially important, wretchedly poor whom Shakespeare's self-doomed Julius Caesar would regard as presenting "a lean and hungry look."

As a result of this combination of trends and develop-

ments, the situation facing the world in general, and the U.S.A. in particular, is far more deadly after the Democratic Party's victories, than before.

To wit, President Bush exposes himself as being either stupid or insane, when he asserts that the U.S. is in a state of prosperity. The non-existent prosperity which he proclaims so madly, is on the verge of the greatest and deepest physical-economic, as well as financial collapse in modern European history since the end of the Thirty Years' War. To wit, as leading military and intelligence services' veterans warn, there is presently no U.S. military course in Iraq with which to stay. The U.S. under the Bush-Cheney-Rumsfeld band has subjected our republic to a self-inflicted humiliation, and a presently onrushing danger, even far worse in its implications than the folly of the U.S. Indo-China war.

The immediate problem now, is that every policy associated with the George W. Bush, Jr., Administration over nearly six years, has been a net disaster. This is a general disaster threatening the welfare of generations yet to come, unless we act soon to reverse the wrong-headed policies which our electorate has already tolerated much too long.

The Crisis Now Before Us

The pivotal feature of the world crisis now spelling doom for a U.S. under a continuation of a George W. Bush Administration, is the presently onrushing general breakdown-crisis of the entire world's present monetary-financial system. As I emphasized, once again, from Berlin, in my Oct. 31, 2006 international webcast address and remarks, there is no effective reform which could be undertaken successfully within the framework of the existing world monetary-financial system.

The present world monetary-financial system is a dollar-denominated system, a system upon which the majority of the outstanding indebtedness of the entire world is dependent. That dollar is not simply a U.S. dollar; it has been, since 1971-72, a world currency denominated as premised upon the



EIRNS/William Jones

President Bush gives his “swan song” post-election press conference on Nov. 8. He appeared “somewhat humbled, but still wildly insane,” LaRouche comments.

U.S.’s ability to defend what is presently the unsupportable ability of the U.S. government to prop up the value of that nominal world currency. At the time any significant sudden decline in the valuation attributed to that dollar occurs, there would be an immediate, chain-reaction collapse of the world’s entire monetary-financial system, a collapse comparable to what struck Europe with the collapse of the Lombard banking house of Bardi during the Fourteenth Century.

Only if we put the entire world system into bankruptcy-reorganization by a concert of leading and other governments, and if we debride the financier derivatives and related claims from the accounts through bankruptcy-reorganization of existing national systems, could relevant agreements on recovery measures be struck in a timely fashion.

For example, in the case of the U.S.A. itself, a “bank holiday” would be required, to prevent a chain-reaction sort of speculative disruption of essential functional elements of banking. This would mean putting the present Federal Reserve System into government-directed bankruptcy-reorganization. The first measures would be directed to maintaining stability for family households and essential business and professional functions. The measures of reorganization-in-bankruptcy would clear the way for creation of masses of Federally created credit for emergencies and for long-term capital investment in new basic economic infrastructure in the public sector, and matching, related expansion of technologically advanced modes in agriculture and manufacturing.

This would require an abandonment of all “free trade” measures introduced during and since 1971-1981, and a return to a protectionist, “fair trade” policy, as replacement for the ruinous “free trade” policies of the post-1960s interval.

The purging of the monetary-financial system of obliga-

tions on account of gambling and related pure speculation, such as “financial derivatives,” would allow the establishment of new international agreements among a significant number of nations, forcing the world to return to the principles of a fixed-exchange-rate system. Without such a fixed-exchange-rate system, no recovery from the presently onrushing general collapse of the world system would be possible. It would not be a U.S.-based system, but a U.S.-dollar-denominated system based on long-term treaty agreements among, principally, leading nations of Eurasia and the Americas, but also covering the urgent need of development in Africa.

This means impeachment of both the President and Vice-President now. The greatest monetary-financial crash in modern history is onrushing now. Drastic reforms made, largely, in concert with the willing among leading nations, now, will determine the future of the U.S.A., and all humanity for a generation or more to come. We can not postpone that decision—unless our political leaders were idiots—until January 2009.

One would prefer that both the President and Vice-President go quietly. That would prompt a kindly reaction on our part: “Go with God, but go!”

Where are the political leaders who have the guts which I have for such an urgent enterprise on behalf of both our republic and civilization generally? Those who lack the disposition for that specific expression of guts, are not leaders, and should not be supported as would-be leaders.

Who Is Our Enemy?

As I have emphasized repeatedly, Europe would be behaving very stupidly if it attempted to blame every problem of the world on the U.S.A. Admittedly, the George W. Bush

Administration has been a global disaster; but, the policy he represents did not originate inside the U.S.A. His Administration's policies have been imported from those Anglo-Dutch Liberal circles, and their neo-conservative offshoots, in Europe, who have sought to induce the U.S.A. to discredit, bankrupt, and destroy itself: To destroy itself by such means as the policies which represent Anglo-Dutch Liberal styles in international financier interest. There are the interests using their influence over U.S. channels typified by circles such as those of the architect of both Chile's Pinochet government and this Bush Administration, George P. Shultz. These latter are, historically, the same channels based among European Liberal financier interests which have been working to undermine and destroy the patriotic legacy of President Franklin D. Roosevelt since the last breath of that President.

The principal strategic significance of the existence of the U.S.A. since its founding, has been as an expression of the best cultural heritages of modern European civilization transported to a place across the ocean, at a relevant distance from the immediate reach of the seats of European oligarchical traditions. Those European oligarchical traditions, especially the Anglo-Dutch Liberal global geopolitical tradition which has been the sponsor of the leading traitors and the like among us ever since 1763-1789, have recognized the U.S., especially since the victory of President Abraham Lincoln's U.S.A. over the Confederacy puppets of Lord Palmerston's Britain, as the greatest threat to the Anglo-Dutch Liberals' long-standing intent, since 1763, to establish a form of world empire called "globalization" today.

It was for that awkward reason, that Anglo-Dutch Liberals and their U.S. accomplices hated the President Franklin Roosevelt who led in defeating the Hitler machine.

I know, and also remember these Liberal types very well; they are, and have been my personal enemies, such as opponent of the FDR legacy Felix Rohatyn; George Soros; and the circles of that John Train who is closely tied to the operations of Mrs. Lynne Cheney's ACTA (American Council of Trustees and Alumni) and related pro-fascist operations. These types have hated and feared me bitterly since the early 1970s, and especially since President Ronald Reagan's March 1983 announcement of his proposal for a Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) as a replacement for a regime of "revenge weapons."



EIRNS/William Jones

Will Democrats now learn, finally, that under conditions of global economic breakdown, performance on the real issues of the world crisis will be more important than a pretty face? Here, Democrats celebrate on the night of Election Day. Left to right: Rep. Jim Clyburn (S.C.), Rep. Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), and Sen. Harry Reid (Nev.). Pelosi is expected to become Speaker of the House, and Reid the Senate Majority Leader.

Look at the facts which confront us now. The effect of the George W. Bush Administration, has been to bring our economy down into a condition worse than national bankruptcy, and the ruin of the lives of most of our population and the communities in which they live. Never in living memory has the respect for the U.S. as a nation been brought so low as under the George W. Bush Administration; if you doubt that in the least, you have no idea of what is actually going on in the world at large!

Supporting the Bush-Cheney regime would not be an act of patriotism. There is no threat to the U.S. anywhere on this planet, as much as the threat to us which the Bush-Cheney Administration has created by its complicity in promoting the Europe-based Anglo-Dutch Liberal game.

Come on folks! Are you actually dumb enough to think that either Bush or "Shot-Gun Dickie" Cheney is smart enough to have designed the disaster which grips the fate of our nation and its people today? Both of them are actually no more than intellectually and morally deranged puppets, who have been foisted upon us, while most citizens who should have recognized this fact, were, in effect, sleeping at the switch, or so obsessed with what they perceived as their personal short-term interests, that they showed no efficient care for the welfare of their nation and its posterity as a whole.

Impeach that worse-than-useless Bush-Cheney pair while we still have a nation which exists to forgive them for what

they have done. Let them go kindly; let them go humanely, but “humanely” means that they must go, and that quickly, for the sake of our nation, and also for all humanity, too. Those who lack the political guts for that great send-off should not be treated as leaders inside the U.S.A.

Cheney Behind Press Campaign

Duggan Hoax Rewarmed Again

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 8, 2006

London sources tied intimately to both U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney and his wife, Mrs. Lynne Cheney, have once again launched a press campaign on behalf of a repeatedly discredited hoax concerning the causes and circumstances of the suicide by a young, emotionally troubled British national, Jeremy Duggan, who, as the official forensic evidence showed beyond doubt, threw himself repeatedly against moving automobiles on a highway near Wiesbaden, Germany.

The reason for both the original, and the now repeated circulation of that press hoax, has been personal hatred of Cheney and his wife against a person, me, whom they continue to fear as a troublesome political adversary associated with a leading, high-ranking faction within the U.S. Democratic Party scene. The significant electoral success the Democratic Party has just achieved will inevitably increase the rage expressed by both Cheneys, and will probably accelerate the circulation of the fraud into corruptible elements of the European press.

Investigation of the press-hoax which was conducted into continental Europe from certain British press-circles, showed a long-standing association of both Vice-President Cheney and his wife, with sometime Blair Cabinet-associated Baroness Liz Symons. Symons has figured significantly in the earlier production and international circulation of the press hoax about the Duggan case.

Persons familiar with the bitter warfare between me, on the one side, and Vice-President Cheney and his wife, on the other, should have no difficulty in understanding why and how this hoax is being spread into various parts of the European continental press at this time. The fact that the Bush-Cheney Administration has just received a jolting setback from the Democratic campaign in which I have figured, should assist Europeans in understanding the motive for the rewarming of the Duggan press-hoax at this time.

Election Upheaval Led by Youth Vote

by Anita Gallagher

Democrats rode a nationwide wave of fervid rejection of the Bush-Cheney policies on Iraq, the economy, and the disastrous “war on terror” to a 29-seat majority in the U.S. House of Representatives, and a 51-49 dominance of the U.S. Senate, as of Nov. 10. The electorate’s anger was taken out nationally against Republicans, with nearly 79 million Americans voting—a 40.4% turnout of eligible voters, the largest turnout in a midterm election in 24 years. This turnout was spearheaded by an increase of 2 million voters in the 18-29 age group—a bloc which is now poised to become the most important force in U.S. political life.

The Democratic victories also extended to a pick-up of six state governorships from Republican incumbents, and winning the majority in nine state legislative houses while losing none. The rejection of Bush-Cheney was ubiquitous: In historically 66% Republican Kansas, the Democrats picked up a Congressional seat; and in Indiana, a 60% Republican state in 2004, the Democrats picked up three. Independent voters (not registered as Democrats or Republicans), comprising 26% of the national electorate, voted for Democrats by a 59-37% margin.

However, American statesman Lyndon LaRouche has pointed out that despite the dimensions of the Democratic victory, even more could have been won without the subservience of the Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), and others, to financier interests like Felix Rohatyn, who arranged the financial destruction of swathes of U.S. auto, steel, and other industry. And, that the Democratic mandate is to change every disastrous policy of Bush-Cheney, now. Exit polls showed high disapproval of the current Congress—Democrats and Republicans.


The Youth Vote Is the Future

Thirteen of every 100 voters on Nov. 7 were younger than 30. In House races, 61% of the youth voters voted for Democratic candidates—the highest proportion of any age group, according to Peter Levine, the director of the Center for Information and Research on Civil Learning and Engagement. CIRCLE has tracked the youth vote since the U.S. voting age was lowered from 21 to 18 in 1971, and found that despite that reduction of the voting age, voting among 18-24-year-olds even in Presidential elections *dropped* by 13% from 1972 until 2000.

The 2 million increase in turnout of the youth vote reflects

FIGURE 1

Where Democrats Took Senate and House Seats, Governorships



2006, compared to the last midterm election in 2002. “At 42 million strong, this generation will only grow in importance as more and more vote in each election,” said Heather Smith, Director of Young Voter Strategies.

About 24% of *eligible*—and thus a higher percentage of registered voters under 30—voted Nov. 7. The youth vote was larger in Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, and Montana than the national average turnout.

The LaRouche Youth Movement has been highly active at universities in the recent period in Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Connecticut, exposing a campus gestapo operation that was set up by Lynne Cheney under the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) in 1994. In Michigan and Missouri, the youth vote made up a full 17% of the total vote. Besides the East Coast and Midwest, the LYM organized campuses in California and the entire West Coast, and registered voters. With many close races nationwide, the LYM’s energizing of the political environment around campuses, and its voter registration efforts, may have been the deciding factor.

It is lawful that youth-dense precincts near universities in eight states showed even greater voter turnout than other areas, demonstrating the effect of making political issues part of the social environment. The 2006 analysis of the Young

Voter Battleground Poll, which focussed on 36 precincts near universities in Ohio, Connecticut, Michigan, and Colorado, where there were voter registration drives, showed that in these precincts, voter turnout numbers *increased by 157%* from the 2002 turnout. This increase was six times the national average increase in voting by young adults.

Furthermore, the youth vote increased in 2006 not because of new campaign tactics, like Internet campaigning on YouTube or MySpace websites, but because of the oldest approach on record: Somebody asked the youth to vote, either in person, or by phone, according to Ed Goetas of Young Voter Strategies.

The bipartisan Young Voter Strategy Poll found that 40% of young voters identify with Democrats; 30% with Republicans, and 23% with Independents. On Nov. 7, half reported they voted for Democrats, and 61% voted for Democratic Congressional candidates. This is the second consecutive election in which the youth vote has gone to Democrats. Some studies show that if a youth votes for a party three times in a row, he or she will identify with that party for life. But the real implication for U.S. political life is, as LaRouche has often said, “These youth will be the ones who inhabit this planet for the next 50, 60 years. And they will kick the Democratic Party into shape. They will demand a future.”



EIRNS/Finn Hakansson

The LaRouche Youth Movement organizing in Hartford, Connecticut, Nov. 5, 2006. The LYM played a crucial—possibly decisive—role in many areas, in turning out the youth vote.

A Huge Vote Against Free Trade

No “fair trade” Congressman lost a seat, while 27 U.S. House seats and six U.S. Senate seats flipped from free-traders to fair-traders, according to a Nov. 8 report compiled by Lori Wallach, Director of Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch, and reported on a conference call on “The Role of Trade Issues in the 2006 Campaign.” Rep. Joe Donnelly, the Democrat who defeated Republican free-trader Chris Chocola in Indiana’s 2nd C.D. (northwest Indiana), said that Delphi Corp.’s bankruptcy and shipment of auto parts jobs overseas was decisive in his win, citing the effects of the Delphi shutdown in Kokomo. Delphi workers were earning \$21/hour with benefits; they were told they would have to work for \$9/hour and no benefits, and “learn to compete” with China. Though this area is predominately rural, virtually every family had a Delphi worker. “We never carried Hamilton County by a larger plurality than this year,” said Donnelly; it was the fair-trade issue that drove rural counties to vote for Democrats. Victorious Ohio Democratic Senate candidate Sherrod Brown concurred, noting that Democratic Presidential candidate John Kerry carried 18 of Ohio’s 88 counties in 2004, while the Democrats carried 51 on Nov. 7, with most of these counties being rural areas opposed to free trade.

Democratic Congressman-elect Heath Shuler from North Carolina’s 11th C.D. said, “My stump speech began and ended with fair trade. My opponent [Rep. Charles Taylor (R)] didn’t vote on CAFTA [Central American Free Trade Agreement], while North Carolina lost 78% of its textile industry to unfair trade agreements.”

Leo Gerard, the president of the Steelworkers union, reported that steelworkers lost 50,000 jobs over the last six years because of unfair trade agreements.

The battle against free trade, and the financial predators like Felix Rohatyn, Wilbur Ross, and Lashmi Mittal, who are buying up entire industries and shipping production overseas, has been led by Lyndon LaRouche. The rest of the Democratic Party, at the urging of DLC Democrat Al Gore, supported NAFTA. In 2006, LaRouche’s Political Action Committee proposed “The U.S. Economic Recovery Act of 2006” to save the auto industry, and hundreds of trade union leaders and elected officials called on the U.S. Congress to pass it. This was a huge issue in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Missouri, which is a major part of the anti-“free trade” vote.

‘Single Issues’ Merge as the Economic Issue

AFL-CIO head John Sweeney, in a Nov. 8 conference call, termed the vote “a referendum on the Bush agenda. The voters combined what pollsters try to keep as ‘single issues’ into a working people’s agenda.” Sweeney claimed that “union voters” drove the vote overwhelmingly against Bush. Hart Opinion Researcher Guy Molineaux said 74% of union members voted for Democrats. The AFL-CIO worked hard to get “drop-off” voters—voters who vote in Presidential years, but don’t come out for midterm elections—to vote, and cited a survey showing that 79% of those voted. In the 12 AFL-CIO battleground states, union members voted 73-27 for Democrats, compared to 55-45% among all voters. The union voters in all categories (white men, women, married women, weekly churchgoers, etc.) voted above the non-union averages for these demographic groupings.

Statewide referenda on raising the minimum wage passed in all six states where they were on the ballot. Gerald MacEntee, President of the 1.4 million member AFSCME municipal workers union, reported that all ballot measures to limit spending at some fixed amount, including proposed Constitutional amendments in Oregon, Nebraska, and Maine, failed to pass because voters now understand that these result in cuts in necessary services.

The AFL-CIO anticipates early Congressional action to raise the minimum wage; restore collective bargaining principles; stop jobs from going overseas, fix Medicare, and restore college tuition funding for the lower 80%.

Democrats gained new majorities in nine state legislative chambers: Houses in Indiana, Minnesota and Michigan, and Oregon; the Wisconsin Senate; and both House and Senate in New Hampshire and Iowa. For the first time in 40 years, Democrats control the governorship, and the State House and Senate in Iowa.

UCI Students Join Fight Against Campus Gestapo

by Nick Walsh, LaRouche Youth Movement

As part of its nationwide assault on the John Train/Lynne Cheney campus gestapo, LaRouche Youth Movement members from Los Angeles intervened at the University of California at Irvine in the days before the election, culminating in a wild scene with Yaron Brook, executive director of the Ayn Rand Institute, who spoke on campus Nov. 6. The key characteristic of the LYM interventions was an increased engagement of the student body itself in the political fight against the right-wing gestapo.

On Nov. 3, two LYM organizers briefed an impromptu 20-person Muslim Students Association meeting, concerning Brook's speeches calling for the mass murder of Muslims. Then, just before the Brook event, a LYM organizer spoke to 100 members of the African Student Union, telling them of Brook's views, and asking why there was such a political vacuum on the campus, including this group itself.

Early on Nov. 6, twenty LYM organizers saturated the campus with copies of the "Is Joseph Goebbels on Your Campus?" pamphlets. Posters at our table attacked Governor Arnie, Lynne Cheney, and Yaron Brook. One poster featured the head of Brook (who lisps) on the body of Elmer Fudd, saying, "Be vewhy, vewhy quiet, I'm hunting Muslims."

At the noon hour, the LYM chorus sang, as organizers handed out a leaflet entitled, "Join the LaRouche Youth Movement in Ridiculing Nazi Fascist Yaron Brook Off UCI Campus!" As a result, when the event began, there were 150 people there, about two-thirds of them youth, including many Muslims—surely an unprecedented number and demographic for the Rand Society, which has only one student member on this campus! To welcome the audience, this one member began by warning that anyone who "stands up, speaks, or sings" would be immediately dragged out. This strange introduction was backed up by ten police officers, standing ready around the room, with more outside guarding the doors, and four squad cars visible near the entrance. Throughout the event, affiliates of the Rand Society youth video-recorded LYM members, and would walk over to police officers to show them photos of whom to watch.

Brook seemed rattled to have so many students there. His speech was as rabidly anti-Muslim as usual. At one point, when Brook said, "If you don't believe me, weed the Wahhabite literature, weed Osama bin Laden, weed. . ." When laughter broke out, he demanded, "What's so funny?" A LYM member responded, "Weed's not good for you."

Music vs. Madness

At another point, when Brook said that the Koran teaches Muslims to stone women who are bad, he was met with laughter from Muslim women students. Later, when Brook unleashed another tirade against Muslims, two LYM women stood and began to sing a political canon. As they were dragged out, two more stood to sing the second part. And as they were, another stood to enter at the third part. This created a beautiful effect on the audience, and people listened well to the words. Brook said, "What a shame such nice voices go to such waste!"

As these LYM members were arrested, others consecutively challenged Brook. Four LYM sang the "You're out, Yaron" canon, and then two more LYM sang "Yaron Brook, his lips did kiss, Cheney's ass he could not miss!" to the tune of "O How Lovely Is the Evening." In all, 13 LYM organizers were arrested for "Disturbing the Peace on a Campus." The atmosphere was so charged that even a student reporter for the campus paper was threatened with arrest while trying to cover the event.

Audience members, other than the old, cranky Rand ideologues in front, increasingly warmed to the LYM approach, and were emboldened by our courage. For example, at one hilarious point, Brook, because of his speech impediment, instead of saying, "We need the right culture, the right society, the right morals," ended up saying, "We need the white culture, the white society, the white morals," provoking much laughter from the audience.

During the question period, many students, mostly Muslims, joined in the challenge to Brook. One Muslim woman asked, "Could you quote the passage in the Koran where it says to stone women?" To which Brook said: "I haven't read the Koran. I don't know where it says that, I don't care what the Koran says." The woman then said, "Before you label a culture inferior, you should do some reading on that culture." Another student said, "Do you think you used "sufficient reason" to detain these people outside?" To this, Brook rambled, "If you came in my house, and tried to impose your will on me. . . ." At that point, another student in the audience shouted, "This is not your house, this is our campus!"

A number of LYM members also effectively intervened, and by the last question, concerning Socrates, Athens, and truth, a majority of the audience applauded, overwhelming the hisses and boos of the fascist Ayn Rand crowd.

Afterwards, in the cognitively churned-up environment, some students were grappling for the connection between Ayn Rand's philosophy and nuclear war. Four students, earlier skeptical of the LYM's accusations against Brook, left with complete certainty that this man is a nut case. Two other students questioned the coordinator of the event: "So, you're saying there's nothing we can do about people on campus inciting violence against a religious group?" Another student was overheard saying, in discussion about the event, "Thank God for LaRouche!"

Counterrevolution in Military Affairs Ambushes the U.S. Army

by Carl Osgood

When the Bush Administration took office in January 2001, military policy discussions were dominated by the so-called “revolution in military affairs,” the idea that the information age was changing the way wars of the future would be fought. Buzz phrases like “effects-based operations,” “rapid decisive operations,” “operational net assessment,” and “standing joint force headquarters” were flying around the halls of the Pentagon and military think-tanks. As explained to this author in 2002, the hypothesis behind all this was that a standing joint force headquarters that uses operational net assessment and employing effects-based operations can achieve decision superiority, enabling rapid, decisive operations.

According to this hypothesis, a standing joint force headquarters (SJFHQ) is a team of qualified experts that is attached to the headquarters of a unified combatant commander’s staff, which can “plug in” to a task force commander’s staff and provide expertise on the region where a crisis has erupted and on conducting operations in that region. At all times, the SJFHQ is responsible for doing the operational net assessment (ONA). The ONA is a “nodal analysis,” which looks at the adversary as a “system of systems,” looking at not only his military capabilities, but also political, economic, and social factors, and information systems and economic infrastructure. Included in this assessment, is a look at the battlespace, U.S. capabilities, and how the enemy sees us. This assessment is used to answer the question, “What kind of effects do you want to achieve?” The means to generate the desired effects are not limited to military ones, but can include diplomatic, information, and economic means, as well. The desired effects are used to design an “effects-based” operation; and “decision superiority” means being able to make decisions faster than the enemy. All of this, employed together, is supposed to result in the execution of a “rapid, decisive operation.”

Somewhere between 2002 and September 2003, however, the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps got ambushed by something else: irregular warfare.

The ‘Clash of Civilizations’ Axiom

To be sure, the think-tankers at U.S. Joint Forces Command are still working with the concepts underlying the buzz

phrases. Early this year, JFCom released a pamphlet entitled *Commander’s Handbook for an Effects-Based Approach to Joint Operations*, which is billed as a “baseline” for continuing the development of future doctrine that will incorporate concepts like effects-based operations. However, a different set of axioms emerging from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan is now dominating the discussion. The invasion of Iraq proved to be neither rapid nor decisive, and U.S. military actions in Iraq have generated often unanticipated effects, unanticipated at least, by anyone who believed the Bush Administration propaganda about the war. The Army, in particular, is reorganizing itself on the basis of an entirely new set of axioms to fight the war that has resulted.

One axiom that remains constant in all this, however, is Harvard Prof. Samuel Huntington’s Clash of Civilizations thesis, first propounded in a 1993 article in *Foreign Affairs*. Indeed, the major war games designed to develop the future war-fighting concepts being espoused by JFCom, such as the annual Unified Quest war game at the U.S. Army War College, are premised on the notion that the future is going to be determined by clashes of civilizations.

Military historian Dr. Williamson Murray, until recently associated with the U.S. Army’s Strategic Studies Institute, wrote in his introduction to a recent volume of essays by students at the Army War College, that Huntington “captured the possibilities” that were already emerging in the early 1990s. “This author would and has argued that the future and its implications are even darker than what Professor Huntington suggested,” Murray added. “The confluence between the world’s greatest reserves of petroleum and the extraordinary difficulties that the Islamic world is having, and will continue to have, in confronting a civilization that has taken the West 900 years to develop will create challenges that strategists are only now beginning to grasp,” challenges that the military, at all levels, must have the expertise to face, Murray argued.

Whether Murray realizes it or not, the Clash of Civilizations thesis is a British Arab Bureau creation. Long before Huntington’s *Foreign Affairs* piece appeared, British Arab Bureau agent Bernard Lewis had crafted the “Arc of Crisis” policy for the Zbigniew Brzezinski-controlled Carter Admin-



DoD/James Bowman, USAF

Donald Rumsfeld is leaving, but will the Pentagon's failing counterinsurgency doctrines continue? The military brass is trying to reorganize itself to achieve an object which is unattainable. Here, President Bush with Rumsfeld and Secretary of Defense nominee Robert Gates (right), at a Nov. 8 press conference.

istration for fostered Muslim Brotherhood-led insurrections along the southern periphery of the Soviet Union. The 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran and the 1979-88 Soviet war in Afghanistan were two fruits of this policy. Lewis continued to agitate for a Clash of Civilizations policy, including joining with the likes of Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, Frank Gaffney, and others from the right wing, in a 1998 letter demanding that President Clinton carpet-bomb Iraq and overthrow Saddam Hussein. In the preface to his 1996 book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Huntington acknowledges the support of the right-wing John M. Olin, Bradley and Smith Richardson foundations for their financial support in making publication of the book possible (see Jeffrey Steinberg and Scott Thompson, "Bernard Lewis: British Svengali Behind the Clash of Civilizations," *EIR*, Nov. 30, 2001).

Imperial Policing Is the Model

The actual model for how the Army is trying to reorganize itself appears to predate even Lewis's and Huntington's promotion of the Clash of Civilizations, however. Maj. Gen. Jonathon Riley, the senior British officer assigned to U.S. Central Command, let the cat out of the bag, during a panel discussion at the annual conference of the Association of the U.S. Army on Oct. 10. He invoked the image of the 1950s British campaign in Malaya, "as the textbook example of counterinsurgency," and suggested that perhaps that may be the model for the future. British success in Malaya has been attributed to two things, Riley said: British experience in imperial policing, and the development of concepts and tech-

niques for waging limited war. Riley noted the 1966 book by Sir Robert Thompson, *Defeating Communist Insurgency, Experiences From Malaya and Vietnam* which enshrined Malaya as the "touchstone" of British expertise in counterinsurgency, and said, "Now that the Cold War is over, perhaps the long view may give us a different perspective, although I think [Thompson]'s wrong to dismiss imperial policing, which one can characterize as an expeditionary campaign to seize the territory followed by counterinsurgency to keep it."

So, the invasion of Iraq would appear to follow the British imperial policing model, regardless of whether that was the original intention. The U.S. military quickly seized the country, but then has been forced to fight a counterinsurgency campaign to keep it, a campaign that was not anticipated by the Bush Administration, though it could

hardly *not* have been foreseen. Now, it would appear that the underlying assumption of the Army's reorganization is exactly what Riley spelled out: to be able to wage major combat operations to seize some designated piece of territory, then spend years waging a counterinsurgency campaign to hold on to it, and that this is the paradigm for the so-called war on terrorism. The only difference is that the empire being defended, today, is the empire of globalization.

The conceptual basis of U.S. military enforcement of globalization has been elaborated at length by Thomas P.M. Barnett, an analyst who lectures at the U.S. Naval War College, in his two books *The Pentagon's New Map* and *Blueprint for Action: A Future Worth Creating*. Barnett divides the world into two spheres, a "functioning core," and what he calls "the red zone," or "the gap." The "functioning core" is that portion of the world where globalization has taken hold, and "the gap," which encompasses Africa, the Middle East (except for Israel), Central Asia, and portions of East Asia and South America, is that portion of the world where it hasn't. The late Adm. Arthur Cebrowski, a collaborator of Barnett's and the one-time head of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's Office of Force Transformation, said in 2003: "Our business is exporting security from the core into the gap." The purpose of exporting that security isn't to strengthen national governments of countries within the gap, however. Barnett has written that "The integration of the Gap will ultimately depend more on private investment than anything the Core's public sector can offer."

Barnett proposes wars of occupation against any countries resisting globalization, and a military restructuring to con-

form to the needs of such a perpetual imperial war mission: light mobile Army units, backed by massive Naval and Air power (shock and awe strategic bombing) with loads of special forces, and using the Marines as the expeditionary force; then a totally separate occupation military force, which he dubs, in true Information Age fashion, the “sysadmin,” or system administrator, force. This is the kind of reorganization that Rumsfeld has been attempting to implement. Rumsfeld may now be gone, but the policy has to change too.

A Little Push Back

A separate panel at the same AUSA conference where Riley spoke, led by Gen. William Wallace, the commander of the Army Training and Doctrine Command (Tradoc), provided some evidence that the Army has not entirely blocked out the lessons of the Iraq invasion. The subject of the panel was “Developing the Future Modular Force,” and it was centered on the development of the Future Combat System (FCS), a system of 18 different combat vehicles and unmanned air and ground vehicles all connected by a network. Future combat formations are going to be organized, both structurally and doctrinally, around the FCS. Tradoc is developing the operational concepts, doctrine, and skills that will be employed by future FCS-equipped brigades, and is experimenting with them in exercises such as the annual Unified Quest war game.

The obvious question, of how FCS fits into a war-winning strategy, however, was only raised after the formal presentations were completed, and then, by a Canadian officer. Wallace had noted earlier that the traditional military doctrine of “seizing the objective” means that once that objective is seized, “you now own it,” and all of the problems associated with it. This is, as one veteran special operations expert pointed out, a belated recognition of a much older truth. In response to the Canadian officer, Wallace said, “You have to recognize that an FCS-equipped formation may not provide all the stuff you need after you take the objective.” He further developed the idea that “the new paradigm suggests that you have to understand” the operational environment, the context of the campaign, the nature of the enemy, and what will the culture degenerate to in the absence of an organized form of government. “If you can understand, you can visualize,” he said, “then you can campaign plan.”

Wallace added that consequence management has to be part of campaign planning. “If I am successful, how am I going to take advantage of that success?” he asked. By the same token, if the campaign is not so successful, how is the damage from that going to be mitigated? “This has to be part of operational planning, up front,” he said.

The kind of planning that Wallace was describing was exactly what was suppressed by Rumsfeld during the run-up to the invasion of Iraq. When this reporter, in discussion afterwards, noted to Wallace that his remarks sounded like the discussions about Iraq in 2003, he said “I was talking about

Iraq in 2006. My experience suggests you can’t consider the end state. There is no end state. What’s beyond is an end state that’s continually evolving, and in my judgement, if you’re very thoughtful about understanding the environment, you can do something about predicting what the next step needs to be and that next step ought to be part of the operational planning.”

But Can Such Wars Be Won?

While the U.S. Army is arguing that it is reorganizing itself to successfully fight counterinsurgency warfare, more sober analysts are drawing the opposite conclusion: that such warfare cannot be won. Dr. Jeffrey Record, who teaches strategy at the U.S. Air War College in Alabama, during remarks at the Cato Institute on Nov. 1, argued that American strategic culture “is not conducive to success in protracted wars against irregular enemies.” He cited a number of reasons for this, two of which are that we are ahistorical—we’re not interested in the history of the places where we’re going to fight; and that we are culturally ignorant. On the second point, he says that the United States is just about the only country in the world where someone can be considered educated without having learned a foreign language.

Even more important is the political environment in which decisions were made that sent the Army to war in Iraq in the first place. *Washington Post* military reporter Tom Ricks, author of the book *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq*, argued in his book that the aim of the neo-conservative ideologues behind the drive to war in Iraq in 2002 and 2003 was not stability. Rather, stability was their *target*. When *EIR* asked Ricks, at the same Cato event, if the Army could ever get counterinsurgency “right,” given the nature of those political decisions, he said, “The Army has been fundamentally at odds with the National Command Authority [that is, the Bush Administration] in its conceptions of the Iraq mission. It keeps calling it ‘stability,’ when there’s no question in my mind, the U.S. National Command Authority’s intentions in Iraq were revolutionary.” Those intentions, Ricks explained, being the removal of the regime in power and the transfer of that power from the Sunni minority to the Shi’ite majority.

While “revolutionary” may not be the right word to describe the intentions of the Bush Administration in invading Iraq, that the Army has a different conception of its mission seems likely. The Army seems to think its mission is to fight counterinsurgency in order to bring about a stable political system to the country it is occupying, whereas the powers behind the Bush Administration are planning more Clash of Civilizations wars, such as against Iran. Yet the message that seems to be emerging is that the United States is in no way suited to fight long-term counterinsurgency wars to enforce globalization. The military establishment, it would appear, is not asking itself what might be the most crucial question: Is it trying to order its means to fit an objective which is unattainable?

ANATHEMA OF VENICE

Lorenzo Da Ponte: Mozart's 'American' Librettist

by Susan W. Bowen

The Librettist of Venice; The Remarkable Life of Lorenzo Da Ponte; Mozart's Poet, Casanova's Friend, and Italian Opera's Impresario in America

by Rodney Bolt

Edinburgh, U.K.: Bloomsbury, 2006

428 pages, hardbound, \$29.95


As the 250th anniversary of the birth of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart approached, I was happy to see the appearance of this new biography of Lorenzo Da Ponte, librettist for Mozart's three famous operas against the European oligarchy, *Marriage of Figaro*, *Don Giovanni*, and *Così fan tutte*. The story of the life of Lorenzo Da Ponte has been entertaining students of Italian for two centuries, from his humble roots in the Jewish ghetto, beginning in 1749, through his days as a seminary student and vice rector and priest, Venetian lover and gambler, poet at the Vienna Court of Emperor Joseph II, through his crowning achievement as Mozart's collaborator in revolutionizing opera; to bookseller, printer, merchant, devoted husband, and librettist in London in the 1790s, with stops along the way in Padua, Trieste, Brussels, Holland, Florence, Dresden; and finally to America, where he ended his days in 1838.


But the more I read, the more I sensed that something important was missing. Bolt had plenty of facts and anecdotes, but the truth itself was lost in the details. How could it be possible, that this creative mind, who worked with Mozart

and made a revolution in opera, who was kicked out of Venice by the Inquisition because of his ideas, who, emigrating to America where he introduced the works of Dante Alighieri and Italian opera, and found himself among the circles of the American System thinkers in Philadelphia and New York, was "not political"? It became obvious that the glaring omission in Rodney Bolt's book is the "American hypothesis."

Any truly authentic biography of this Classical scholar, arch-enemy of sophistry, and indefatigable promoter of creativity in science and art, must needs bring to light that truth which Venice, even today, would wish to suppress: that Lorenzo Da Ponte, (1749-1838), like Mozart, (1756-91), was a product of, and also a champion of the American Revolution and the Renaissance idea of man that it represented.

The battle in which Da Ponte was engaged and to which he dedicated himself, through to his 90th year, was against the same enemy we face today: the Venetian oligarchy, with its offshoots in the Anglo-Dutch Liberal fascist operations, and their method. Lyndon LaRouche has recently emphasized the historic and ongoing mortal battle between the proponents





©2006 Rodney Bolt

New York's Italian Opera House, the first in the city, opened in 1833. Da Ponte financed its construction with his own funds and with large sums he raised from others, but the company failed in 1836. Still, it laid the foundation for a permanent presence of opera in the city, which was revived in the 1860s, after his death.

of true creative thinking, on the one hand, and sophistry, on the other; between the Classical concept and the Romantic (as in Roman Empire). Sophistry destroyed ancient Athens, and as the enemies of the American System know, sophistry, in the form of cultural and moral degradation, intellectual fraud, and “spin” instead of truth, has been their preferred method of attack on the U.S. population in the recent decades, to destroy us *from within*, to the point that the population tolerates all kinds of horror, for example, the Cheney-Bush Administration.

Often, as in the three Mozart-Da Ponte operas, reality lies “behind the notes”; this book’s title itself, though catchy, reveals a lack of comprehension of the political warfare in the late 18th Century, which then, as now, was fought mainly on the battleground of ideas, with scientific, cultural, and literary weapons. Contrary to Bolt’s enchanting portrayal of the poet, adventurer, lover, composer, and controversial Enlightenment thinker, who emigrated to America where he survived careers as grocer and merchant before becoming New York’s first teacher of Italian and setting up its first opera house, I offer here a more truthful perspective.

Lorenzo Da Ponte lived poetry and the poetic principle, and dedicated his life to ensure that he could bequeath this knowledge to future generations. From a young age, he put a premium on truth, and despised the pretentious academic “bread scholars” (as the German poet Friedrich Schiller dubbed them), court poets, and other phonies he often encountered, and his polemics were often humorous, and frequently with biting irony, but always elegantly composed, demonstrating a knowledge of artistic composition and Classical literature that was unsurpassed, except by a few of his associates.

As a teacher who created the first chair of Italian language and literature at New York City’s Columbia College, he brought to life Dante, Petrarch, Alfieri, Ariosto, and the Greek Classics to more than 2,500 students in America; as a bookseller and a philosopher, he personally deposited more than 26,000 Italian-language books into libraries and bookstores. He expounded on many subjects in magazines, newspapers, and gave orations; he held small cultural events for birthdays, and at age 75, he organized and financed the first American production of his opera *Don Giovanni* in 1826. When he was well into his 80s, he personally organized and financed the first opera house in New York City, in 1833. This nation owes a tremendous unacknowledged debt to our immigrant son Da Ponte.

This article will begin to do justice to his real legacy.

A Genius Develops in Venice—And Is Expelled

Lucky is he who takes
The good in all
And through chance and events
By reason is led.

What is wont to make others weep
For him is cause for laughter
And in the turmoil of the world
He will find peace.

—Finale of *Così fan tutte*

Lorenzo Da Ponte was born Emanuele Conegliano, in 1749, near Venice, in the Jewish ghetto of Ceneda, the oldest of three sons of Geremia Conegliano, a leather tanner, and his

wife Rachele. Not enough is known of his education; the Latin tutor hired by his father taught him very little, and he had no other reported schooling, although when he was 13 years old, Emanuele was Bar Mitzvah'ed, which meant he had a familiarity with the Bible and the Hebrew language. He also reports in his *Memoirs*, that he devoured all the books he found in the family's attic.

Nine years after his mother died, when Emanuele was 14, his father decided to marry a Catholic girl, which he could not do as a Jew unless he converted. In August 1763, father and sons were baptized by Msgr. Lorenzo Da Ponte, and the family adopted his name. Emanuele then became Lorenzo Da Ponte. Many half-siblings followed from this marriage. By 1764, Lorenzo and his two brothers were enrolled in a seminary, where they were provided a real Classical education, which, under their previous circumstances, would have been unthinkable.

An inspired young teacher, Abbé Cagliari, from the University of Padua, instilled in Lorenzo a respect for the Italian language which he already loved as a medium for poetry and great ideas. The revolutionary idea that the Italian poets Dante and Petrarch were as worthy as the Latins Virgil and Horace, thrilled these bright young minds, and with his friends Girolamo Perucchini and Michele Colombo, he studied, criticized, and exchanged verses, and discussed philosophical ideas.

The bishop and Lorenzo's father determined that the boys would continue toward the priesthood, so in 1769, the Da Ponte brothers went to the seminary in Portogruaro, near Venice, where their education continued in science and the humanities. However, the Italian language had to be studied in secret. Lorenzo became an instructor and then vice rector. Sometime during this period, Da Ponte began an unfortunate three-year love affair with Angela Tiepolo, a very abusive woman, who lured him deeper into the Venetian swamp. His passion and loyalty were manipulated by Angela and her gambling-addicted brother, to the point of his near ruin. He abandoned his beloved poetry and art! The Tiepolos were *barnabotti*, poor members of the old nobility who, although often penniless, were forbidden to work (because they were *nobility*), and turned to gambling, intrigue, and debauchery, as the main professions open to them.

Bolt paints a dynamic picture of the Venice of the 1770s, and of the woeful tale of the young poet, caught in the clutches of that slimy culture. Venice was the epitome of hypocrisy: the use of the masks, even when Carnival was over, enabled respectable husbands, wives, nobles, priests, and others to engage, undercover, in amorous affairs, gambling, dancing, drinking, and all-around degenerate behavior, all night long. It was accepted practice, of course, that when the morning came, the cloaks came off, and respectability, rules, and laws of behavior, which were very strict, returned, and everything appeared "normal." (As we shall see, the political system was just like the social system: Appearance said it was a republic, but it was in fact a police state with sugar coating.)



The Venetian oligarchs' famous masks allowed them to engage in all sorts of night-time degenerate behavior, as well as political intrigues, until morning came and the disguises were packed back in the closets. Here, "The Ridotto," a painting by Pietro Longhi, from the 1740s.

In 1775, when his brother Giralomo and his friend finally extracted Lorenzo from the disastrous affair in Venice, the Da Ponte brothers secured teaching jobs in Treviso. Lorenzo advanced rapidly, shining as a teacher and poet, and was later given the honor of composing poems for students to present at the ceremony at the end of the school year. He concentrated on his work, spending his time with his books and in discussions, with Girolamo and the scholar Giulio Trento, rediscovering his Muse and his passion for teaching.

The Spirit of 1776

Bolt mentions that the Da Ponte brothers had "likely heard" about the American Declaration of Independence, while in Treviso. The year of the signing of the Declaration, with its idea of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was also the year that Venice's Inquisition began its campaign to *expel* Da Ponte. The two events were related.

In the 1770s, Benjamin Franklin, the "Sage of Philadelphia," and his electrical discoveries, were the talk of Italy. One can imagine the discussions in the cafés among the active minds in Italy, as his lightning rods were being erected atop buildings. Franklin's scientific theories were printed in Ital-

ian, beginning in 1752, and by 1771, the political and philosophical news from America was also followed very closely. Da Ponte studied with the famous scientist Giovanni Battista Morgagni (1682-1771), who was well-reputed throughout Europe for his work in medicine, anatomy, and letters, during the period that Franklin's associate John Morgan was visiting him. By 1775, translations of Franklin's works and correspondence were circulating throughout most Italian universities, and many Italians were talking of the Franklin stove, the three-wheel clock, and, of course, the glass *armonica*, which Franklin named in honor of the musicality of the Italian language, and for which both Mozart and Beethoven composed small compositions. And after Poor Richard's *The Way to Wealth* began to make the rounds in Italian translation, in 1775, Italian verses proliferated celebrating the man "who took the lightning from Jupiter, and the Scepter from the tyrants."

Such was the environment in Italy in 1776, and one is hard pressed to imagine that in that historic year, Lorenzo Da Ponte was *not* profoundly influenced by the philosophy and revolutionary ideas of the scientist and statesman Benjamin Franklin, whom Bolt never mentions. When Da Ponte was honored with the task of composing the poetry, on some scientific theme, to be presented for the ceremony at the end of the school year, in August, he chose the theme of "happiness."

The Accademia presentation, designed to show the skill of the poet, was to be composed in Latin or Greek, and Italian, and was to employ different meters, style, and rhythm. Lorenzo penned a prose prologue, and then four Latin and 11 Italian poems, each with its own concept, in the form of a Socratic dialogue, on "Whether Mankind had attained happiness by uniting a social system, or could be considered happier in the simple state of nature." The recitation, by the best students, was composed in the prescribed form of pro and con debate, which they did very eloquently.

Although an unusual subject for a scientific exposition, everything went well, until, as was customary, the works were published. The Venetian Inquisition authorities read them and began immediate action to ban the teacher with the dangerous ideas. The *Riformatori*, the body in charge of education, received the accusation, which was then referred to the Senate, which ordered a trial for Da Ponte in December 1776.

The Inquisition Moves In

In his *Memoirs*, Da Ponte described this "epitome of justice" for his readers, after reporting that his recent Venetian friends (Senator Bernardo Memmo, whom he had just met, and Pietro Zaguri) "did not deem it wise or necessary to speak" in his defense:

A very forceful orator, the Procurator Morosini attacked me, and at the same time, the two Public *Revisori* whose function it was, *ex officio*, to prohibit or permit the publication of my theses. The ecclesiastical *Revisore* was a monk, of whom Barbarigo, an indefatigable

defender of the cowl, loved and favored *usque ad aras et ulterus*. Barbarigo undertook his defense, joining meantime with Morosini in denouncing me, and seeing, or thinking that he saw that sentiment was on his side, he read in stentorian tones a Latin elegy, which must have been but vaguely understood by these worthy Pantaloons, but which, declaimed energetically with a dressing of invective and sarcasm, served marvelously to arouse those ill-humored pigtailed against me. The American in Europe was the title of the elegy: *Ergo ego semotoe tactus telluris amore, etc.*

After reading these Latin verses, of which the Most Serene Venetian Senate heard much, understood little, and knew nothing at all, the shrewd cripple [Barbarigo, counsel to the Holy Office in Venice—SB] read one of my *sermoni*, which, being in Italian, must have proved more intelligent to them: "Man, by Nature Free, becomes a Slave through Laws." Unimaginable the tumult that arose in the assembly at the reading of that poetic skit, composed by me for no other reason (as indeed were all the other compositions of that scholastic entertainment) than to supply practice for a certain number of my pupils in the art of declamation. I had, in fact, refuted it in the opposing thesis written on Cicero's well-known adage, *Servi legume facti sumus, ut liberi esse possemus*. ("We are made servants of the law, so that we can be free.") That, however, my accuser did not take the trouble to read.

"Listen, your excellencies," cried the dishonest orator in a loud voice, "listen attentively to the scandalous principles of the young man and then judge of what answer you must make."

And here he repeated several passages of that poem, among others the following, which was more emphatically disapproved and hissed than others:

"Subject and slave through error of mortal men, once I feel the weight of chains whose jingle the sane man hears from afar, I fear no longer the fasces of consul or the threatening frown of censor. I embrace in one glance the king on his throne and the ragged beggar on the street, to whom, at times, I toss a worthless coin that he may pay his crossing to the Ferryman of the Stygian swamp. The chatter of those Lords who proudly lift their gilded horns on high seems the light breath of a nascent zephyr, and while worshipful throngs pay them homage, I, self-possessed, lift calm eyes upon the clouds to follow some passing crane, or mayhap, some winged Hippogriff, or now lower them to gaze reflectively at the marble statues of Pasquino and Marforio."

The greater part of those poor wearers of the toga thought they saw in the "golden horns" I ridiculed, the little horn of the Doge's cap, and unable to endure the profanation, voted against me with one general cry. The great verdict was then announced: the two *Revisori*

were declared *uno ore innocens*, and I alone guilty and deserving of punishment. (Memmo came running to give me news of everything.)¹

As they announced Lorenzo's sentence, everyone was struck by fear, except for him. Da Ponte describes how difficult it was to keep from bursting out in laughter at the arrogant *Riformatori*, "who had more need to be reformed than morality and judgment for reforming." Da Ponte said:

The importance attached to the affair by my adversaries, and the dazzling apparel given the prosecution of a public senatorial trial, led many people to think that the aristocratic majesty I had offended could be appeased only by the complete sacrifice of my liberty or of my life. My brothers and my friends wished me to evade the thunderbolt by flight, But I laughed at them and their fears. I could not believe that they would proceed with severe punishments after having beaten so many drums to make an effect. *Venetian policy never barked when it intended to bite* [emphasis added].

The upshot was that Da Ponte was expelled and forbidden to teach anywhere in the Serene Republic, although his banishment was not executed until December 1779. Every copy of the poems was confiscated, and orders went out through the Venice to investigate the educational system and report back to the Senate on their findings.

Just before the trial began, the literary figure Gasparo Gozzi was secured by Memmo to help Da Ponte. Gozzi was impressed with Da Ponte's work and suggested tolerance to the *Riformatori*, for the youth had much talent, but Gozzi was told point blank: "So much the worse. We must deprive him of the means of becoming dangerous." Da Ponte was barred from teaching ever again, but he remained in Venice, privately tutoring the children of noblemen, and soon, with his brother, becoming a successful improviser of verses on the streets and in cafés, as his Venetian protectors embraced him, typically, to keep an eye on him, before insisting that he flee Venice (the first time.)

During these three months, the scandal made the young poet a local *cause célèbre*, and while staying at the home of Memmo, Da Ponte was introduced into Venetian high society, where he met the Venetian spy Casanova, with whom he is often mistakenly identified and compared. (Even the title of Bolt's biography indicates a friendship between them.) Correspondence between Casanova and Zaguri, for whom Da Ponte worked, exposes the actual disdain they showed towards Da Ponte, rather than any friendship. Our poet maintained contact with many acquaintances, especially in the literary world, like Casanova, although he was not fooled by the latter's evil

nature, as he describes in his *Memoirs*. He and Girolamo worked in Venice until he had to flee for good.

Da Ponte's *Memoirs* describe a series of Venetian setups, although they are never identified as such, where he was "played" by the oligarchy there. (Often, biographers like Bolt misidentify this as Da Ponte's unjustified sense of persecution). He was forced to leave Venice for Padua, where he met Cesarotti and other poets, but after a while returned to Venice, made amends with Memmo, and was assigned to tutor the children of the nobleman Giorgio Pisani, whom he had met at Zaguri's house earlier. Pisani was a leader of the *barnabotti*, and ran for the office of *avogador* in 1778-79, on a campaign to reform Venice's laws. Pisani gave speeches attacking the Venetian police-state methods employed under the cover of silk stockings—which began to disturb some authorities. He lost the election, and any hopes for reform in the Serenissima Repubblica were dimmer than ever. A disgusted Da Ponte composed a little *sonetto codato*, a poetic form used for satire, developed by John Milton.

Da Ponte's blistering polemical poem attacked the state, and also three senators by name. He had circulated it privately to some friends, but "through the indiscretion of a few people," it became generally circulated, and within a short time it was the talk of the town. It was written in the local Venetian dialect, so even the more humble folk could understand it, and gossip quickly spread about this author of the "American Elegies" corrupting the youth, as his poem intensified the rage of his detractors, who moved to oust him for good.

A scandal involving an affair with the married woman in whose house he was living, became the official reason for his banishment. It was later that Da Ponte discovered that an accusation had been placed in the mouth of the lion at St. Mark's about the horrid and enormous crimes of the Abbé Da Ponte, who had "embraced the faith only to trample on and ridicule it and dishonor two noble families of the republic" (an Inquisition-like reference to his having converted from Judaism), through his affair with Angioletta Bellaudi. This accuser, Gabriel Doria, was not just a relative of the families, but an official agent of the Inquisition. And although Da Ponte may never have discovered this, it was his great Venetian patron who set him up, as evidenced in a letter from Zaguri to Casanova dated years later, in 1792, after Casanova had informed Zaguri that Da Ponte would go to London with a woman. (Da Ponte did not tell Casanova that he had married Nancy Grahl, who was with him.) Zaguri writes:

He [Da Ponte] is too much of a scoundrel, but since we also greet scoundrels, greet him in my name. I am perfectly sure that the English will not like him, *and that any day some accident will happen to him*, such as, after a few days at my house, on account of which I said to him, "too many things, abbé, too many things!" [emphasis added].

1. Quotes from Da Ponte are from his *Memoirs* and other books by him. See *For Further Reading*.



©2006 Rodney Bolt

Da Ponte discovered that his banishment from Venice had been precipitated in the usual Venetian manner: An accusation against him was placed in the mouth of the famous lion at St. Mark's Square. The accuser was an official agent of the Inquisition.

Zaguri proceeds in the letter to misrepresent the facts of the matter, which were not unknown to him. This incident involving Angioletta Bellaudi was the pretext used to evict Da Ponte from Zaguri's home, and shortly after that, from Venice. By September 1779, the order came for Da Ponte's arrest, and since he had already left the area, by December 1779, Da Ponte was sentenced: 15 years' banishment from Venice and all her territories, which judgment, if he defied it and was caught, meant he was to be imprisoned in a room without light for seven years.

The Long Arm of Venice

The fugitive poet did not wait around for the sentence, but fled to Gorizia, a town north of Trieste in the Austrian Empire, and thus outside the reach of the long arm of Venice. There was an Italian community there, and it was a center of book-publishing and culture. He had no influential patrons or letters of introduction, but given the occasion of the 1779 Peace of Teschen, just concluded between Frederick the Great and Maria Teresa, he wrote an ode and dedicated it to Count Guido Cobenzl, whose son was the negotiator of that Peace. This endeared Da Ponte to the older Count, who personally printed and distributed the poem. From this, further opportunities opened up, and Da Ponte secured work writing, translating, and publishing for the local lords of Gorizia, at least until his run-ins with other poets forced him to search for greener pastures.

Da Ponte had joined Gorizia's "Arcadian colony," which had Count Cobenzl as its president, and another poet, Colletti, as secretary. This was a discussion group of *literati* committed

to maintaining the purity of the Italian language, especially in the Austrian Empire, which met for drinking, writing, and reciting poetry. Da Ponte prospered, but grew tired of the local rivalries, and took the opportunity to leave Gorizia, having received an invitation to come and work at the court in Dresden.

Arriving there, Da Ponte discovered that the letter was a forgery, a trick, and that there was no employment there for him at all. He was befriended by the poet Catarola Mazzola, with whom he stayed while in the city, and from whom he gained an introduction to the work of adapting libretti, as Mazzola agreed to let Da Ponte assist in his work.

Da Ponte left Dresden after Mazzola brought him two letters some months later—one about the death of his beloved brother, whose income had supported the Da Ponte family at home in Ceneda, meaning that that responsibility would now be his.

The second letter was addressed to Mazzola from a friend in Venice, warning that Da Ponte had come to Dresden for Mazzola's job, and he should be on his guard. They both laughed, but Da Ponte, sentient about Venice, and also detecting that Mazzola might indeed have had such concerns, decided to move on. As he was leaving, Mazzola quickly wrote and handed Da Ponte a letter of introduction to Antonio Salieri, the composer for the court of Emperor Joseph II, who was in the imperial capital, Vienna.

The Court of Austrian Emperor Joseph II

Da Ponte arrived in the grand city of Vienna in late 1781, and lived off the funds he had brought with him from Dresden, circulating in literary circles and looking for work. In late 1782, Da Ponte, attending the public gatherings of poets held nightly by the famed imperial poet Metastasio, had the fortune to have the aged bard read lines of Da Ponte's poem, and then ask the author to recite the rest. This praise by Metastasio was fortuitous in gaining Da Ponte some notice, and when Emperor Joseph II decided to reestablish the Italian theater in Vienna, which had been replaced by the national theater a year earlier, Da Ponte applied for the post of poet to the theater, and was accepted.

Joseph II, though a Habsburg, was an enlightened monarch, a cultured educator, for whom science and art were crucial to what he considered good government. He was known for his religious toleration, which allowed Jews to dress in the same manner as Christians and even associate with Christians, and his attempt to break down social barriers to develop the economy. These radical ideas outraged both the authorities of the Church and also the nobility, but Joseph persisted in this policy throughout his ten-year reign (1780-90). He elaborated his radical ideas:

I am prepared to employ anyone, let anyone practice agriculture or a trade, establish himself in a city, who

has the required qualifications and would bring advantage or industry into my states.

This same Joseph II, before he became Emperor, made a secret sojourn to Paris in 1775 to meet Benjamin Franklin. Joseph had been traveling with his royal Italian friend Belgioioso, under the name of “Count Falkenstein,” and Niccola, the Tuscan minister, was trying to arrange the meeting. According to Franklin’s writings, the scheduled meeting, which was to appear accidental, did not take place at that time.

Joseph, a musician and man of letters, was very much involved in the musical life of the capital, and Da Ponte was granted an audience, so Joseph could meet the man who would become the poet to the imperial theater. Da Ponte described the audience in his *Memoirs*:

Before this, I had never spoken to a monarch. Although everyone had told me that Joseph was the most humane and affable prince in the world, nevertheless I could not appear before him without feeling great awe and terror. But his smiling countenance, his pleasant voice, and above all the extreme simplicity of his manner and clothes, which in no way reflected what I had imagined of a king, not only raised my spirits, but scarcely gave me time to realize that I was standing in front of an Emperor. . . .

. . . Always eager to learn, he asked me many questions about my country, my work, and why I had come to Vienna. I replied quite briefly, which seemed to please him. At last he asked me how many plays I had written, and when I said frankly, “None, Sire,” replied with a smile, “Good, good! We shall have a virgin muse!”

We will never know what else was discussed between the Emperor and the poet.

A New Kind of Opera Librettist

Da Ponte’s new appointment included securing opera libretti for the theater, adapting and revising them, and preparing the performances, but the virgin librettist knew he had much yet to learn, to master the art of composing a good opera libretto. His work with Mazzola had been an introduction, but did not fully prepare him for the task. He made a special arrangement to view some of the older libretti in the theater, and after a few hours of studying the “precious jewels” in the library of Sr. Varesi, Da Ponte recoiled in horror. The Italian comic operas he perused were neither poetry nor art; he found only doggerel and banal junk, lacking in metaphor, drama, and idea content.

His intention was to compose a libretto that would conform to a high literary standard, but he had no model.

His first commission for the court composer Salieri came in 1784, and the play chosen by the composer for Da Ponte,

was selected without much thought. *Il rico d’un giorno* turned out to be a fiasco, which Da Ponte foresaw, but was yet unsure of a solution:

I now fell seriously to work, but I soon perceived how far imagination outruns execution. The difficulties that I had to surmount were innumerable. The subject did not admit of a sufficient variety of incidents to keep alive for two hours the attention of an audience; I found as I advanced, that the dialogue was tame, the songs forced, the sentiments trivial, the action languid, and the characters uninteresting; in short, I seemed to have lost the entirety of the art of writing, and I felt like a child endeavoring to wield the club of Hercules. At length, however, I finished the first act, and there remained but the finale to compose.

The frustrated librettist put it aside and returned to it again and again, but was cognizant of its inherent failings, and thus thankful each time the opening night was postponed. When *Il Rico* was finally performed in December 1784, it was a big flop, much to the pleasure of those who wanted Da Ponte’s job. Salieri was so angry that he swore that that he would “cut off his own fingers” before accepting another libretto from Da Ponte. Only Joseph II told the poet that his opera was not so bad, and he should try another.

Da Ponte was developing a concept of what Lyndon LaRouche calls the “unity of effect,” which is necessary for a successful composition. In considering the very popular opera of the day, *Il re Teodoro*, whose libretto by the widely known poet (and Da Ponte’s rival) Abbé Casti was set by Salieri, Da Ponte said:

The songs were charming, the *pezzi concertati* (duets, trios, etc.) extremely poetical, the Finale well imagined and written, and yet the opera was neither warm and interesting, nor calculated for stage effect; the action was languid, the characters insipid, the catastrophe improbable and almost tragic; the parts *in fine* were beautiful, but the drama, upon the whole, was contemptible. It brought to mind the idea of a jeweler who had destroyed the effect of several gems for want of skill in their arrangement and symmetry.

From the study of this successful, but flawed opera, he learned much about the defects of his own drama, recognizing that being a good poet is not sufficient to write a good drama. In 1785, with the encouragement of the Emperor, and commissions for libretti for the Spanish composer Vicente Martin y Soler (known as Martini) and for Stephen Storace, emboldened him to master this art.

For the (half English) Stephen Storace, the brother of famed soprano Nancy and friend of Mozart, he transformed Shakespeare’s *The Comedy of Errors* into the Italian opera

Gli equivoci. For Martini, he successfully transformed a comedy by Goldoni into the opera *Il burbero di buon core*, and began to turn the corner in Vienna, even as fierce skirmishes with the jealous Abbé Casti and others in the court raged on. In January 1786, when the opera succeeded, Joseph, who was seen applauding at the opera, approached the poet and said aloud, “Da Ponte, we have gained our cause!”

Da Ponte, like Mozart, faced many rivals in the Italian theater environs. That he was favored by Joseph II gave him certain capabilities, but it also made for acrimonious relations among the envious cretins in the court environs. Da Ponte’s disdain for sophistry, together with his vast knowledge, enabled him to maneuver successfully through the web of intrigue that was the Habsburg Court in Vienna. It also made him a perfect magnet for the like-minded genius, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.

The Immortal Mozart

In 1783, Mozart first met Da Ponte at the home of Baron von Wetzlar, one of the cultural salons that were frequented by musicians, political operatives, and other intellectuals.² These gatherings were hotbeds of pro-American sentiment and activity, in which the latest breakthroughs in science and philosophy were also debated. Mozart requested a libretto from the Italian theater poet, and was promised one within six months, after the poet’s other obligations were met.

After the first discussions between Mozart and Da Ponte at the salon, Mozart wrote to his father about the promise from Da Ponte, expressing concern that nothing might come of it—that this Italian poet might not follow through, or that he might be involved in the prevalent cut-throat competition and court intrigues, which would mean that Mozart might never receive a decent libretto. But after his obligations were completed, Da Ponte was ready to deliver as promised. He had been emboldened by the success of his collaboration with Martini, and also the encouragement from the Emperor himself against his rivals:

Before long several composers turned to me for libretti. But there were only two in Vienna deserving of my esteem: Martini (Martin y Soler) and Mozart, whom I had the opportunity of meeting in just those days at the home of Baron Wetzlar, his great admirer and friend. Though gifted with superior talents to those of any other composer in the world, past, present, or future, Mozart had, thanks to the intrigues of his rivals, never been able to exercise his divine genius in Vienna, and was living there unknown and obscure, like a priceless jewel buried in the bowels of the Earth. I will say boldly, and I think myself entitled to support my assertion, that to

my exertion alone, the world is indebted for those fine vocal compositions which he afterwards composed. I consider my success in forcing him into notice, as an eminent composer for the voice, as the most agreeable circumstance of my life. As a writer for the stage, I had gained the entire confidence of the Emperor, and was determined to use my favor at court for the interest of Mozart.

. . . I was at a loss for some time to find a mode of showing his [Mozart’s] abilities to advantage, without risking the displeasure of my imperial patron who was prejudiced against him as a composer of vocal music, by the evil reports of those who were fearful of his rising into notice. Under these difficulties, I paid Mozart a visit, and asked him whether he would undertake to compose the music for a piece which I had some thought of writing. “I would most willingly undertake it,” replied he, “but I know that neither the managers of the theater, nor the Emperor, would suffer it to be performed.”

Indeed, Mozart’s desire was to demonstrate to the world what he could create with an opera, which fuses the orchestral and vocal, dramatic, and musical into one coherent work of art. He had composed operas since he was a child, but he knew well that his Muse was yet to be discovered by the world. Earlier, Mozart had expressed thoughts similar to Da Ponte’s about the role of the libretto for the composer, in a 1781 letter to his father, before the release of his 1782 German opera *The Abduction From the Seraglio*:

I should say that in an opera the poetry must be the obedient daughter to the music. Why do the Italian comic operas please everywhere—in spite of their miserable libretti? Just because the music reigns supreme and when one listens, all is forgotten. Why, an opera is sure of success when the plot is well worked out, the words written solely for the music and not shoved in here and there to suit some miserable rhyme. . . . I mean words or even entire verses which ruin the composer’s whole idea. Verses are indeed the most indispensable element for music—but rhymes—solely for the sake of rhyming—the most detrimental. . . . [T]he best thing of all is when a good composer, who understands the stage and is talented enough to make suggestions, meets an able poet, the true phoenix; in that case, no fears need be entertained as to the applause even of the ignorant.³

By 1785, Mozart had been in Vienna for three years, and had been married to his beloved Constanze for two. At the salon with Baron Von Swieten, which met each Sunday, Mo-


2. Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., “Mozart’s 1782-1786 Revolution in Music,” and “Mozart and the American Revolutionary Upsurge,” *Fidelio*, Winter 1992. Available at www.schillerinstitute.org.

3. Emily Anderson, ed., *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (Macmillan: 1989)



©2006 Rodney Bolt

Leonardo Da Ponte as a young man.



©2006 Rodney Bolt

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, as he appeared when Da Ponte arrived in Vienna in 1781. Mozart and Da Ponte met in 1783, and their historic collaboration began soon after. Shown here is a portrait of the Mozart family by Johann Nepomuk.

zart had been studying the fugues of Bach, and said they discussed and “played nothing but Bach and Handel.” This intense examination led to Mozart’s breakthrough on the principle of motivic thorough-composition, specifically, with his breakthrough compositions K.475 Piano Fantasy and the K.476 “Das Veilchen,” the first *Lied*. Mozart engaged in a musical dialogue, across the generations, with the discoverer of well-tempered polyphony, Johann Sebastian Bach.

Mozart had made a scientific breakthrough in principle, which generated the genre known as the German *Lied*, and he wanted to apply that same principle to opera. The composer had worked his way up from an unemployed artist to a prolific composer, respected and prosperous pianist, and music teacher. That year, Mozart wrote piano concerti, chamber music works, a horn concerto, the “Masonic Music,” the comedy *The Impresario*, and the Haydn string quartets, as well as the works mentioned above. Mozart also gave numerous concerts, threw parties, and hosted illustrious colleagues, including Joseph “Papa” Haydn, who told Mozart’s father in February 1785, “I say to you before God, and as an honest man, that your son is the greatest composer known to me either in person or by reputation: he has taste, and what’s more, the most profound knowledge of composition.”

Little is known of the story behind the March 1785 performance of Mozart’s cantata “Davide Penitente,” K.469, the text of which is attributed to Da Ponte, but we do know that work on *The Marriage of Figaro* began in earnest. One of the most powerful combinations of creative capability the world has ever seen went to work. Da Ponte considered his

work with Mozart as the crowning achievement of his career.

Although Mozart was doubtful that he could break through the cabals controlling the theater, Da Ponte assured him that he would take care of that matter. Composer and poet began to discuss an appropriate libretto, with Mozart insistent that he wanted a text for Beaumarchais’s *Marriage of Figaro*, even though it had just been banned in the empire! The play had been recently scheduled to open in the German theater, but Joseph II forbade it just before opening night, although he did permit printed copies of the play to circulate, so it was very well known in Vienna. Baron Wetzlar offered to finance the opera as a private affair outside Vienna, were the Emperor to forbid it, but Da Ponte insisted they begin working on it, and said he would seek permission from Count Orsini Rosenberg, or from Joseph himself, at a fortuitous moment.

The Revolutionary ‘Figaro’

The Marriage of Figaro was a pro-American play written by the French supporter, financier, and spy for the American Revolution, Pierre Caron de Beaumarchais, who had secured arms for the colonies in the American Revolution. Mozart and Da Ponte began work, and Mozart’s father reported that because they composed from morning till night, Wolfgang had no time to correspond with him. They worked in secret, (without a commission) for two months straight, until that opportune moment, when Da Ponte would be able to demonstrate to Joseph that all the offensive parts had been removed, and that the music was divine.



©2006 Rodney Bolt

A ticket for the premiere of Mozart and Da Ponte's *The Marriage of Figaro*. Da Ponte considered his work with Mozart as the crowning achievement of his career.

When the opera was finished, it just so happened that there was a need of a score for the theater, so Da Ponte went to speak with Joseph, who had personal oversight over the musical events in Vienna. "What?" said Joseph, "Don't you know that Mozart, though a wonder at instrumental music, has written only one opera, and nothing remarkable at that?" Da Ponte's reply was that without his Majesty's clemency, he would have written only one opera himself in Vienna. The Emperor gave his conditional permission, relying on Da Ponte's judgment in transforming the French play into a non-offensive Italian opera.

Now, Joseph knew that there would be many ruffled feathers among the nobility, if this piece were performed, and just as Da Ponte arrived to tell Mozart, so did a messenger of the Emperor, demanding that he immediately present himself, and his score, at the Palace. Upon hearing some of the music, which astounded the monarch, Joseph commissioned the work, and in May 1786, after more intrigue and attempted sabotage by the opera honchos, the two artists presented *The Marriage Figaro* to the world, endearing them to posterity, but further infuriating their opponents. The two were conscious of the wholly unique creation which they brought into the world, as the poet wrote in the libretto's introduction to their four-hour-long work:

This opera will not be one of the shortest to have been exhibited in our theater, for which we hope that ample recompense will be offered by the variety of themes woven into the action of this play, as well as its original-

ity and large dimensions. The musical numbers are of the widest possible variety, so as not to leave any performers unoccupied for long periods, to avoid the tedium and monotony of long recitatives, and to lend expression to the many different passions which the characters experience. We wanted to present our most gracious and honorable public with a virtually new kind of play.

And that they did. Previous to the production of *The Marriage of Figaro*, what existed were comic operas and serious operas, generally with set-piece arias, duets, trios, a certain amount of action, connected by recitatives, designed most often to show off the vocal qualities of the singers. With this work, the composer and librettist, who considered art to be very serious business, set an entirely new standard in opera which shook the world. Consider Da Ponte's

comments on writing a *Finale*, which he did not want to be disconnected from the rest of the opera, in the customary fashion:

This *Finale* in Italian comic operas, though strictly connected with the other parts of the drama, is a kind of little comedy by itself; it requires a distinct plot, and should be particularly interesting; in this part are chiefly displayed the genius of a musical composer, and the power of the singers, and for this is reserved the most striking effect of the drama.

Recitativo is entirely excluded from this division of the piece. The whole of it is sung, and it must contain every species of melody. The *adagio*, the *allegro*, the *andante*, the *cantabile*, the *armonioso*, the *strepitoso*, the *arcistrepitoso*, the *strepitososissimo*, with which last every act commonly ends. It is a theatrical rule that in the course of the *Finale*, all the singers, however numerous they may be, must make their appearance in solos, duets, trios, quartets, etc. And this rule the poet is under the absolute necessity of observing, whatever difficulties and absurdities it may occasion; and though all the critics, with Aristotle at their head, exclaim against it, I must observe here that the real Aristotles of a dramatic poet are in general, not only the composer of the music, but also the first *buffo*, the *prima donna*, and not very seldom the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th buffoon of the company. After this description, the distress I suffered in attempting to compose my



Wolf Trap Foundation/©Peter H. Krogh

The Countess and her servant Susanna, in the Wolf Trap Opera Company's 2002 production of The Marriage of Figaro. The two women devise an elaborate plan to trick the skirt-chasing Count into fidelity to his own wife.

first *Finale* may be easily imagined; I was a thousand times tempted to go to the Emperor and entreat him to liberate me from my engagement.

Figaro, with its unity of effect from beginning to end, using the full colors of the orchestra and voice with its arias, sextets, quartets, to create a real drama filled with ironies and paradoxes, truly enabled the audience to leave the theater better people than when they entered it. The story line is complex: A Count intends to use the nobility's "right of the first night" (to sleep with the bride before the groom does), even though the practice had been officially banned. The target, Susanna, his wife's servant, with help from her fiancé Figaro (the Count's servant), and from the Countess herself, plan to trick the Count into loving his own wife. The first plan goes awry, and a second one is cooked up by the ladies without Figaro's knowledge. Meanwhile the Count's own plan, to use one of Figaro's creditors to force Figaro into another marriage, backfires completely. This operatic representation of the revolutionary ideas of the 1776, filled with humor, disguises, and jokes, and subsuming the themes of fidelity, love, real nobility versus "noble" birth, perception versus reality, poses the question of what the future holds for society. The audience sees the hormonal young page Cherubino, and decides whether he will grow up to be "noble" like the Count, or truly noble, like the upstart servants Figaro and Susanna. With amazing playfulness and divine music, this revolution in opera demands that individuals confront their axioms and relationships, and act accordingly.

Michael Kelly, Mozart's friend and the tenor who played

both Basilio and Don Curzio in the première performances of *Figaro*, wrote in his autobiography:

At the end of the opera, I thought the audience would never have done applauding and calling for Mozart; almost every piece was encored, which prolonged it nearly to the length of two operas, and induced the Emperor to issue an order on the second performance that no piece of music should be encored. Never was anything more complete than the triumph of Mozart and his *Nozze di Figaro*, to which numerous overflowing audiences bore witness.

There are few, if any, existing letters or documents which would give more insight into the deliberative creative process that gave birth to these operas, but it is evident from the works themselves, that Mozart and Da Ponte were having a great time battling the sophists and the oligarchy! There are many jokes within the work, some more "inside jokes" than others, such as when Susanna says to Figaro, "We have gained our cause!" after she deceives the Count by agreeing to meet him in the garden. (This was precisely what Emperor Joseph had said to Da Ponte, as recounted above.) More serious jokes were included also, with Figaro singing of the glories of war, for which the entire empire was being mobilized.

Years later, in a reply to the *Edinburgh Review*, which deliberately left out Da Ponte's name from its discussion of his operas, he elaborated the role of poetry and the libretto. In his "An Extract from the Life of Lorenzo Da Ponte," he included an appendix which showed the transformations of

the French prose of Beaumarchais's play into the Italian verse that was set to music. (Casti belittled it as "just a translation.") Da Ponte cited the letter shown to him by Salieri, where Beaumarchais commented on his adaptation of *Figaro*, saying that even with the many deletions and transformations, the poet maintained continuity, such that had he (Beaumarchais) done the same, he would have called his an original work. He had a more developed idea of the librettist:

. . . [I]f the words of a dramatic poet are nothing but a vehicle to the notes, and an opportunity to the action, what is the reason that a composer of music does not take at once a doctor's recipes, a bookseller's catalogue, or even a spelling book, instead of the verses of a poet, and make them a vehicle to his notes, just as an ass is that of a bag of corn? Mozart knew very well that the success of an opera depends, *first of all on the poet*; that without a good poem an entertainment cannot be perfectly dramatic. . . . I think that poetry is the door to music, which can be very handsome, and much admired for its exterior, but nobody can see its internal beauties if the door is wanting.

Da Ponte showed his disgust with what he saw as ignorant or maliciously poor translations from the Italian to English, which "destroy the sense of the original, and present to the public a mass of low and unintelligible absurdities." He cited the poetic translation made by one of his students of the "*Voi che sapete*" arietta of Cherubino in *Figaro*, as superior to the literal translation they provided, since it conveys the *idea* of what is being sung. To make a good translation, although he never explicitly says it, requires creativity, which his detractors despised.

I was reminded of a recent comment by LaRouche, in a paper about creativity, that "true joy lies within the bounds of that quality of creativity which sets the human individual apart from the animal world. True joy is helping to make the world better, in that fashion, for people of times to come. True joy is building a nation, or resuscitating a ruined nation which will be fit for creative human beings to inhabit, or simply mustering the insight to do a kindness." It is exactly that quality of joy that characterizes both Mozart and Da Ponte, with their unbounded optimism despite adversity, and their sense of humor, profound use of irony and metaphor, their commitment to truth, and refusal to be manipulated by money or, rather, lack of it.

They happily broke the all constraints and intrigues of the Venetian players and defenders of mediocrity. With their revolution, they defeated the windbags who had been hoping for a "wind egg." The *Finale* of *Figaro*, which Da Ponte outlined above, indeed ends with the singers facing the audience, after all the intrigues are over, and addressing them: "So let us all be happy."

The Imperial Opera

By 1786, Da Ponte was a busy man—of the 21 operas staged at the Burgetheater, ten were new productions, and of these, six had libretti written by him, including *Una Cosa Rara* for Martini, and *Figaro*. After *Figaro*, both Mozart and Da Ponte made more enemies at the court, who preferred the triumph of mediocrity. Gossip and sabotage were predominant, but Da Ponte, as always, drew from his arsenal to out-flank the Lilliputians and prevail.

Da Ponte wrote a new libretto for Martini on a Spanish comedy of Calderón, appropriate for his patron, the Spanish ambassador, but insisted that Martini grumble at Da Ponte's "delay in writing," and say publicly that "a poet from Venice sent him a libretto." His *Memoirs* tell of the normal conflagration and complaining when the parts were distributed to the singers, and he says one can imagine his inner gloating when one singer in all earnestness approached him saying, "Read that book, Signor Da Ponte, and see how a comic opera is written!" Since they didn't know the poet's identity, the singers and others in Orsini Rosenberg's employ proceeded to attack Martini's score, which both Da Ponte and Joseph thought beautiful. The singers waged intrigues against them, until Joseph's personal intervention demanded that the opera be performed.

At the opening of the opera *Una Cosa Rara, o sia bellezza ed onestà* (*A Rare Thing, Is Beauty and Virtue*), chatter among the nobles continued about the "wonderful Venetian librettist." Applause was enthusiastic, and even Joseph demanded an encore, breaking his own rule of a few days earlier. When Da Ponte, the librettist, was finally presented, the singers, the opera chatterers, and the society ladies were embarrassed, some were miffed, and some of his previously most vocal rivals were livid: "I imagine they regret having been born with tongues, having praised my words so highly before knowing that I was the author."

This not only ended the public debasement of his talent, but it made him and Martini popular throughout Vienna. The two had a good laugh over Da Ponte's dramatic change in stature, as many conspicuous signs of favor and flattery emanated then from Viennese society folk. The popularity of the opera *Una Cosa Rara*, although virtually unknown today, eclipsed *Figaro*, as fashionable Viennese women copied the opera's hairstyles and Spanish pastoral clothing, and as audiences filled the opera houses night after night. Mozart thought the music was very pretty, but commented that "in ten years no one will remember it!"

After these successes, Da Ponte was inundated with requests, and after a few uninspired compositions, he was told by the Emperor that he need not write more libretti for mediocre composers. When he was asked for a libretto by each of Mozart, Salieri, and Martini, Joseph was cautious, but gave him permission to compose for all three, simultaneously, only after Da Ponte told the Emperor his plan:

I shall write evenings for Mozart, imagining I am reading the *Inferno*; mornings I shall work for Martini and pretend I am studying Petrarch; my afternoons will be for Salieri. He is my Tasso!

For Mozart, Da Ponte decided on *Don Giovanni*; for Martini, Da Ponte composed an original libretto called *The Tree of Diana*, and for Salieri, he adapted Beaumarchais's play *Tarare*, which had opened in Paris that year. The story of Tarare's overthrow of the cruel tyrant, ends with the gods proclaiming that Man's greatness derives from solely from his character, not his social status. Da Ponte transformed and lightened up the ending, and added numerous ensembles. Da Ponte and Salieri realized that other major changes were necessary to accommodate music for "Italian acting singers," as opposed to the "French singing actors." They changed the name from *Tarare* to *Axur, Re D'Ormus*, and it was also a success.

Don Giovanni

Mozart set to work and finished *Don Giovanni* over the Summer of 1787. In the year that the U.S. Constitutional Convention was taking place across the ocean, poet and composer again delivered a stinging blow to the oligarchy, with *Don Giovanni o il punti dissoluto*, which was a *dramma giocoso*, a drama with humor. According to Da Ponte, Mozart had wanted to compose a tragedy, but Da Ponte insisted on inserting "Batti, batti," "La ci darem," and other lighter elements, to improve the dramatic action. Indeed, Da Ponte not only understood dramatic impact, he may have foreseen the political necessity of such additions in such a work.

Again, with sublime art and a clear conceptual framework, they targetted the Venetian oligarchical system, and its conception of man as a beast. "Don Juan" was not a new theme—in fact, there were a number of plays and even an opera already being performed on that theme in Vienna that year; but Da Ponte had two other commissions he was obligated for, simultaneously, and Mozart was pleased with the idea. Da Ponte borrowed liberally from Bertati's libretto of *Don Juan*, but the transformation was complete. The opera premièred in Prague, exceeded all expectations, and was hailed as a masterpiece unlike anything the world had known before. Mozart conducted, and was applauded throughout. Da Ponte had been called back to Vienna to work on the opera with Salieri, who did not like being upstaged. Da Ponte said:

I did not see the performance of *Don Giovanni* in Prague, but Mozart immediately wrote to me and told me about his miraculous success and Guardasoni wrote me the following words: "Long live da Ponte, long live Mozart! All the impresarios and all the virtuosi must praise them. As long as they are in the world theater, will never know want."



Washington Opera/Carol Pratt

Don Giovanni and Zerlina, in The Washington Opera's production of *Don Giovanni* in 1998. This powerful polemic against oligarchism was written in 1787, the year that the U.S. Constitutional Convention was taking place.

...The Emperor summoned me, overloaded me with gracious felicitations, presented me with another hundred sequins and said that he greatly longed to see *Don Giovanni*. Mozart returned, and since Joseph was shortly to depart for the field [he left in February 1788—SB], hurried the score to the copy-clerk to write out the parts. The opera went on the stage—*Don Giovanni* came on the stage—need I recall it? *Don Giovanni* did not please! Everyone, except Mozart, seemed to think that something was missing there. And so parts were added, the arias were changed and it was newly performed: and *Don Giovanni* did not please!

And what did the Emperor have to say about it? "That opera is divine, it is perhaps even more beautiful than *Figaro*, but it is not a morsel for the teeth of my Viennese." I told Mozart this and he was not upset, and he said: "Give them time to chew on it!"

He did not delude himself. I ensured, according to his wish, that the opera was performed frequently: And the applause strengthened with every performance, and little by little, even Vienna of the dull teeth acquired a taste for it, they appreciated its beauty and ranked *Don Giovanni* among the most beautiful operas staged in the opera theater.

Don Giovanni is a Spanish nobleman whose activity consists of seducing women, often procured with the assistance of his servant, Leporello, who opens the opera complaining of his fate. Giovanni, masked, is inside the house seducing an unsuspecting noblewoman, whose screams awaken her father, as she tries to free herself and unmask her seducer. The father comes out to defend her, and Giovanni kills him in the duel. The lunge unfolds through to the end of the opera, where Giovanni is destroyed by a higher power, represented by the statue of the man he killed, who comes to dine with him. The work is an elaboration on the ideas of justice and vengeance, natural law, love, the relationship between the oligarchy and the peasants, reality and perception, through a masterful use of irony and humor.

What audience cannot hear the biting irony, as the degenerate nobleman sings “*Viva la Libertad!*” at his banquet, espousing the virtue of hedonistic “freedom”—as the ideas of republican liberty in the U.S.A were pronounced with the close of the Constitutional Convention. This was no “morality play,” as was so commonplace at the time, where the “evil guy gets it in the end.” Even without discussing the music itself, the complex of characters, their relationships, and the issues facing society indeed do address the morality of the population and the rulers, but from the standpoint of the complex domain.

Being a servant of the feudal lords and oligarchy (as the musicians serving Don Giovanni were) was an affront to the very idea of Mozart’s concept of man. His insistence that art and artists serve only posterity kept him in financial difficulty much of the time, but he was not one to sell out for money. The smaller ironies entwined within the major polemics of Mozart and Da Ponte, enrich the operas and make them even more enjoyable, while most of the popular operas of the day are long forgotten.

The year 1787 was a turning point for Mozart, with the death of his son, financial difficulties, lack of subscribers to his concerts, and then, the death of his father, Leopold. Nevertheless, Mozart worked through the Summer on the score, and finished just in time for the October opening. 1787-88 was also a turning point for Joseph II of Austria, whose support was waning among his subjects in the capital, as Austria prepared to join the war against the Turks. In France, in the aftermath of the Queen’s “necklace affair,” which was run against Joseph’s sister Marie Antoinette, there were riots in Paris, and a deterioration of the political and social conditions was becoming evident in the Austrian capital as well. Joseph left for the front in February 1788.

Under the stress of imperial financial problems, in addition to his anger at an insult by one of the singers, Joseph announced the cost-cutting measure of closing of the Italian opera. When he returned to Vienna, Da Ponte came to him with a plan to keep it functioning via subscriptions, which he had already organized. Da Ponte gained his objective, and the opera company was maintained.



Library of Congress

Habsburg Emperor Joseph II (reigned 1780-90) was an enlightened monarch whose government reflected the ideas of the American Revolution, and who made the immortal contribution of sponsoring the collaboration between Mozart and Da Ponte.

‘Cosi Fan Tutte’

The last operatic blast at the oligarchy created between Da Ponte and Mozart was born in 1789-90. In 1789, as the French Revolution was erupting and the Austrian Empire was in trouble, Vienna itself was changing. Intrigues and spying were even more rampant, as the uncertainties in the political situation and the power shifts inside the capital made everyone suspect and cautious. Joseph’s policy of tolerance was gone, and one historian of the day, cited by Bolt, observed that in Vienna, “one never speaks openly, and never about matters of importance. It is known that the walls have ears.”

In this environment, Da Ponte continued at his post, writing libretti for popular operas of the day by Salieri and Martini, and also putting on performances of operatic arias called *Il Pasticcio*—a performance of concert arias by different composers, with light recitative, often satirical, in between, which also kept the singers, orchestras, and stage personnel employed. Competition among prima donnas and others was fierce, and it was over the rivalry of the two mistresses of Da Ponte and Salieri, both prima donnas, that their friendship ended. Mozart travelled to Leipzig, where he heard the St. Thomas Choir of the Bach tradition, and to Berlin, where he was offered better employment, but returned to Vienna. Da Ponte continued to raise subscriptions, and began to open the opera to a wider audience. Previously, it was limited to the nobility, and the popular theater for others.



Washington Opera

A Washington Opera Company production of *Così fan tutte*, with (left to right) Guglielmo, Don Alfonso, and Ferrando. Don Alfonso, the “philosopher,” makes his wager with the dreamy-eyed young men, to teach them a thing or two about the world.

In 1789, *Figaro* and *Don Giovanni* were revived in Vienna with great success, after which Joseph ordered Mozart to compose a new comic opera with a libretto by Da Ponte. Thus was born *Così fan tutte* or *La scuola degli amanti*, which opened in January 1790. Both Mozart and the poet thought that this “third child” of their collaboration was exquisite, and were excited about its production.

This third opera, a comedy based on Classical references from Ovid, Boccaccio, Ariosto, and Shakespeare, but original to Da Ponte, is a hard-hitting attack on sophistry, with specific barbs at the anti-science mob and the formalists who were dominant in 1790 Austria. To say, as critics often do, that these operas are about sex, lust, and adultery, rather than politics, is worse than foolish. The construction of political freedom, as Schiller discusses, is the most beautiful of all works of art. Hopes for such a situation in Vienna were rapidly waning.

Così fan tutte, actually a *dramma giocosa*, has within it some of the most sublime music ever composed for voice. Some scholars report that Joseph wanted the plot to be based on current scandals in Vienna, and some say it targeted him. Again, Mozart and Da Ponte use metaphor to try to uplift a decaying society, and force the audience to reflect on itself in history. There is evidence that Salieri began working on, but then abandoned, the libretto which Mozart took on.

The action opens with a heated debate in a tavern, between two young soldiers and an older philosopher, Don Alfonso, over the fidelity and virtue of the soldiers’ fiancées. The philosopher tries to end the debate, but the soldiers draw

their swords and demand a duel to the death, to defend the honor of their women. In dramatic duets and trios, they finally agree to Alfonso’s wager, that he will prove in 24 hours that their Penelopes are no different than other women respecting fidelity.

Then the women, two Ferrarese sisters (a joke on Da Ponte himself, since his mistress was from Ferrara) sing of their lovers, as Don Alfonso arrives to give the disastrous news: Their men have been called to the front. The soldiers enter and say their goodbyes in a series of duets and trios which meld into the sublime quintet. Music that reaches the depths of the soul is sung both by the sincerely upset women, and the men involved in the bet.

At this point even an uninformed audience conceives a paradox between the music and the action.

The men leave and the women go home to kill themselves, but enter Despina, the maid, who sees them distraught and suggests instead that they amuse themselves. They are horrified at the thought and leave. The philosopher engages the assistance of Despina in bringing in some rich foreign gentlemen, mustachioed Albanians (their fiancées in disguise), to woo the ladies. A description does not do justice to the amazing Italian libretto, with its poetic form and its multitude of puns, inversions, and jokes.

After many amorous moves, it’s still not clear what the women will do. The rejected Albanian wooers are so tormented by this repudiation that they drink poison and “die.” But a doctor comes, Despina in disguise, and they are miraculously revived. Then the women give in, and call a notary—again Despina in disguise—to perform the marriage between the sisters and the Albanians. She babbles unintelligible nonsense, supposedly Latin, which is a very good imitation of a “bread scholar” who speaks in a language no one can understand. But alas, at the wedding, Don Alfonso says he hears the return of the troops, and reality strikes the women, as the Albanians exit.

The soldiers return, singing of the joy of love and fidelity, question the goings on, after finding the notary hiding in the back. Despina shows herself, when Don Alfonso pushes the double marriage contract to the floor into plain sight. The women are pale, but point to Don Alfonso and Despina, whom they blame for corrupting them. Don Alfonso tells the soldiers that the answer is in the room he points to, where the “Albanians” are hiding. The young soldiers return with their cos-

tumes partially on, and begin to woo the ladies as they had done when they were disguised as the Albanians, exposing the cruel hoax. The three women are astounded, the sisters continue to blame Don Alfonso, who laughs and replies that he indeed invented the plot to make them all the wiser, that it was all done for the good. Despina says she learned the moral to the story: Take care that in fooling others, someone else may well fool you.

They all sing to the audience, as was done in *Giovanni* and *Figaro*, that we must let our actions be guided by reason:

Lucky is he who takes
The good in all
And through chance and events
By reason is led.

What is wont to make others weep
For him is cause for laughter
And in the turmoil of the world
He will find peace.

The use of disguises, and also the testing of marital fidelity, were literary devices that have been used since ancient Greece. Having Despina acting as a lawyer, babbling nonsense is just one attack on the sophistry of the day. A more glaring example, indicating the authors' disgust with the sophistry so prevalent in Vienna at the time, is the scene where the rejected Albanians take poison to kill themselves, only to be miraculously revived by Despina, disguised as the eminent doctor, who arrives with a giant magnet. She touches their heads with the magnet, and pulls it along their bodies, saying this is Mesmer's cure, and then the Albanians begin shaking and shivering until they are miraculously revived. The reference to the fraudulent "animal magnetism" theory of Mesmer, which had been refuted by a French commission that included Benjamin Franklin in 1784, is very clear.

Così fan tutte premiered against the backdrop of the United States of America becoming the first constitutional republic, but also, of the disastrous French Revolution, which proved to be very different than the hoped-for model of the American Revolution. Emperor Joseph was both politically weak, and physically ill, and the Austrian Empire's economy was suffering from the terrible, unpopular war that was claiming her sons. Joseph II's reforms, which had characterized his early reign beginning in 1780, and the Josephine era, were coming to an end. And they were finally laid to rest with the Emperor's passing.

Emperor Joseph II died in February 1790, after just four performances of *Così fan tutte*, and Leopold, Joseph's brother, who had formerly ruled in Tuscany, had little concern for the arts and sciences. In the Habsburg Empire, the door was slammed shut on those ideas which Joseph had allowed to resonate—the ideas of American Revolution.

Martini soon moved to Russia to take the post of court composer in St. Petersburg. With the Italian theater closed, and Emperor Leopold's disinterest in the artistic world, there were no more Mozart-Da Ponte commissions. Mozart set *Cleomenza di Tito* by Metastasio and adapted by Mazzola for the coronation, which is a most compact and beautiful treatise on statecraft. A letter indicates that Da Ponte suggested they try their luck in London, but Mozart was working on *The Magic Flute* for the German "popular" theater for at least six months more. Mozart died in December 1791. Salieri stayed on in Vienna.⁴

Escape to London

After Joseph's death, Da Ponte stayed on as theater poet through 1791, but was relieved of his post shortly after that, supposedly in the context of a scandal about his mistress, topped off by a lie that he had written a slanderous poem against the new Emperor. Again, Da Ponte had to flee. He wrote in 1807:

I was obliged to leave Venice. I sought asylum in Vienna, where I had the good fortune to obtain the favor of Joseph II, who conferred upon me the office of dramatic poet, and continued me in that employment until his death. Having been favored by Joseph, was a crime in the eyes of Leopold. After a year of suffering, I was constrained to leave Vienna.

Da Ponte was not only unemployed, but exiled. A meeting with Leopold outside Vienna was helpful in clearing up the matter, but not sufficient to allow him to return and work in the capital.

He fled Vienna and went to Trieste, where he met Anna Celestine Grahl (Nancy), through her father, and they married in 1792. He taught her Italian as she taught him French, and they fell in love, but she was betrothed to another. When her father, a merchant from Dresden, discovered that Nancy's fiancé was after his money and not the love of his daughter, he offered Da Ponte her hand. Nancy, born in England, to a German father and French mother, both converted Jews, was

4. It is important to note here the context in which Salieri and Mozart were "enemies." Mozart knew his own genius, and opposed the predominance of the mediocrity of the court and its environs. Salieri was the court composer, and therefore Mozart's opponent in a cut-throat competition. Mozart was not an early favorite of the Emperor, and by the time Joseph appreciated Mozart's capabilities and creativity, the monarch was preoccupied with the foreign wars and domestic unrest.

Salieri prevented Mozart from getting commissions early on, and the long delayed première of *Don Giovanni* in Vienna required the personal intervention of the Emperor. Salieri simply did not want his own work to be upstaged. These intrigues were rampant and destructive. However, contrary to some allegations, Salieri did not kill Mozart, nor was he a key protagonist in that affair, even if, for his own advancement, he might have liked to kill Mozart's spark of creative genius.

educated in languages. They resolved to go to Paris.

The Da Pontes left Trieste and travelled to various cities, visiting many people, including Casanova, from whom the poet hoped to collect a debt, on their way to Paris. He carried a letter of recommendation to Marie Antoinette, from Joseph II, but when they learned of the imprisonment of the Queen, they changed course for London instead, and joined Nancy's family which had moved there. They spent a year in London, travelling also to Holland and elsewhere trying to establish an Italian theater, and returned to London when a post opened up at an opera house there. Da Ponte wrote libretti, oversaw opera theater operations, and was assistant to the manager, William Taylor, whose wheeling and dealing cost Da Ponte much money and trouble.

In London for over 12 years, Da Ponte faced many enemies and more intrigues in the theater and among the various characters there. He had a successful bookselling business, and developed a working friendship with the librarian and poet Thomas Matthias. There is catalogue of Da Ponte's Italian-language books in the British Library today, which lists the thousands of books in his possession. He signed notes to help his friends at the theater, for which he ended up bankrupt, but of his political and other associations, little is known.

Many people passed through London in the 1790s, including scientists and musicians, such as Haydn, who had attended the dress rehearsal of *Così fan tutte* in Vienna, at Mozart's request. It was in London that Da Ponte reestablished contact with a number of the Italians he had known as a young man, including Michele Colombo. His half-brother Paolo came to London and set up a printing shop, but Da Ponte's *Memoirs* tell us little about the interesting people he must have been in touch with there. There is also much to be learned about Nancy Da Ponte, a cultured and educated woman 20 years his junior, who bore him four children there and also worked in the theater coffee house. Da Ponte had financial problems there, and all the biographies report on his 1800 bankruptcy. This is given as the reason that the family decided to go to the United States, where some of Nancy's family had already settled. She and their children sailed in September 1804, and soon after, Da Ponte followed them.

Bringing Classical Culture to America

In June 1805, at the age of 56, Lorenzo Da Ponte crossed the ocean, and disembarked at Philadelphia and joyously rejoined his family, who had relocated to New York. He carried

just a few books and some personal belongings, along with a vast knowledge of Europe's Classical culture and literature, which he was ready to disseminate through the New World like intellectual seeds ready for planting. Cultivating these seeds became his life's mission, both to enrich American culture with the beauty of Dante and the Italian language-culture, and to develop others who would be inspired by the Muses to keep the poetic art alive for posterity.

Da Ponte was an anti-sophist, Classical thinker, and part of the transatlantic American republican conspiracy, from his early days in Venice, to his work with Mozart and the republican circles, to his 33 years in the U.S.A. (1805-38). He was neither a Casanova libertine, nor a Rousseauvian, but rather, a scientific thinker, trained in astronomy, medicine, history, language, and the arts, who loved his culture and both his countries with an indefatigable passion to defend the Classical tradition of Judeo-Christian civilization against its numerous adversaries. He was an Italian-American, having become a U.S. citizen in 1828, "making it possible for him to express his opinions freely on any subject he chose."


Da Ponte taught more than 2,500 students, and single-handedly filled libraries with thousands of volumes of Latin and Greek Classics and works of ancient and contemporary Italian authors. He spread his books also through Mexico; he catalogued the books and described them (from his memory, as these were the first such reference books), such that librarians from all over the country could begin to order books in Italian.

The American chapter of Da Ponte's life is as full of yarns and tales from his days in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York, as was his exotic life in monarchical Europe. But more important than the events reported while Da Ponte was living in America, were those not reported! The author of the "American Elegies" of 1776 and the librettist of *The Marriage of Figaro* in 1786, did not likely retire from the political scene when he came to America. In fact, he saw no distinction between scientific, poetical, and political work, such that what he left in his *Memoirs* and letters as footprints for us to follow, indicates that we yet have much to uncover about his work in the United States.

For example, a portrait of Ponte was painted by Samuel Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, although there is no mention anywhere that their orbits ever crossed paths.

When Da Ponte first arrived in the country, he followed the advice of his father-in-law, and invested in a grocery store:

Let anyone who has a sense of humor imagine how I laughed at myself whenever my poetical hand was obliged to weigh two ounces of tea or to measure half a yard of "pigtail" for a cobbler or a teamster, or to pour for him a three-cent "morning dram" which, of course, had nothing in common with my other dramas, *Una Cosa Rara* or *Le Nozze di Figaro* for instance.



A few months later a yellow-fever epidemic broke out, and the family moved to Elizabeth, New Jersey, where he discovered that, to his dismay, even in America there are unscrupulous types in business, so when calm returned to New York, so did the extended Da Ponte family.

New York in 1807

The family returned to New York in 1807, which is when Da Ponte met Clement C. Moore (1779-1863) in Riley's bookstore, where they began a lifelong friendship. Moore was a scholar of Greek and Hebrew, and later the founder of the General Theological Seminary and a trustee of Columbia College, but who is best known today as the author of "The Night Before Christmas," which he wrote for his children. The editor of Da Ponte's *Memoirs* (Livingston, 1929) wrote:

There is no doubt that this was an important moment for the American mind. Da Ponte made Europe, poetry, painting, music, the artistic spirit, classical lore, a creative classical education, live for many important Americans as no-one, I venture, had done before. . . . And his classical scholarship, his competence as a creative Latinist, dazzled quite as much as his fame as an Italian poet. . . . It was not so much Da Ponte, as Da Ponte and his setting—the cultural atmosphere of his home—that survived in his children and thereafter. . . . It happened to me thrice, a near century after Da Ponte's death, to hear some New Yorker boast, not quite knowing the significance of the words, that his grandmother, or his mother "studied with Da Ponte."

Indeed, when Moore met Da Ponte, hope that he might learn to read Dante in the original was kindled; after discovering that the poet not only had heard of, but had met Metastasio, and had known Mozart personally, and more, that he had visited the places that Clement and his cousin Nathaniel and others had only talked of, he invited the old European to meet his father, Bishop Benjamin Moore. Bishop Moore was an Episcopal priest, later Bishop of New York, a professor and president of Columbia College, and the person who officiated at the inauguration of President George Washington, and administered last rites to Alexander Hamilton after his fatal duel with Aaron Burr.

The Bishop was dazzled by the poet's mastery of Hebrew and Latin, his vast knowledge of Roman and Vulgate scripture, and his poetic ability. Here was a man who also knew Virgil, Horace, and other Latin authors by heart, as well as Homer and other Greeks. Here in New York City was the man who had written the words for Mozart's operas! Mrs. Da Ponte was also a hit with this society crowd, and besides introducing Italian cuisine, Nancy spoke French, German, Italian, Dutch, and Spanish, and could discuss music and literature as well as her husband.

Clement Moore became Da Ponte's student and lifelong friend, and soon assisted him in setting up his Manhattan Academy for Young Gentleman and Nancy's Manhattan School for Young Ladies, where languages, music, and the sciences were taught. In March of 1807, Da Ponte began his *Conversazione*, the first of which he published with his *Storia compendiosa della vita di Lorenzo Da Ponte*. This little book, published by Riley, included the poems and dialogues recited and translated by his first Italian class, which included Clement and Nathaniel Moore, and John MacVickar, among others. Contributions included a poetic translation of the arietta "*Voi che sapete*," sonnets of Dante and Petrarch, other Da Ponte poems, a dialogue called "The Two Brothers," and a translation of a Metastasio poem (which Mozart had set as a trio) into English and French.

From 1807 through 1811, the Da Pontes continued to be in the center of New York society; they held cultural evenings in their home with poetry, socialized with some of New York's leading families: the Livingstons (with whom Da Ponte maintained a warm friendship), the Hamiltons, the Duers, Ogilvies, the Verplancks, and others. Da Ponte began teaching a number of students, began working on importing Italian-language books, and also set up a distilling business. But in 1811, when the distilling business ran into trouble, Nancy's family invited the Da Pontes to join them in what they described as an idyllic situation in Sunbury, Pennsylvania, and the family left New York and moved west.

Pennsylvania, 1811-18

Facts and figures are voluminous about Da Ponte's debts and finances, his business acumen, and family feuds, especially around his move from New York to Sunbury, but little else of substance is presented. He stayed in Northumberland County, where his wife's family, the Grahls and the Niccolinis, had settled earlier. His neighbors included the family of Joseph Priestly, relatives of Benjamin Rush, and other prominent families with whom the Da Pontes socialized. These families shared in the education of their children; he and Nancy established a music school where they taught language; and his children, now five of them, were tutored by some of the parents of his students. In 1814, he built a large three-story residence, and he was so successful in business that he became the second-biggest taxpayer in the county.

Again, there is much to be investigated, as one can hardly imagine that during the years in Sunbury, the poet was not involved at all in any political or world affairs. As a merchant, he made 72 trips between Philadelphia and Sunbury, in seven years, and though he divulges very little about his activities, he mentions two friends, Dr. Physick and Dr. Benjamin Smith Barton, fathers of American surgery and medicine, who were both active members in the Philadelphia branch of the American Philosophical Society, founded by Benjamin Franklin.

(Latin was the language of medicine in those times, which Da Ponte had studied with some of the Maganagi circle as a young man in Italy.) He often spoke of the many pleasant hours he spent in conversation with eminent scientists and philosophers.

Another Philadelphia friend and associate of Da Ponte, member of the American Philosophical Society, and of James Fenimore Cooper's Bread and Cheese Club (a literary-philosophical-political society), was American System fighter Charles Jared Ingersoll (1782-1862), a Pennsylvania Congressman and U.S. Attorney, who was instrumental in bringing the German economist Friedrich List to Pennsylvania. Da Ponte's son Joseph apprenticed in Ingersoll's law office, until the young man's early death from consumption in 1821. Philadelphia was a center of political activity during the War of 1812, and also throughout the teens, with people like economist Mathew Carey, who was elected to the American Philosophical Society in 1822, writing pamphlets and organizing politically. Carey was also a publisher and a bookseller.


New York, 1819-1838

Da Ponte was happy to leave Sunbury in 1818, and, after a short stay in Philadelphia, he was invited in 1819 to return to New York and teach at Columbia College, by Clement Moore, by then a leading professor of Greek and Oriental Studies there. The Da Pontes' five children all benefitted from the Classical scientific education they received. They were all fluent in many languages, and helped with translations, as well as with the family businesses. His children were Louisa (1798-1823); Fanny (1799-1841); Joseph (1800-21); Lorenzo L. (1804-40); and Carlo (1806-?).

Moore continued to encourage Da Ponte's teaching, and also his bookselling and other literary activities.

In New York, Da Ponte inaugurated a series of lectures on Dante's *Divine Comedy*, the which introduced that divine poet to an American public for the first time, creating a surge of interest in the Italian language and the Renaissance. Some of the lectures were published in the *New York Review and Athenaeum Magazine*.

In 1819, he published his *Extract from the Life of Lorenzo Da Ponte, with the History of the several Dramas written by him, including "Figaro," "Don Giovanni," and "The School for Lovers," with music of Mozart*. This was a reply to an article about the London King's Theater productions in the March 1819 *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, which was nothing more than a running commentary on the actors and singers in the Italian theater, much of it derogatory. In discussing *Don Giovanni* of Mozart, Da Ponte took umbrage at the deliberate omission of any mention of his name as the librettist, and took the occasion to publish this beautiful treatise which covers poetry, libretto writing, and some of his own history, with the text in both Italian and in English. He included the *Blackwood's* article itself, in Italian as well as



©2006 Rodney Bolt

Da Ponte at Columbia College (now Columbia University) in New York City, where he was the first professor of Italian. He sold his library of Italian literature—some 26,000 volumes—to Columbia, forming the core of its collection to this day.

English, and an appendix, mentioned above, with wonderful samples of his libretto arias, transformed from the original French prose, and also Clement Moore's translation of the arietta "*Voi che sapete*."

By 1821, he and Nancy founded the boarding school at his house for students to join his own children and friends in a real Classical education. That year however, the Da Pontes suffered a devastating loss with the death of Joseph, their talented son who was apprenticing with Charles Jared Ingersoll. Joseph returned from Philadelphia and died soon after from tuberculosis, which was not diagnosed then. Da Ponte went to the home of his dear friend John R. Livingston to mourn—a house where he often spent his Summers. The Livingston family had been active in political and scientific life since the American Revolution, and John's brother was a Congressman. John R. Livingston, whose daughters Da Ponte had tutored, had escorted George Washington at that President's inauguration. He worked with Robert Fulton and the steamship business. Da Ponte worked on translations there, and got back to work.

By 1823, at Columbia College, Da Ponte began publishing his *Memoirs*. They were first published as a small essay in 1807, and then in the *Extract* in 1819. He published them serially, as a three-volume work, which he found most useful in teaching his students Italian. (He revised them through the last version in 1830.) He was saddened by the death of his oldest daughter Louisa in 1823, but continued on, writing a history of Italian literature. He created a catalogue with lists of his own books, and he and his son Carlo wrote the book descriptions.

Da Ponte was adamant in his defense of the culture, language, and history of Italy, especially in the face of prejudices arising in the context of Italian immigration to New York City in 1820s. His biting debate with the young historian Prescott in 1824 in the *North American Review* was to defend the importance of the Italian influence in literature.

He was the teacher and associate of a number of leading American System political figures, many of whom were involved in the 1824 Presidential campaign of John Quincy Adams and the New York Bread and Cheese Club of James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, and Fitz-Greene Halleck. (One may imagine that Cooper's book *The Bravo* may have been informed by some of the Da Ponte's intimate, first-hand knowledge of Venetian methods.) Congressman Gulian Verplanck boarded and studied with Da Ponte for years, and as a Congressman he arranged the first bulk purchase of books from Da Ponte for the Library of the Congress.

As the Erie Canal opened in 1825, there was a sense of optimism and growth, with the American System developments under President John Quincy Adams.

Columbia College in 1825 established the first chair for Italian literature, and Da Ponte became its first professor. He sold his library of Italian literature—comprising some 26,000 volumes—to Columbia. He also established an Italian library (with 600 volumes) within the New York Public Library. Both remain to this day the cores of their collections of Italian poetry and other literature.

Manuel Garcia and his opera troupe came to New York, via London, to perform Rossini's opera *The Barber of Seville*. It was in that late 1825 performance that Garcia's young daughter, the later famous Maria Malibran, made her debut.

Inspired by the success of the opera, by May 1826, Da Ponte had organized the first production of *Don Giovanni* in America. He personally raised the funds, organized the management, and located and recruited one of the singers! James Fenimore Cooper and other celebrated New Yorkers were in attendance, reportedly seated prominently in the front row.

Da Ponte appreciated Rossini, but also enjoyed the knowledge, as recounted in his *Memoirs*, that there was an order of magnitude of difference between the Rossini operas and *Don Giovanni*. He describes a patron at the opera who asked to be awakened to hear certain arias in the Rossini. When Da Ponte,

whose identity was unknown to the patron, sat by him again at the performance of *Don Giovanni*, Da Ponte asked if he wished to be awakened at a certain point in the opera; the patron replied, absolutely not! He said he could not sleep at all during this performance, nor after it, either!

In 1828, Da Ponte became an American citizen, sponsored by his son Lorenzo L. This was not mentioned in the *Memoirs*, but Da Ponte told his friend Rosetti in Italy in an 1829 letter, that this would enable him to speak more freely. New York was going through many changes, technological, political, and social. Sojourner Truth, the former slave and abolitionist leader, lectured in New York that year; the state legislature abolished slavery; and there was a Presidential election. Da Ponte continued his teaching, and donated a huge number of books to the New York Society Library, which were available for his students to consult at any time.

Nancy, his beloved wife and partner since 1792, passed away in 1831, after a short and unexpected illness. She was much younger than Da Ponte, in her 60s, and the poet was devastated, but tried to express his sense of loss in the 18 sonnets he composed in her honor.


The next year, he brought the Italian opera company of Giacomo Montessoro to perform in New York and Philadelphia. They performed Rossini and Bellini operas, among others. And in 1833 (when he was 84 years old!), Da Ponte financed with his own funds and with a large sum he raised for the construction of New York's first opera house, which he managed and promoted, with Count Chevalier Rivafinoli. It went through management shuffles and later burned down, much to the poet's dismay, but laid the foundation for a permanent opera presence there, which was reinvigorated in the 1860s.

In the 1830s, New Yorkers had seen the opening of the Erie Canal, major technological innovations, the American System, commerce, and opera. There had also been epidemics and financial problems, and with the advent of the Jacksonian era, scandals were brewing as part of political attacks (against the Livingstons and others). In contrast to the "aristocratic" opera in foreign language, popular culture was moving in. By 1832, four years after his first performance in Louisville, Kentucky, Thomas "Daddy" Rice, as "Jumpin' Jim Crow," was one of the highest paid entertainers in America. Rice, the white entertainer who painted his face black with burnt cork, dressed as a slave, limped like a cripple, sang and danced, jumped and turned. Throughout the 1830s in New York and elsewhere, the racist caricature of the "shiftless Negro" developed into a prominent form of "entertainment." Sheet music was sold to the public, and these shows were booked in "better" theaters, like those which had previously booked Shakespeare.

It was this degradation of culture which Da Ponte was involved in fighting, as were leading American patriots. What Americans know today as "Jim Crow," the set of racist norms



Library of Congress



National Archives/Mathew Brady



Library of Congress

During his decades in the United States, Lorenzo Da Ponte became part of a circle of American System proponents, including such notables as (left to right) inventor/artist Samuel Morse, author James Fenimore Cooper, and Congressman Gulian Verplanck.

and laws enacted in the late 19th Century to deny African-Americans their rights as American citizens, was named for the racist stereotype introduced in the theater. The oligarchy has always understood the power of cultural warfare, and uses it to effect policy changes.

In the 1830s, Da Ponte, even with his extensive scientific, cultural, and political network, may have seen himself as the last of a dying breed of scholars, and was determined not to allow that quality of creative thinking, which enabled Dante, Franklin, or Mozart to create such sublime works, to be extinguished. Although his opera house project failed, he continued to teach, publish, and organize for the Classical idea in America. Since his *Memoirs*, covering the period after 1830 no longer exist, there is much yet to discover from letters and other sources.

His correspondence with political figures around the 1830s Italian Risorgimento, including his oldest and dearest friend Michele Colombo, has not been translated into English yet. It was Colombo who invoked the name and ideal of Benjamin Franklin in Italy, using *Povero Ricardo* (Poor Richard) to mobilize his own countrymen in the 1830s. Da Ponte also corresponded with the poet Felice Romani, who was a friend of the patriotic poet Ugo Foscoli. Da Ponte had met the young Foscoli years earlier in Italy, and spoke highly of him. Romani travelled throughout Europe and then settled in Milan, where he worked with Italian patriots such as Foscolo and Monti. Romani wrote librettos for Vincenzo Bellini, including *Norma*, *Il Pirata*, *I Capuleti e i Montecchi*, *La Sonnambula*; and for Gioacchino Rossini, *Il Turco in Italia*; Gaetano Donizetti, *Anna Bolena* and *L'elisir d'amore*; and Giuseppe Verdi, *Un Giorno di regno, or il finto Stanislao*. One can only imagine Da Ponte's input into what developed as the golden

age of *bel canto* in Italy, directly linking Mozart to Verdi. (Did the direct connection from Mozart to Verdi go through New York?!)

Da Ponte's American Circle

Da Ponte continued writing and publishing his *Memoirs*, the last one published in 1830. He had apparently composed a final section of it, which we are told was destroyed because it contained attacks on Nancy's family in Sunbury. He had often referenced some tension between them over financial and business decisions, but that may not have been the real reason. What interesting window might the world have today, on the insight on the various events in the music and politics, were those pages not destroyed? But he did leave us with this:

Now will my patient reader listen to me for a few moments. In the first 3 parts of my *Memoirs*, the cities in which I lived, the character of the posts I held, the distinguished individuals with whom I had to deal and a certain play of Fortune that seemed bent on subjecting me to the extremest test of her capricious power, supplied me with ample and excellent material wherewith to interest and entertain my reader. The country I have been inhabiting for more than 5 *Lustra* past, yields me no such adventures. I am therefore in the situation of a preceptor of botany traveling about with pupils to instruct them in that science; and who, after showing them the attributes and virtues of trees, plants and flowers, must now pass through desert lands or cross barren mountains, and in order not to waste time, discusses the properties of the shrubs and brambles he has at hand.

Living as I am here in America, I can only write of domestic affairs, and of those events and cares of civic life in which I have been and still am, if not the protagonist of the tragic-comedy, at least one of the leading actors. From all such, nevertheless, a wise reader may learn something useful; the person with the eye to see the doctrine that is hidden under the verses, may learn the rules of good living both from the precepts of Socrates or Plato, and from the child's tales of Aesop. Many writers . . . maintain that more may be learned from the reading of some private "Life" than from that of many histories of peoples and nations.

Da Ponte's long-time friends included many in the circles of Columbia College, including Dr. John W. Francis, who was by his side in his last days as the poet translated and recited for him, which, as Francis said, was to show him that his mind was still sharp. Dr. Francis was the medical doctor for Edgar Allan Poe, as well as for some of the U.S. Presidents, and he was a founder and elected associate of numerous medical and scientific associations abroad as well as in the United States; he was also a founder of Rutgers Medical School. His other endeavors included the New York Historical Society.

Two of the most beloved people in Da Ponte's life, and his closest collaborators, were his son Lorenzo L, and his son-in-law, astronomer and physician Dr. Henry J. Anderson, Fanny's second husband.

Lorenzo L. (1804-40), married to Cornelia Durant, a niece of President Monroe, was a professor of Italian literature at the University of the City of New York, now New York University, as well as at a small Washington College, where he taught French, Spanish, and Italian, as well as History and Literature. He held teaching posts elsewhere, and was known as a Greek scholar.

He wrote histories, including the 1833 *History of the Florentine Republic and of the Age and Rule of the Medici*. In the preface, he proclaimed that it was to be the first volume of a projected *New American Library of History*, which would chronicle the history of the world from a patriotic Yankee point of view. According to a Washington College historian, Lorenzo L. planned that, "unlike the works of British historians," who he said were tainted with "opinions and doctrines the reverse of those which, as Americans, we should desire our children to imbibe," his history books would show a healthy respect for democratic traditions.

Like his father, he was remembered for his teaching. A former student remarked, "He taught us English literature in such a successful manner that we regarded that study merely as a recreation."

Dr. Henry J. Anderson (1799-1875) was one of the first boarders at the Da Ponte home in 1821, and married Fanny Da Ponte in 1831. Anderson graduated in medicine from Columbia, and devoted his leisure time to mathematics. In 1825,

he was appointed professor of mathematics and astronomy at Columbia College. In 1826, he was editor, along with William Cullen Bryant and Robert Charles Sands, of the short-lived, monthly literary magazine *The New York Review and Aethnaeum Magazine*, which featured book reviews and essays on science, literature, and the arts, as well as poetry. Contributors included Fitz-Greene Halleck, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Richard Henry Dana, and others.


In 1840-41, he and Fanny went to Italy and then Paris, hoping to restore Fanny's health. In Paris, he worked closely with the anti-Newtonian astronomer François Arago, who, together with Carl Friedrich Gauss and Alexander Dallas Bache, Franklin's grandson, organized the *Magnetische Verein* (Magnetic Association). After Fannie died in 1841, Anderson travelled in Europe and Asia on scientific missions, including the geological survey of the Dead Sea in 1847, for which he wrote the official report for the U.S. government. By the 1850s, he was active in the aforementioned New York Bread and Cheese Club, and until his death he was active in international scientific missions. In 1874, he joined as a volunteer the American scientific expedition sent out to observe the transit of Venus in Australia at his own expense. On his return, he visited India, but died while exploring the Himalayas.

Other literary figures who were regulars in the Da Ponte home were writer Samuel Ward, Jr., and his daughter, Julia Ward Howe, composer of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic"; Italian emigrés such as the music teacher and composer Bagioli; and of course his many students over the years. Through these students and friends, the Da Pontes intersected many social, literary, and political orbits. Probably those closest to him at the end of his life, were the pallbearers at his funeral:

Clement C. Moore, mentioned above as Da Ponte's first Italian student and lifelong friend, who met Da Ponte in 1807, and brought him into academic and society circles in New York.

Gulian Verplanck, a friend of Clement Moore, professor at the Theological Seminary; New York Congressman from 1825 to 1833; and House Ways and Means Chairman from 1831 to 1833. He was an early boarding student of Da Ponte, wrote on Shakespeare, and was a member of the Bread and Cheese Club. Re-elected as a Jacksonian democrat, Verplanck drew Andrew Jackson's ire when he would not follow the President's opposition to the rechartering of the Second Bank of the United States, which he said was sound and stable, findings contrary to those Jackson wanted. Verplanck's defiance cost him favor with the Administration, and his career at the Federal level ended in 1833.

Dr. Macneven, an Irish-American medical doctor, was also known as "the father of American chemistry." He was an associate of Drs. Hossak, Francis, Dr. Physick, and Mott. He was a prominent activist for the uplifting of Irish-Americans, and had been a political prisoner from 1798-1802 in



A portrait of Da Ponte in old age, from a miniature by Nathaniel Rogers. His last years were saddened by the decline of American culture around him, yet he never gave up his efforts to uplift the population with beauty.

Dublin. He had been a medical student in Vienna in 1784, and may have known Da Ponte there. In New York in the late 1830s, he was an important social activist in the Catholic Church.

Lorenzo Da Ponte lived until 1838, and although some of his later writings reflect sadness at the treatment he had received from various quarters, especially after the failure of the opera house in 1836 due to some bad business manipulations by his partners, the Panic of 1837, and the cultural decline all around him in New York, he kept at it. He moved in with his son Lorenzo L. and daughter-in-law, where Cornelia continued the boarding school after the death of Nancy in 1831. Da Ponte continued to teach and write to his friends.

He was adamant that the legacy of the Classical art he fought for not be lost, and that his work, and that of the immortal Mozart, not be forgotten in the new world:

I believe that my heart is made of a different stuff from that of other men. A noble act, generous, benevolent, blinds me. I am like a soldier who, spurred by the longing for glory, rushes against the mouth of the cannon; like an ardent lover who flings himself into the arms of a woman who torments him. The hope of giving, *post funera*, immortality to my name, and of leaving to a nation which I revere a memory of me which will not be ignoble; and the sweet allurements of arousing feelings of gratitude and goodwill in those who follow an art that was not disgraced by my pen; the desire to awaken love for the beautiful language which I brought to America, and love too for our ravishing music; longing to see once again on the American stage some of the children of my youthful inspiration, which are remembered in the theaters of the Thames, the Danube and the Elbe; and finally, a sweet presentiment of joy,

encouragement and honor, based on the integrity of my actions, the reliability of my promises and the happy success of a well-organized spectacle, were the powerful spurs which goaded me to this delightful undertaking, and from which nothing, so far, has succeeded in deterring me. I dreamt of roses and laurels, but from the roses I had only thorns and from the laurels bitterness! So goes the world!

In this 250th year after Mozart's birth, new publications and celebrations are welcome, to celebrate the creative output of the composer and his librettist. Those of us engaged in today's battle against sophistry and oligarchism can benefit greatly by knowing more about the great minds who shaped our civilization and culture. But a more accurate title for such a new biography might be *Lorenzo Da Ponte, Classical Scholar, Poet and Librettist; Enemy of Venice, Friend of Mozart and the American System, and the Midwife of Dante in America*.

For Further Reading

Books:

- Emily Anderson (ed.), *The Letters of Mozart and His Family* (Macmillan: 1989)
- Volkmar Braunberghrens, *Mozart in Vienna* (Harper Perennial: 1991)
- Richard Cecil Garlick, *Italy and the Italians in Washington's Time*, Columbia University, Casa Italiana (New York: Arno Press, 1933; 1975)
- Dr. John Wakefield Francis, *Old New York, or Reminiscences of the Past Sixty Years* (New York: New York Historical Society, 1857), on the Internet in "The Making of America Series."
- Sheila Hodges, *Lorenzo Da Ponte, the Life and Times of Mozart's Librettist* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2002)
- Antonio Pace, ed., *Benjamin Franklin and Italy: Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* (American Philosophical Society: 1958)
- Lorenzo Da Ponte, *Memoirs of Lorenzo Da Ponte*, edited and annotated by Arthur Livingston (J.P. Lippincott Co.: 1929; 1959 reprint)
- Lorenzo Da Ponte, *An extract from the life of Lorenzo Da Ponte: with the history of several dramas written by him, and among others, Il Figaro, Il Don Giovanni, & La scola degli amanti, set to music by Mozart* (New York: 1819).
- Lorenzo Da Ponte, *Storia compendiosa della vita di Lorenzo Da Ponte* (New York: Microform Publisher, printed by I. Riley and Co., 1807)
- Joseph Louis Russo, *Lorenzo Da Ponte: Poet and Adventurer* (New York: AMS Press, 1966)

Magazine and Internet sources:

- Paul Cohen, "Lorenzo Da Ponte in New York," *American Book Collector Magazine*, 1987
- Adam Goodheart, "Don Giovanni, A Historical Intermezzo," *Washington College Magazine*, 2006, <http://magazine.washcoll.edu/2006/summer/03.php>
- H.E. Krehbiel, "The History of Opera in America, Being Historical and Critical Observations And Records Concerning the Lyric Drama in New York from Its Earliest Days Down to the Present Time," 1908, www.projectgutenberg.com
- H.C. Robbins Landon, "Mozart Compendium" (Borders Press, 1990)
- George G. Struble, "Lorenzo Da Ponte, Our Neglected Genius," (Northumberland County Historical Society, 1947)
- H.T. Tuckerman, "Lorenzo Da Ponte," *Putnam's magazine*, July-December 1868

Don Giovanni 'Stays the Course'

by Harley Schlanger

A review of the Houston Grand Opera's presentation of Mozart's Don Giovanni, Oct. 28 to Nov. 11, 2006.

The final scene of Mozart's opera *Il Dissoluto Punito* ("The Rake Punished"), also known as *Don Giovanni*, is one of restrained joy. Don Giovanni, the marauding libertine, having refused one last opportunity to repent, has been dragged straight to Hell, while the characters who suffered at his hand gather to sing of their triumph:

"Thus are all evil-doers punished. And in this life, scoundrels always receive their just deserts."

At the end of the glorious performance of this work by the Houston Grand Opera (HGO), as this refrain is sung, the house lights go on, and the characters on stage playfully point their fingers at members of the audience. For this time and place, this action seems to be not just appropriate—after all, this is the Houston of Enron, in the Texas of George W. Bush—but perhaps even prescient, given the smashing verdict which was delivered by voters to the neo-conservatives in the mid-term elections on Nov. 7!

While this concluding gesture brought a smile to many in the audience, I suspect that they were also profoundly shaken, as Mozart undoubtedly intended. For the evil-doer, Don Giovanni, was not punished by an act of men, but of Heaven, by Natural Law acting supernaturally, through a stone statue which imposed the final sentence. Don Giovanni's boast, that "No human force can stay me," thus appears to have been true.

Art and Politics

There has been an ongoing debate as to whether Mozart included the final scene to provide relief from the overpowering musical tension in the preceding one, in which the unrepentant Don Giovanni meets his doom. Some critics believe it weakens the ending, by inserting a didactic moral lesson. Others have written that Mozart feared condemnation for the "licentiousness" of the opera, so he inserted a religiously correct footnote to protect him, and his collaborators, from the wrath of the Catholic Church, or an unhinged nobleman.

Such arguments show that their proponents have missed the point. Mozart's opera is highly political, in the only way that great art can be political. This subject, of the relationship between art and politics, was taken up by Lyndon LaRouche,

in a review of the next-to-the-last opera written by Mozart, *La Clemenza di Tito* ("The Clemency of Titus"), which he saw in Dresden several years ago.

"The only kind of politics which belongs within the domain of such art," he wrote, "is the politics of ideas bearing upon the task of defining the nature of mankind, as all of the great Classical Greek and modern tragedies do" (LaRouche, "A Surprise in Dresden," *EIR*, Dec. 8, 2000).

In *La Clemenza*, Titus ultimately rejected vengeance, which is embedded within the axioms of Roman law, in favor of forgiveness, such that his decision cohered "with the higher principle of agapē," which, through the opera, "is reproduced within the imagination of the individual member of the audience."

LaRouche continued, that in his presentation of this transformation, "Mozart does not preach, he evokes the experience of the discovery of the principle of agapē within the cognitive experience of the individual members of the audience, by means of the unfolding, ironical development within the drama as a whole."

By such means, Mozart accomplished what his contemporary, Friedrich Schiller, described as the goal of great drama: To make members of the audience leave the theater as better human beings than when they entered!

Mozart Takes on the Venetians

In Mozart's mature operas, beginning with his first collaboration with the poet/librettist Lorenzo Da Ponte, *The Marriage of Figaro* (first performed in Vienna in May 1786, more than a year before *Don Giovanni* premiered), the composer addressed the great question of his time: Would the success of the American Revolution, in overthrowing the rule of an oligarchic empire, spread to Europe? Would the idea of the inalienable rights of man, protected by institutions of self-government, replace that of the divine right of monarchs and the tyrannical, arbitrary power of the landed aristocracy, as the basis for government?

European republicans faced two primary obstacles. First was the seeming complacency of the general populace, their willingness to abide by oligarchic traditions, in which the majority was treated like human cattle. They might complain about such treatment, as did Don Giovanni's servant Leporello, or the peasant Masetto, who was beaten by Don Giovanni for attempting to interfere with his plans to seduce Zerlina, Masetto's betrothed.

However, at the end, as they celebrate the Don's demise, they reveal that they will continue to abide by the laws of oligarchic rule. Masetto and Zerlina sing that they wish only to go home to dinner, while the abused Leporello announces that he is off to the tavern, to find another master to serve—albeit, this time, a better one.

The real focus of Mozart and Da Ponte, was to expose what was behind the littleness of the people, which caused them to cower in fear when confronted by tyranny. As Susan



Brett Coomer

Leporello, Don Giovanni's obsequious servant, confronts an outraged Donna Elvira with evidence of his master's infidelity.

Bowen demonstrates in the accompanying article, these two artists understood that the problem was not just the continued existence of a parasitical feudal oligarchy, but of a specific type of oligarchic system, spawned in Venice, which, by the end of the 18th Century, was the dominant political/cultural force in Europe.

The problem of Venice was well known among republican circles in Europe, especially in German-language culture. Two of William Shakespeare's plays which exposed the evil duplicity of the Venetians and their system—*The Merchant of Venice*, and *Othello*—were well known in Germany, thanks largely to the work of the universal genius Gotthold Lessing. In 1757, Lessing launched a project to develop a German "national" theater, centered around translating the tragedies and histories of Shakespeare, to replace the dreadful, but popular, plays of the French "Enlightenment." French theater was the entertainment of choice for the Venetian-linked oligarchy, with its emphasis on style and manners, and its adherence to the empiricist philosophical outlook of Aristotle, with its insistence on the status quo.

Mozart's sometime patron, the Hapsburg Emperor Joseph II, supported the creation of a German-language "national" theater, and Mozart's first opera composed for Vienna, *The Abduction from the Seraglio*, was a contribution toward this goal. Both Joseph II, a reformer with some sympathies for the American Revolution, and Mozart, were the targets of intrigues by court figures among the nobility who favored Venetian methods.

Mozart was familiar with Shakespeare's "Venice" plays from his acquaintance with Emanuel Schikaneder, whose travelling theater company spent nearly six months in Salzburg, in 1780-81. Schikaneder became a regular at the Mozart household, and gave them three complimentary tickets for the

season. His company regularly performed Shakespeare.

Schikaneder is perhaps most famous as the librettist for Mozart's last opera, *The Magic Flute*, in which he appeared in the role of the birdman Papageno.

Another devastating critique of Venice written during this time was Schiller's *The Ghost Seer*.

Mozart's Thorough Composition

From the first measures of the overture to *Don Giovanni*, with its eerie opening theme—in which the first violins play syncopated quarter notes against 16th notes played by the second violins, followed by a succession of minor scales played by the first violins and the flutes, an octave apart—the audience is riveted, seized by a sense that something both awful,



Brett Coomer

Donna Elvira struggles to keep her husband, Don Giovanni, from seducing her maid Zerlina, who is betrothed to Masetto.



Brett Coomer

The statue of the Commendatore (right), who had been murdered by Don Giovanni, when the old man attempted to defend his daughter, gives Don Giovanni one last chance to repent of his crimes.

and yet, sublime, is coming.

This theme is heard again at the end of the opera, in the pivotal scene when the statue of the Commendatore—who was murdered by Don Giovanni in the first scene, while defending his daughter against the rapacious intentions of the Don—accepts Don Giovanni’s offer, and comes to dinner. When this theme is repeated, it is accompanied by three voices: that of the Commendatore, warning Giovanni that he must repent; Don Giovanni refusing, defiantly; and a whimpering Leporello, begging that he submit. The repetition compresses the action of the preceding three and a half hours, forcing a recognition in the audience, that Don Giovanni will not change. He will continue to use force against those who oppose him, while trifling with women and sneering at Heaven.

Though he can be seductive, as in the charming “*La ci darem la mano*” duet with Zerlina, he is always prepared to apply brute force, as when he pulls Masetto aside and warns him, “Masetto, be discrete; or else—be sorry!” The audience has already seen him kill, and walk away laughing.

He is a model Venetian. He is a de Maistre Beast-Man.

The audience is, thus, not surprised to see him defiant to the end. Don Giovanni truly “stays the course.”

Developing a Mozart Tradition

The Houston Grand Opera’s presentation of *Don Giovanni* was a fine way to end a year of commemoration of the 250th anniversary of Mozart’s birth. The performance was superb. The conductor, Patrick Summers, demonstrated from

the opening measures that he would not rush, allowing the counterpoint to unfold and the tension to build, to heighten the ironies in the libretto.

The performance was a reprise of the staging brought to Houston in 1986 by the late Goran Jarvefelt, who won acclaim for his Mozart productions at the Swedish Royal Theatre (Drottningholm). The settings are simple, allowing the use of an uncluttered stage, to give maximum freedom of motion, so the audience has a clear view of the conspiracies and counter-conspiracies at work. The director of the present HGO performance is American director Harry Silverstein, who remains faithful to Jarvefelt’s vision.

The singing was top-notch. Don Giovanni was played by Polish baritone Mariusz Kwiecien, who thrilled the audience with his powerful performance. He re-

mained the fierce libertine to the end, playing his final scene with a drunken verve, intoxicated by both wine and the power he wielded. Soprano Alexandra Deshorties was also excellent, reaching the audience convincingly with both the mournful plaints and the pleas for vengeance of Donna Anna. The Commendatore was sung forcefully by bass Raymond Aceto, whose entrance as the stone statue at the end was chilling.

One of the most exciting aspects of HGO is its development of young artists, through the HGO Studio program. Soprano Anna María Martínez, who played the Contessa in *Figaro*, and was a magnificent Donna Elvira in *Don Giovanni*, is an alumna of the HGO Studio, as is Oren Graddus, who played Leporello. Ryan McKinny, bass-baritone, who sang the role of Masetto, is another Studio graduate. This commitment to youth by HGO means that the wonderful performances of Mozart of the last two decades will likely become a tradition.

In concluding his review of *Clemenza*, Lyndon LaRouche wrote that such traditions are indispensable if nations “are to be inspired to rise above that kind of general moral depravity” which prevails today.

“Without sweeping and profound changes in the cultural habits acquired during the recent thirty-five years, the U.S. were not likely to outlive the effects of the global financial collapse now nearing its climax. . . . *Clemenza*, so performed [as in Dresden] is essential spiritual medicine for all mankind. . . .”

The HGO’s *Don Giovanni* dispensed such “essential spiritual medicine” in large doses in its just-concluded run.

Bursting Housing Bubble To Take 1.5 Million Jobs

by Richard Freeman

From 1992 to 2005, former Federal Reserve Board chairman Alan Greenspan built up the U.S. housing bubble to dizzying heights, a prime prop for both the speculative and physical sides of the economy. Especially from the start of 2001—when Greenspan threw this process into high gear—through October 2006, the housing bubble created 1.5 to 1.7 million housing-related jobs, directly and indirectly. That was *half of all the jobs created in the United States in that nearly six-year period.*

The process is now going into reverse. The rupturing of the housing bubble has already begun to throw these 1.5-1.7 million workers out of work, and the majority will go within the next 12 months. Already since February, 93,000 direct residential construction jobs are gone, along with others dependent on them; the reversal is accelerating, as **Figure 1** shows. They will join the former workers in auto and steel, and other manufacturing sectors, who continue to be laid off. These combined layoffs will ravage the physical economy and the financial sectors too. They will be accompanied by crises in the bloated mass of housing financial paper, derivatives and hedge funds. The financial disintegration will intensify the physical-economic collapse, and vice versa.

Greenspan's Fantasy

To construct the housing bubble, Greenspan deconstructed the function of the home. The purpose of a home ultimately is to raise creative and productive human beings, providing a family with a place to live, to nurture and educate children, etc. Greenspan transformed the home into a speculative instrument, to which a mortgage of \$350,000 to \$5 million is attached. Several levels of speculation, including trillions of dollars of mortgage-backed securities and derivatives, were built upon this. The housing sector became the underpinning of both the entire physical economy and the



EIRNS/George Hollis

An unfinished and abandoned McMansion in Virginia's Loudoun County—until recently, one of the nation's hottest housing markets, which Lyndon LaRouche had dubbed "ground zero" for the blowout of the speculative bubble.

speculative financial system, a position it cannot sustain. The housing bubble saturated every pore of the economy. By dint of that process, a rupture of the housing bubble will no longer just eviscerate the housing sector; it is pulling down the entire economic system.


On the financial side, through such risky gimmicks as cash-out refinancing, the housing bubble provided an enormous percentage of consumer spending, and turned out trillions of dollars of speculative instruments. (We will examine that in a forthcoming issue.)

The pace of layoffs of housing-related workers will speed up in late January, as the new Democratic-controlled Congress takes office. Democrat Lyndon LaRouche, the world's leading economist, has stated that only bankruptcy-reorganization of the *systemically* failed world financial system—in

FIGURE 1

U.S. Residential Construction Employment: Combined Building Workers, and Specialty Trade Contractors

(Millions of Workers)



Sources: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; *EIR*.

which a plan for restarting the U.S. economy is spelled out—can salvage the situation.

Residential Construction Job Creation

In March 2000, the Information Technology bubble blew to Kingdom Come, sending the NASDAQ crashing by 64%. (It still has not recovered.) A scrambling Fed chairman Greenspan began cutting the Federal funds rate (the overnight interbank lending rate) with a fanatic fervor at Federal Open Market Committee meetings. Home mortgage rates fell, and households began either buying new homes, or remodeling their existing ones on a level never seen before. (Between 2001 and 2005, the number of new home sales leapt by 42%.)

The residential construction and remodeling boom fostered a dramatic expansion of the housing-related workforce. Figure 1 shows that the level of residential construction employment increased from 2.60 million workers in January 2001 to 3.25 million workers in October 2006, an increase of 650,000. This category of employment represents a combination of two different sets of workers:

- those who, according to the U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), “construct buildings.” In October 2006, the BLS reported there were 985,000 workers who “construct buildings”; they made up 30% of all residen-

TABLE 1

Volume of Cement and/or Concrete in Construction of a New Standard Single-Family Home

Use	Tons
Basement/Crawl Space/Foundation Wall	2.8
Basement Floor	1.6
Foundation Footings	1.9
Above Grade Walls	1.1
Slabs & Floors	3.9
Concrete Products	2.7
Fireplaces, Hearths & Chimneys	0.1
Landscaping and Paving	5.1
Total	19.1

Source: National Association of Home Builders.

tial construction employment displayed in Figure 1.

- those labeled “residential specialty trade contractors” by the BLS. This second group is composed of roofing contractors, siding contractors, electrical contractors, plumbing and HVAC contractors, and so forth. Usually, contractors work as self-employed shops of one or a few people. In October 2006, the BLS reported there were 2.32 million residential contractors, who comprised 70% of all the residential construction employment displayed in the figure.

(It’s important, however, to note that the reliability of the BLS data is questionable; the overview we are presenting here should be seen as an approximation.)

Bubble’s Second Layer of Jobs

The construction of a home is, of course, a physical process: There is an ordered array of materials involved, called a bill of materials. There is also a list of services that accompany construction of a home. For example, **Table 1** shows the amount of cement and concrete that goes into constructing a standard new single-family home of about 2,000-2,200 square feet.

The National Association of Home Builders concluded a recent study, “Home Building’s Direct Impact on the U.S. Economy,” which looked at how many jobs the construction of a new single-family home generates (see www.nahb.org). This study used primarily industry accounts published by the U.S. Commerce Department’s Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), as well as a housing input-output table supplied by the BEA. Using the NAHB study, *EIR* constructed **Table 2**, which shows, for example, that for every 100 residential construction jobs, 40.1 manufacturing jobs are directly created in producing cement, wood products, copper products, and so forth.

Using these relations, *EIR* concluded that in the period January 2001-October 2006, the housing-bubble growth of

TABLE 2

Direct Job Creation for Each 100 Residential Construction Jobs

Sector	Jobs
Manufacturing (cement, wood products, copper products, etc.)	40.1
Wholesale and Retail (construction materials and inputs)	24.4
Professional/Business Services (architects, engineers, landscapers, etc.)	16.9
Transportation, Communications & Utilities	7.6
Agriculture, Forestry, & Mining	5.2
Real Estate, Finance, & Insurance	2.9
Other	4.7
Total Jobs Created	101.7

Sources: National Association of Home-Builders; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis; *EIR*.

TABLE 3

Principal Areas of Housing Bubble Jobs Increase, January 2001-October 2006

Area	Jobs Growth
Residential Construction	653,000
Residential Construction-Dependent	500-550,000
Financial/Cash-Out Refinancing	400-500,000
Approximate Total	1.45-1.7 million

Sources: *EIR*; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; National Association of Home Builders.

650,000 new residential construction jobs, created approximately 500-550,000 additional new jobs that directly depend upon residential construction. Normally, there would be an almost one-to-one relationship between new jobs created in residential construction and new jobs created that depend directly upon construction. But (considering a number of constraints) *EIR* has chosen to be conservative. This 500-550,000 new jobs appears in **Table 3**.

Cash-Out Refinancing Holds Sway

There remains one other area where the housing bubble held full sway in creating jobs: the increase in the cash-out refinancing, and other methods by which homeowners borrowed against their homes, or used their homes to extract a tremendous amount of cash.


This housing-based cash extraction permitted new purchases, and created new jobs providing the goods and services purchased. *EIR* estimates conservatively, that this method, and a cognate method, created 350-500,000 new jobs.

Thus *in toto*, between January 2001 and October 2006, the housing boom created in the range of 1.5 to 1.7 million

FIGURE 2

U.S. Manufacturing Employment

(Millions of Workers)



Sources: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; *EIR*.

new jobs. The residential construction industry has a useful role to play, but since January 2001, Greenspan had hyped it to a level far beyond that. During the same period, the U.S. economy reportedly created 3.37 million jobs. The inflated housing bubble was responsible for creating roughly half of all the new jobs in the economy.

During the same January 2001 to October 2006 period, through globalization, America's manufacturing base was shrunk by the *elimination* of 2.92 million jobs, shown in **Figure 2**. In fact, were it not for the housing bubble, which created manufacturing jobs, the loss of manufacturing jobs would have been even worse.

Job Liquidation

The research firm Economy.com has reported that during the 1990-91 recession, which involved a housing collapse, 825,000 housing-related jobs disappeared. Double that loss can happen now, in as short a time, or shorter.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics announced on Nov. 3, that during the month of October alone, the construction sector slashed 26,000 workers' jobs. The process has begun to accelerate, which could lead to the liquidation of 1.5 million housing-related jobs within a year. The devastation of the physical economy would be completed in the process.

To reverse that devastation, will be Lyndon LaRouche's subject in a webcast from Washington Nov. 16.

Election 'Job-Growth' Fraud Turning To Plunge

by Paul Gallagher

The post-election, ending months of 2006 are seeing a plunge in the housing bubble, auto and construction industries, and the U.S. economy as a whole; they may also see an end to the jobs-growth frauds which the White House hyped in the pre-election period, to claim falling unemployment and "economic success." The election results and the exit polls demonstrated again that these 2006 employment claims were too opposed to economic reality to be credible, and Americans do not believe them. The last few months' announcements of dramatic "upward revisions" in job growth have been challenged by economists and international financial press, and this fakery could be abandoned as the economy manifestly falls.

Sharp analysts of Federal government statistics, such as the New York firm Shadowstats.com, have noted that the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), over the past ten months, has been repeatedly altering the "seasonal adjustment factors" it uses on the payroll jobs survey, enabling it to "publish just about any apparent result desired" in the monthly jobs and unemployment-rate report.

The obvious giveaways to this fraud are several. First, is that the evident consideration that over a full year, from any month to the same month ("season") one year later, the growth or decline in jobs should be the same with seasonal adjustments, as without them. And historically, they have been. But no longer. In 2006, the BLS, by constantly changing its seasonal adjustment factors, has spiked the figures for new jobs over the year October 2005-October 2006 by about 6%—about 120,000 "extra jobs"—and has loaded most of these faked jobs into the final three jobs reports—August, September, and October—released and revised before the election.

The BLS has added additional fakery via the corporate death/birth or "virtual jobs" adjustment factor. This is the practice by which the agency makes an assumption about how many new start-up companies formed and hired in different economic sectors during the month, based on a ratio to how many firms went bust and liquidated in those sectors. It knows the latter figure; it is just hypothetically assuming the former, about new companies that it did not survey, but "should be out there." This statistical hokus-pocus is manipulated in the short term: Take a look at the October 2006 report, in which 73,000 of the total 92,000 reported new payroll jobs were simply assumed by this hypothetical "corporate death/birth" computer program; only a 19,000 growth in jobs was actually counted in the BLS Establishment Survey. Compare to No-

vember 2005, when only 57,000 out of 334,000 reported job growth was "virtual."

If the same seasonal adjustment factors had been used in recent months, as were used one year ago, the job growth figures would have been 146,000 in the August report, 126,000 in September, and 60,000 in October. Instead, they have been reported as 231,000 new jobs in August, 148,000 in September, and 92,000 in October. This is 130,000 "extra" jobs in three months, created at will by statistical manipulation, and added to the manipulation of the "death/birth" or "assumed new jobs" computer program.

Manipulation May Reverse Itself

These mere indications of what the real new jobs figures are, point to an employment plunge—as do all other serious reports, such as those showing plunging home sales and prices, falling auto production and sales (11% lower in each of September and October), drops in total consumer credit in September and October, low wholesale and retail sales and industrial production. Even in the manipulated BLS reports, a total of 60,000 manufacturing jobs disappeared in September and October.

But there has also been a pattern to the manipulation itself, which threatens to reverse and thereby show the ugly truth even more clearly. In each of the four months' jobs reports leading up to Election Day, the new month's job growth was a low figure, around 100,000; this apparent "low-to-moderate growth" each month allowed the Federal Reserve to stop raising interest rates since the Summer. But at the same time, in each month's report, the *previous* two months' jobs growth figures were revised dramatically upward, and then revised upward again, packing the cumulative job-creation figures and backing up the President's and the GOP's hyping of a lowering unemployment rate. The August jobs figure was nearly doubled by revisions, from 128,000 first reported, to 231,000 at latest. The September figure has been nearly tripled in its first revision, from 51,000 to 148,000.

These are "highly unusual" revisions, and when challenged on them, BLS chief economist John Goodman had to point back to April 1999 for any comparison—and that month's revisions totalled only 40% of the original reported figure. Also highly unusual, is the huge upward revision for 2005 as a whole—830,000 jobs—which the BLS loudly reported in early October.

Now the election is past; the "highly unusual" statistical revisions did not impress the voters as "economic success" for the Cheney-Bush White House; and the BLS is in an exposed position because of these very large upward revisions and because its seasonally adjusted jobs figures are inflated up above the unadjusted reports. As it compensates, we could see the real dimensions of the economic collapse under way, being reflected in the next months' jobs reports. The Federal Reserve would use such reports to justify keeping interest rates flat or starting to lower them, despite a falling U.S. dollar.

German Power: Back to Nuclear, or Blackouts

by Rainer Apel

Citizens in about 10 million households in Western Europe were cut off from electrical power on Nov. 4, many for several hours, when the overland power transmission grid collapsed, first in numerous regions throughout Germany, and then also in France, Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and the North African nation of Morocco. The blackout originated in the northwestern German grid of the E.on power company, hitting 1 million households throughout Germany, 5 million households in France, and 4 million in Italy, Austria, Spain, and Morocco.

The blackout was primarily the result of European deregulation and privatization, which has created complicated power grids that do not operate according to the rule of taking the most direct route to the consumer, but are instead based on cost-cutting. The power that one consumes in Italy,

may even come from across the Adriatic Sea in the Balkans, via numerous other grids in Europe. Energy security is kind of a lottery.

The fact that Morocco was also hit by the power blackout, is indicative of the absurdity of the European power supply system: Morocco, which certainly needs power for its own development, has repeatedly transferred power “surpluses” to Spain and France, during extreme Summer drought or Winter snow-and-ice periods. The corporate strategy of buying electricity from wherever it is cheap, instead of investing at home, is typical for the big power companies—four of which dominate most of the German market.

Power companies have not invested as they should have: to improve and stabilize the supply for the big metropolitan region in North Rhine-Westphalia, some 800 kilometers of overland power lines have to be built, and another 400 kilometers of existing lines modernized. The approximately 1.5 billion euros this would cost—capital that would be tied up in long-term investments—is apparently a deterrent for the short-term profit orientation of shareholder-oriented power-sector managements, because they have made little progress on the grid—much of which is 40-50 years old. All in all, net power-grid investments have fallen by 40% during the past 20 years.

The ailing state of entire sections of the power grid became all too evident just a year ago, when ice storms tore down overland power transmission lines overdue for replacement in the northwestern Münsterland region of Germany, leaving 250,000 citizens without electricity supplies for up to several days.

III Windmills Blow No Good

But deregulation and privatization are not the only aspects of insanity in the strategy of generating power. Especially in Germany, the “windmill movement” has grown with substantial state support. Usually, the available wind does not suffice to generate more power than is instantly consumed for the operation of the windmill itself, and if there is no wind at all, the windmills simply do not produce power. And, wind is not really calculable—which was drastically demonstrated on that Nov. 4, when due to very heavy winds, unexpectedly “overproducing” windmill parks in Germany’s north threatened to overload the power grid, therefore numerous conventional coal and gas power plants



EIRNS/Jacob Welsh

A gust of wind in Germany did in the anti-technology greenie geniuses and deregulators in Europe in one blow. Heavy winds caused windmills in Germany to overproduce electricity, and efforts to protect the grid from the surge provoked a chain-reaction blackout in five European countries and Morocco. Shown here is a windmill farm in Hesse, Germany.

were turned off, to clear the grid for the windmill surge. That caused a chain reaction of grid turnoffs throughout Germany, immediately affecting all the above-mentioned countries. This should have proved to the blackout victims, as well as everyone else, that using windmills to generate electricity is insane.

The advance of windmills in Germany has been accompanied by the decision to abandon nuclear power. As laid down in a treaty between the government and the power industry in 2000, Germany will shut down the last of its nuclear power plants (of which there are still 17 operating) by the end of the year 2021. The power companies signed the treaty because under the dominance of the cost-cutting paradigm, managements argued that investments in nuclear power, with all the safety requirements, was too “expensive,” whereas buying power from surpluses from other countries in Europe was the “better” solution. The other side of this coin, is that Germany imports power from France’s nuclear power plants and re-supplies France if necessary. Therefore, when Germany held back electricity Nov. 4 to deal with the blackout there, French households were hit five times harder than German households. Sometimes (when there is wind), the windmills in northern Germany supply the otherwise nuclear-powered France.

An Insane Energy Policy

After this blackout, a debate has resumed also in Germany about ways to prevent another such disaster. Terrorized by 30 years of continuous ecologist brainwashing and about 20 years of wearing the cost-cutting straitjacket, Germany’s elites are too timid to openly call for a return of nuclear power. The most that could be expected for the time being, is the call for letting the existing nuclear power plants run for a longer period, so that the final shutdown would not be in 2021, but in 2031, or even 2041. The dominant “energy strategy” in Germany is to establish an economy that needs less power, shooting for consuming 20% less by the year 2020. That is being promoted under the misleading term “energy efficiency,” and the government, Christian Democratic Chancellor Angela Merkel most of all, believes that is “a modern approach.”

Insanity on energy policy is worse among Social Democrats (SPD): Typical is the proposal, made in mid-October by Andrea Ypsilanti, chairwoman of the Hesse state section of the SPD, for shutting down the two nuclear power reactors in Biblis by 2010 and replacing them with 1,700 windmills that would be posted along the state’s highways. A broad majority of SPD members, notably its leading party officials, believe that is a “future-oriented approach.”

As of now, the only pro-nuclear political factor in Germany is the LaRouche Movement, and its arguments will convince more and more Germans, with every new power blackout, that windmills are insane and that nuclear power is the only solution.

Book Review

Senator’s Shot at Free Trade Misses Its Core

by Paul Gallagher

Take This Job and Ship It: How Corporate Greed and Brain-Dead Politics Are Selling Out America

by Senator Byron Dorgan

New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2006

276 pages with index, hardcover, \$24.95

Attacking “free trade” with its anti-industrial devastation, and campaigning for fair trade, gained Congressional seats for Democratic candidates on Nov. 7, particularly in Ohio and Indiana, but also in North Carolina, California, and other states. A London *Financial Times* commentary on Nov. 9 ruefully concluded that “the real casualty” of the U.S. election “was free trade.” Shortly before the election, U.S. Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) brought out *Take This Job and Ship It*, a serious public attack on “free-trade” policy, which is unique for a sitting Federal elected official in the post-1989 period of unbridled and almost unchallenged globalization, de-industrialization, and financial bubbles.

The Democratic Party must quickly become the party of anti-globalization and return to the economic policy legacy of FDR, if it is to save the U.S. and world economies from collapse, as Lyndon LaRouche showed dramatically in his *Prolegomena to a Democratic Party Platform*, issued in March 2006.

Despite his clear and serious intent, Senator Dorgan misses the core of globalization—the worldwide erosion of productivity, technological and industrial progress, and advanced economic infrastructure. Exhibit A: Dorgan scarcely mentions the disappearance of the U.S. auto industry, indicating a complete lack of understanding of its special machine-tool significance to national economic and strategic security. Failing to see the physical-economic forest of collapse, for the fall of individual trees, he thus stops well short of any real policy attack upon globalization and free trade.

Senator Dorgan’s book is an earnest attack on the de-industrialization crisis which has wrecked the U.S. economy. It is an attempt to document this wreckage—“to make the

facts march”—not merely to wave hands at it politically. And it is not a 2006-election-campaign book, but a completely bipartisan argument for bending the stick of Congressional policy against free trade for the first time in more than 30 years.

Dorgan is here arguing flatly for *protection* of American industry; and what is equally notable, he is describing the dynamic of globalization and free trade as, essentially, a dominant corporate imperialism, to which governments including that of the United States have become servile. His most forceful chapters are those which deal with the complete bending of the United States tax codes over the past decade, to provide massive rewards to companies which center their profits in operations outside the United States, and to give strong tax incentives for multi-national corporations based in the United States, to move industrial production out of it. Dorgan shows clearly that these tax changes are not the *cause* of outsourcing; rather, they are the demand of finance and corporate groups promoting globalization, to make their aggressive outsourcing more profitable in the short term—and White House and Congress are simply granting these demands. This includes his detailing the “great tax holiday of 2005,” when Bush-Cheney and the Congressional leadership welcomed back hundreds of billions of overseas corporate profits virtually tax-free, allowing these corporations to begin a new cheap-labor investment cycle without being taxed on the last one.

Dorgan’s denunciation of the World Trade Organization also shows his top-down view of the destructive “imperial” *diktat* of free trade, going beyond opposing specific free-trade swindles like NAFTA. “The WTO is essentially an extension and expansion of the old GATT treaty,” he writes. “What the WTO does, is subject a democratic country to taking orders from those with a corporate mind-set. There’s no Constitution or Bill of Rights to protect the vulnerable, in this country or others. *The WTO would not allow* a ban of products made by child labor and makes no allowance for bans against goods produced under ruthless dictatorships.”

The Heart of the Beast

But Dorgan’s book, despite impressive breadth of research, is not intended as an academic review; it is written in a tone of populist agitation, and its *intention* is Congressional action. There, his axiomatic blocking on the driving heart of globalization, prevents him from even thinking of the “Rooseveltian” solution. Although he looks to FDR as the builder of the Democratic Party, he shows no understanding of FDR’s fundamental policies.

The Nov. 10 *Business Week*, in a commentary, “Can Anyone Steer This Economy?” challenges 110th Congress Democrats like Dorgan: Don’t expect to have levers “at home” to control globalization. Imports are now 17% of U.S. GDP, it lectures; foreign investors now finance 32% of domestic investment, four times more than a decade ago. “Now many of the levers affecting the U.S. economy are located not in

Washington but in Beijing, London, and even Mexico City.”

What is globalization? When financial and corporate interests began, decades ago, to move production from industrial nations with modern, intensively developed economic infrastructure, to draw together cheap labor in nations with less-developed infrastructure, the process lowered productivity in *both regions*, looting productive capacity and labor alike. Removed from modern infrastructural support of transportation, power, water control and sanitation, health care and education, industrial technological progress slows down and stops, worldwide.

Trade limitations, regulation, even protective tariffs, though essential in reviving this devastated economy, are neither sufficient nor even the central issue of attacking and reversing globalization. That issue is new national infrastructure, restoring technological progress, and therefore, real productivity. Senator Dorgan does not come near touching the lever of rebuilding infrastructure with high-technology government investment—the core of FDR’s policy of national economic development and military strength. Dorgan’s discussion of scientific progress and education is weighted to environmentalist axioms rampant among Democrats, which when exercised as in promotion of biofuels, actually reverse technological progress and lower industrial and agricultural productivity further.

The Senator’s intended Congressional actions, though well-argued in *Take This Job . . .*, are impotent tinkering with the oncoming collapse of extreme, “imperial” globalization. These actions center on trade protection through a system of Import Certificates, a policy suggested by billionaire investor Warren Buffett; repeal of all tax incentives for the export of jobs; barring imports from companies that abuse and loot workers overseas; and confronting China on trade relations.

Thus Senator Dorgan’s portrait of “fair trade” is protecting “good corporations” from being defeated by bad ones like Wal-Mart. He doesn’t try to discover what made old-fashioned “good corporations” (as he says he believes Wal-Mart used to be!) into evil ogres of globalization. And he doesn’t locate the power to reverse this process.

The fundamental restoration of *action by government for the common good*, vs. the dogma that markets, banks, and large corporations are the guiding actors of economics, does not appear in the Senator’s strategic outline. If it did, he would focus on large-scale government intervention to rebuild the nation’s broken-down infrastructure through public credit, public works, using the unutilized and closed-down industrial capacity of the auto sector, in particular, to build it.

He would attack the crisis, in short, as FDR would have, and did; and as Lyndon LaRouche proposes now.

What appears to be blocking the Senator’s thinking is the dominant axiom of free trade—limiting the permitted scope and action of the governments of nations, by “fiscal responsibility,” balanced-budget dogma, and the like, until they can do little more than “make rules” for trade.

Business Briefs

Science & Technology

Isotopes Can Destroy HIV Virus in Cells

A group of scientists is developing a technique to link radioactive atoms of bismuth-213, an energetic alpha emitter, and rhenium-188, a beta emitter, to HIV antibodies, to seek and destroy the virus that causes AIDS in the cells where it hides out.

The November issue of *PLoS Medicine* (Public Library of Science) reports that the scientists have had success killing infected immune cells in mice carrying human immune cells infected with HIV. Such techniques have already been used for tumor reduction in humans.

The bismuth-213 is a decay product of actinium-225, which is a decay product of uranium-233, from a stockpile kept by Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL).

Similarly, rhenium-188 is a decay product of tungsten-188, which is a product of the high-flux isotope reactor at ORNL. ORNL processes and packages radioisotope generators for use in the medical field.

Hedge Funds

British Regulators Warn Of 'Inevitable' Crash

"FSA Warns of 'Inevitable' Crash" reported the Nov. 7 London *Guardian*, in a public escalation of (particularly British) regulators' alarms over a blow-out of a large mass of "leveraged debt" hitting the financial markets, from the wild takeover speculation by hedge funds and private equity funds.

The British Financial Services Agency (FSA) published a "discussion paper on the private equity market" on Nov. 6, containing a strong warning, and a notice that it is increasing its oversight.

The *Guardian* article parallels closely the account of a threatened hedge-fund leveraged-debt crash in *EIR*, Nov. 3. A Wall Street source had told *EIR* at the time of the "Three Regulators' Meeting" in New York

on Sept. 27, that the British FSA was warning the U.S. Federal Reserve and Securities and Exchange Commission regulators of a leveraged-default crash.

The article lays out the FSA's worries: 1) big private equity defaults are inevitable, and "may" threaten the system; 2) leveraged bank lending into takeovers is \$90 billion (68 billion euro) in Britain alone this year, and 80% of that debt is then securitized to hedge funds, leading all holders of the debt to deny the risk; 3) the takeover funds engage in "smash and grab" looting of targets to carry through on "leverage"; 4) international funds are now flowing more rapidly into hedge and private equity funds than into stock markets, and actually shrinking stock markets. Insider trading is also mentioned.

Eurasia

'Iron Silk Road' Dream Comes Closer to Reality

"Asia's 40-year dream of 'Iron Silk Road' Comes Closer to Reality" proclaimed the headline in the Nov. 7 *Malaysia Sun*. Transport ministers and officials from 43 countries gathered in Busan, South Korea, the Asian terminal of the Great Eurasian Land-Bridge, on Nov. 6, for this year's ministerial conference on transport, organized by the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP). The highlight of the six-day conference was to be the Nov. 10 signing of the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Trans-Asian Railway—the "Iron Silk Road."

The 81,000-kilometer (50,200-mile) network, first mooted by the United Nations in 1960, is to link capitals, ports, and industrial hubs across 28 Eurasian countries "from Busan to Rotterdam." The project has been portrayed by the international LaRouche movement as the necessary physical economic basis for a new world financial system.

Twelve of the world's 30 landlocked countries are in Asia, said Barry Cable, director of UNESCAP's Transport and Tourism Division.

"The agreement lays a framework for coordinated development of internationally important rail routes," UNESCAP chief Kim Hak-Su said in a statement.

Kim noted that Asia boasts 13 of the world's top 20 container seaports, but it has fewer than 100 "dry ports"—inland container depots—while Europe has 200 and the United States, 370.

Ministers of 15 of the 43 member countries, including China and South Korea, are to sign the agreement on Nov. 10. Others are to sign later. North Korea, which has participated in the meetings and was party to the agreements, "could not come to sign the agreement," according to Kim Hak-su, UNESCAP executive secretary.

Only about 6,500 kilometers are lacking to connect the whole 80,000-kilometer route—4,000 kilometers in Southeast Asia, and 2,000-plus kilometers in central Asia.

China already has a rail connection to the Koran Peninsula. Signed, but not yet implemented, are Chinese agreements with Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan to build railroads from Xinjiang, and an agreement with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to build a road and rail network connecting Kunming in Yunnan Province with Singapore.

Energy

Six Arab Nations Plan To Go Nuclear

The International Atomic Energy Agency has announced that six nations in the Arab world have indicated interest in developing nuclear technology for energy purposes.

The countries are Algeria, Egypt, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and the United Arab Emirates. Egypt led the way this Fall, announcing that it would revive its old nuclear energy program. Since then, President Hosni Mubarak has travelled to Moscow to discuss technology transfers. He also plans to visit China.

The Nov. 6 London *Times* and other media reporting on the Arab nations' interest, have raised the "specter" of a nuclear weapons race in the Arab world.

Why Condi's Anti-Shi'ite Alliance Won't Work

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

As wild speculations are making the rounds in world capitals about possible changes in Iraq policy, in the wake of the electoral defeat of the Bush-Cheney regime and the ouster of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, one insane option, known as the anti-Shi'ite coalition, has been sneaked onto the agenda by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. If this project were to be realized, it would not only accelerate the widening civil conflict inside Iraq, but draw neighboring forces into a region-wide war along sectarian lines.

While Rice's name has been publicly associated with this new lame-brain scheme, the actual authorship comes from the usual cabal of neo-conservatives who once championed the Shi'ites as the "change agents" for Middle East democracy—before Iraq turned to Hell-on-Earth. Some of these neo-cons have turned into sharp critics of the Bush-Cheney Administration, in a supreme act of hypocrisy and duplicity that reflects their survival strategy into the post-Bush-Cheney era, as both a dominant faction within the Republican Party, and as born-again conservative Democrats (see accompanying article).

Rice's GCC+2 Wingding

Rice first floated the idea of pulling together a new "coalition" of "moderate" Arab states, ostensibly to jump-start the peace process between Palestine and Israel, during a regional tour in early October. The "new configuration," which she dubbed the "GCC+2," was to be made up of the Gulf Cooperation Council members (Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Oman, and Qatar), plus Egypt and Jordan—Arab countries considered allies of the United States "I do think that the GCC+2 effort is new," she said on Oct. 2, "and it gives us an opportunity, in a new configuration, to work with the moderate states and the moderate voices in the region." Then she added, "That configuration can be quite powerful in resisting extremist forces as well." The "extremist

forces" are identified as Hezbollah and other Shi'ite movements, as well as the Palestinian Hamas, all considered to be under the leadership of Iran.

Rice put the option on the table, at a meeting of foreign ministers of her self-styled GCC+2, in Cairo on Oct. 3. On that occasion, she made clear that the "new configuration" was to be wielded as a weapon against Iran. Arab sources reported to *EIR* that Rice essentially informed her interlocutors of Washington's decision to attack Iran, and asked for their support, not only politically, but logistically; the GCC includes countries with U.S. military bases that would be used in such a new war.

Turning Point: Lebanon

Significantly, Rice presented her idea with reference to the disastrous Israeli war against Lebanon, which had taken place in July-August. She said that that conflict had brought to the fore a rift between the "moderate" and the "extremist" states in Southwest Asia.

The rift was indeed there: In the first post-Lebanon War meeting of the Arab League states, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt tried to lay the blame for Israel's attack and invasion of Lebanon on the Hezbollah, whose forces had captured two Israeli soldiers crossing into Lebanese territory. As the war progressed, and Hezbollah emerged victorious, that movement, and especially its leader Sheikh Hassan Nasrullah, became the heroes of the Arab and Islamic world, including among Christians. This forced the governments in Riyadh, Amman, and Cairo to rethink and reformulate their position, at least in form.

The significance of the Lebanon War of 2006 cannot be understated. It had been envisioned by the Israelis and their sponsors in the Cheney camp, as a prelude to the planned assault against Iran. Hezbollah was viewed, rightly, as an Iranian-backed and trained militia, which would, in the event



State Dept./Josie Duckett

Secretary Rice meeting with Saudi Foreign Minister Saud al-Faisal on Oct. 2. Condi is attempting to mobilize a “new configuration,” including Sunni leaders such as the Saudis, against Iran, the Shi’ites, and Hezbollah.

of an attack on Iran, immediately mobilize its forces against Israel. Thus, knocking out Hezbollah was considered the precondition for the war against Tehran.

The plan backfired. Israel was not only militarily defeated, but humiliated. Its vaunted air offensive failed to destroy Hezbollah’s rocket-launching capabilities, and its land offensive failed to occupy and hold any significant site; the casualties the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) sustained were disproportionately high, and those of Hezbollah, despite the war propaganda, relatively low; and the proclaimed aims of the war—to free the two captured soldiers—were nowhere in sight. In-depth studies of the war have brought to light the superiority of Hezbollah forces in intelligence (they succeeded in “turning” Israeli spies, and in intercepting Israeli coded communications); in training and tactics (they succeeded in firing rockets and removing the launchers to safety within 60 seconds); in weaponry; and, above all, in determination and morale.

With a total force of 3,000 highly trained, dedicated troops in the Nasr Brigade, Hezbollah maintained the resistance for

34 days, against not only IDF regulars, but also 15,000 called-up reserves. It was reportedly in a position to continue fighting for another three months, and to continue firing rockets into Israel. (See Alastair Crooke and Mark Perry, “How Hezbollah Defeated Israel,” *Asia Times*, Oct. 16.)

As a result, those Arab governments—Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia—which initially supported the Israeli attack (and reportedly endorsed an Israeli plan to assassinate Hezbollah’s Nasrullah), found themselves threatened by opposition movements in their own countries, which had taken up the banner of Hezbollah’s fight. In polls conducted throughout the region, Arabs who were asked to name their favorite political leader, put Nasrullah as number one, and Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (who is not an Arab) as number two.

Fallacy of Composition

Why should the governments of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt have been tempted to support the Israeli attack against Hezbollah? How could they even consider Condi Rice’s crazy scheme for an “axis of good” vs. an “axis of evil”?

Whatever else may be working in these strange machinations, the underlying ideological, political problem is that leading circles in Cairo, Riyadh, and Amman confuse the rising power and regional stature of Iran, with a “Shi’ite danger.” Jordanian King Abdallah II spoke in alarming terms of a “Shi’ite crescent” which he said was forming, in the wake of the establishment of a Shi’ite-majority government in Iraq. This crescent, he said, would stretch from Iran, across Iraq to Lebanon. In addition, the stunning victory of Hezbollah against Israel is viewed by these governments as a threat, because mass-based political movements in their own countries—whether Shi’ite or not—have been energized by that victory, to demand radical political change. As reported in *Middle East Online* Oct. 25, a leading Saudi cleric, Salman al-Udeh, came out with a dramatic warning, that, due to the mounting popularity of Hezbollah, and the situation in Iraq, Sunnis are converting to Shi’ism in waves. Speaking to al-Jazeera TV on Oct. 23, he said, “This allegiance [to Shi’ism] turns in many cases into a fertile soil to be exploited. . . .” He went on to attack Iran, which, he said, “has flagrantly dipped its hand into Iraq’s affairs.”

The knee-jerk response to this perceived Iranian regional power *qua* “Shi’ite threat,” has been to nurture the idea of a Sunni power bloc, embracing Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Jordan, and stretching into Iraq.

It is in this light, that one can understand the calls by Jordanian King Abdallah II, for rebuilding the Iraqi Army on the basis of former Ba’ath Party officers, not completely compromised by the former regime. Thus, too, the moves toward reversing the disastrous de-Ba’athification process imposed by then-U.S. proconsul Paul Bremer in the immediate aftermath of the U.S. invasion of Iraq. On Nov. 7, the Iraqi Supreme National Commission for de-Ba’athification



www.moqawama.org

Sheikh Hassan Nasrullah, leader of the Lebanon's Shi'ite Hezbollah movement, now viewed as heroes in the Islamic world, following its victory against Israel in the Lebanon War.

announced that it was sending a draft law with amendments to parliament for ratification. The law would move toward rehabilitating Ba'ath Party members who had been banned from public service under Bremer.

This move, which must have been made with the consensus of the occupying powers, appears to go in the right direction, in that it would allow former Ba'ath Party members to be reintegrated into civil service. Other reports of talks aimed at reconciliation with leaders of the Sunni resistance, initiated by the Iraqi government as well as by the occupying powers, dovetail with this process.

All this would be laudable, were it not for the fact that key forces inside the United States, along with co-thinkers among the "moderate" Arabs and the Israelis, view such a Sunni revival not as a step towards national reconciliation, but as a move against Iran. A rehabilitated Sunni political (and military) force in Iraq is seen by these outside forces, as a battering ram to be mobilized against the Shi'ites, within the larger planned attack on Iran.

Were such a scenario to be implemented, it would rapidly accelerate the process of civil war already unleashed inside Iraq, to overwhelm the region. Sunni forces in those countries named, would be mobilized, and Shi'ite communities in Saudi Arabia, Bahrein, Kuwait, and other Persian Gulf countries would respond.

On the Drawing Board

None of this is hypothetical. In Washington, D.C., just days prior to the elections, the issue was at the center of a public forum with Akiva Eldar, a leading Israeli pro-peace journalist, and Nematt Salameh, the Washington bureau chief of the London-based Saudi daily *al-Hayat*. The two were featured speakers at a forum of the Middle East Institute, the American Friends of Peace Now, and the Middle East Peace

Forum. In their opening remarks, as well as in extensive discussion thereafter, both speakers said that the "moderate" Arabs—i.e., the Saudis, Egyptians, and Jordanians—considered a nuclear-armed Iran to constitute a greater threat than [a nuclear-armed] Israel. They went so far as to assert that a U.S. or U.S.-Israeli attack on Iran, to take out the country's purported nuclear weapons program, would be quietly applauded by the Arab regimes. The *al-Hayat* bureau chief added that during the Lebanon War, Arab heads of state had been quietly hoping that the Israelis would kill Hezbollah leader Sheikh Nasrullah, whom they view as an Iranian puppet.

Washington sources, in discussion with *EIR*, have pointed to the role of former Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, as an architect of this Arab-Israeli grouping against Iran, and as the contact point for the Cheney group in the Bush Administration (see article, this issue: "Cheney and Neo-Cons Plotting More Wars.")

EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg had questioned Eldar and the *al-Hayat* bureau chief at the Washington event, noting that a vast number of U.S. military, intelligence, and diplomatic experts had come out against any military action against Iran, arguing that it would not succeed, and would trigger asymmetric warfare all over the globe. Eldar made it clear that he personally preferred a diplomatic solution to the Iran nuclear issue, but clearly the Arab-Israeli support for a U.S. strike against Iran is "in the air" throughout the region.

Significantly, *al-Hayat* journalist Salameh has a pedigree identifying him as close to the war party in the United States. He worked at the pro-government (and pro-American) *al-Rai* and *Jordan Times* in Amman, did a stint in London, and now has become the D.C. correspondent for the Saudi paper.

A few days after this forum, on Nov. 8, the neo-con mouthpiece *Washington Times* published an op-ed by William Hawkins, with a similar line of argument. The author, described as a senior fellow in national security studies at the U.S. Business and Industry Council, called for a Sunni alliance against Iran and the Shi'ites.

Inside Iraq today, Hawkins wrote, Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki would have to rise above Shia partisanship, if he wanted to be a national ruler. Al-Maliki, he said, is too closely aligned with Shi'ite leader Moqtada al-Sadr and the Mahdi Army, considered agents of Iran. Hawkins wrote that if al-Maliki were not ready to declare war on al-Sadr and his militia, then the United States should consider shifting its support to the Sunnis. Although the Sunnis are a minority in Iraq, they are a majority in the Muslim world.

While rehabilitating nationalist, patriotic Sunni figures in Iraq, is a precondition for providing the political and military leadership for a strong Iraq, it must be promoted as part of a process of national reconciliation, including Shi'ites, Kurds, Turkmen, etc., which must be endorsed and reinforced by all neighboring countries, emphatically including Iran, with its Shi'ite majority, as well as Sunni Turkey and Syria.

Cheney and Neo-Cons Plotting More Wars

by Jeffrey Steinberg

On March 11, 2003, as final preparations were under way for the neo-cons' greatest triumph—the invasion of Iraq—*New Yorker* magazine investigative reporter Seymour Hersh exposed an extortion scheme by neo-con Richard Perle, to extract tens of millions of dollars out of the Saudi royal family, in league with the infamous Iran-Contra arms dealer Adnan Khashoggi. The scheme involved a Perle company, Trireme Partners LP, which wanted a piece of the billions of dollars in homeland security contracts soon to be issued by the Kingdom. The proposal, according to Prince Bandar bin Sultan, then the Saudi Ambassador in Washington, smacked of a quid pro quo: Perle, a leading critic of the Saudi regime, would drop the propaganda barrage and the calls for regime change, coming out of his Defense Policy Board, and the Saudis would cough up.

Several senior U.S. intelligence officials recently told *EIR* that some higher-ups in the Saudi royal family, perhaps including Prince Bandar, who is now the national security advisor to King Abdullah, regret that they didn't take the bait and pay off Perle and his partners back in January 2003. A few million dollars might have saved them several years of headaches, as the neo-con propaganda Wurlitzer waged a non-stop regime-change campaign against them. But even more to the point, suddenly, the Saudis, along with several other Sunni Arab regimes, find themselves as strange bedfellows with Washington's neo-cons and with the Ehud Olmert government in Israel—in common cause against Iran.

A Nov. 3, 2006 teaser from *Vanity Fair* magazine revealed that the neo-cons are going through a major retooling—wiping their hands of the entire Iraq fiasco, and placing the blame for the failure squarely on the shoulders of President George W. Bush and his team of national security incompetents and nincompoops. In a preview of a story to appear in the January 2007 *Vanity Fair*, author David Rose delivered excerpts from interviews he conducted in October 2006 with some of the cream of the neo-con crap—starting with the “Prince of Darkness,” Perle himself, and also including Kenneth Adelman, who gained infamy by proposing that the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq would be a “cakewalk”; Michael Ledeen, Frank Gaffney, and Michael Rubin.

Lovers of Iraqi faker Ahmed Chalabi, and Iraq warhawks to a man, these neo-cons are now saying that if they had it to do over again, knowing that the Bush-Cheney-Rice team was the most incompetent national security management group in

the post-World War II history of America, they would have opted for an alternative to war.

In a scene worthy of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, these modern-day Brutuses have stabbed President Bush and Condi Rice in the back. As far as the neo-cons are concerned, according to a number of informed Washington sources, both Iraq and George W. Bush are yesterday's news. They are now preparing to survive the fall of the House of Bush, and are already making plans for the next confrontations: against Iran and Russia, to name the top two targets *du jour*.

While the Bush Presidency is flaming out in the aftermath of what has been dubbed the “Nov. 7th Massacre,” the neo-cons are still a formidable force inside the Republican Party, with some leading neo-con superstars, like John Podhoretz, already touting Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) as the elephant they intend to ride back into the Oval Office. Across the aisle, another crew of hardcore neo-cons is preparing to surface within the Democratic Party, should a donkey take the Presidency in 2008. It is reminiscent of the Jimmy Carter era, when scores of life-long “Scoop Jackson Democrats,” led by Perle, Stephen Bryen, Ledeen, Gaffney, and Elliott Abrams, slithered over to the GOP as “Reagan Democrats,” and, after Ronald Reagan's landslide victory in 1980 over Jimmy Carter, occupied top civilian posts at the Pentagon, and cushy consulting jobs with the Reagan National Security Council.

Whichever party lands in the White House come January 2009, the neo-cons hope to be there to share in the spoils. Either way, they are busily organizing a “Get Iran” war alliance with frightened Sunni regimes in the Persian Gulf and Arab world *and Israel*—to make sure that the Bush-Cheney regime commits one more fatal atrocity—a military strike on Iran's purported secret nuclear weapons sites—before leaving office (see preceding article).

To make sure that this Iran war happens before Team Bush leaves office, the neo-cons are working through their one reliable partner remaining inside the regime—Vice President Dick Cheney. Cheney's office remains Neo-con Central, with David Wurmser and John Hannah still on staff. Elliott Abrams remains the Cheney “mole” at the National Security Council.

According to Middle East and Washington sources, this crew was responsible, earlier this year, for trashing all efforts by the Syrian regime of Bashar Assad to reopen direct peace talks with Israel, talks that no Israeli regime prior to that of Ariel Sharon, would have flat-out rejected, no matter how much pressure came down from Washington.

More recently, they are reportedly pushing a covert weapons-smuggling operation into the West Bank, arming Fatah factions to launch what would rapidly become a full-scale civil war against Hamas. The noted retired Israeli general, Shlomo Brom, in a recent paper for the Jaffe Center at Tel Aviv University, warned that such an outbreak of communal violence among the Palestinians would be *bad* for Israel, provoking a likely split between a Fatah-controlled West Bank

and a Hamas-run Gaza Strip. Both sides would be vying to prove that they are more effective in terrorizing Israel, through suicide bombings and rocket attacks, the general warned, and this would make life unbearable in the Jewish state.

Arab sources have added that in his recent trip to Washington, Lebanese Druze leader Walid Jumblatt was given a similar offer of “covert military aid” to take on Hezbollah inside that war-ruined nation, which still hasn’t recovered from its 15-year civil war (1975-90). Such covert operations, aimed at provoking the neo-cons’ beloved perpetual warfare throughout the Eastern Mediterranean region, do not depend on Pentagon muscle, so the departure of Donald Rumsfeld from the scene, and his replacement by former CIA Director Robert Gates, a Brent Scowcroft and James Baker III ally (and presumable a Dick Cheney enemy), does not necessarily interfere with the game.

In fact, as the Democrats prepare to take back control of the U.S. House and Senate in January 2007, they face a world map of hot-spots, all set to blow, with the slightest provocation (see map, p. 53).

Several senior Washington intelligence veterans, and one regional vice president of a major U.S. defense firm, say that their greatest fear—between now and the New Year when the Democrats take the keys to Capitol Hill back—is a “Gulf of Tonkin” incident, a provocation covertly arranged originating from Washington, that would provide the pretext for war. The most likely target of such a scheme: Iran. The most likely architect of such an operation: Dick Cheney and his remaining coterie of neo-con troublemakers and whatever assets they have recruited from within the Special Forces community and the “black operations” side of the intelligence community. One burning question is whether President Bush has already signed a Presidential Intelligence Finding, authorizing these covert tricks.

On Oct. 10, 2006, the web-based magazine *World Politics Watch* ran a provocative story, echoing the new neo-con scheme, under the headline “Mideast Realignment: Could Iran Unite Arabs and Israelis?” Noting the rumors, officially denied by both sides, that Prince Bandar had secretly met in Jordan with a top Israeli government official, Frida Ghitis wrote that “a handful of Middle East observers were not surprised to hear of possible talks between Israel and the kingdom. That’s because they predict a major realignment will reshape this region. The cause,” she continued, “of this gradual but far-reaching political transformation is fear of Shi’ite Iran by Sunni Arabs. As a result, the traditional enemy of Arabs, Israel, could gradually begin developing a subtle but powerful alliance with Sunni Muslim regimes in the Arab world. . . . It is this natural convergence of interests that has the potential to recast the political landscape from the traditional one of Arabs versus Israelis, which has dominated the Middle East since the late 1940s, into a Sunni vs. Shi’a alignment, with Israel and Sunni governments on the same side.”

This, Washington sources emphasize, is the latest neo-con wet dream. For years the neo-cons have been preaching their own brand of Leon Trotsky’s “Permanent Revolution,” masked in the cry for “democracy.” From the start of the Bush-Cheney regime up to recent months, the number one target of these latter-day Jacobins had been what Middle Eastern historians referred to as the “Sunni Stability Belt,” the ruling combination of hardline monarchies and dictatorships that kept the oil patch safe and stable from the time of Sykes-Picot (1916) on. Now that the neo-con “Shi’ite Card” has turned Iraq into Hell-on-Earth, the flexible neo-con fantasists have modified their rhetoric, to suddenly find common cause with the very Sunni Arab monarchs and dictators whom they targetted only months ago, with such schemes as their 1996 “A Clean Break.”

The neo-cons are shameless sophists, who have no problem distorting the truth beyond recognition—if it suits their goal of perpetual power. Will the Sunni Arab lions and the Israelis be so stupid as to walk into this trap?


Stay tuned.

Bush-Cheney Policies Proliferate Hotspots

The wave of irregular warfare, which has been set off by the Bush Administration’s pursuit of an Anglo-Dutch global imperial strategy, has put the world on the edge of conflagration. In fact, none of the conflicts shown in this map has been generated by local forces, or causes, but by the financial oligarchy’s international strategic drive for the elimination of the nation state. Without immediate action toward impeachment of the Anglo-Dutch puppets Cheney and Bush, one of these hotspots is likely to be chosen as a military target in the very near future.

1. Darfur region of Sudan: The UN Security Council passed resolution 1706 on Aug. 31, under U.S. prodding, which opens the door for armed intervention in this vast western region of Sudan, where bloody civil conflict already reigns. The resolution calls for the UN peacekeepers, if invited by the Sudan government to replace African Union forces, to operate under Chapter VII, which authorizes the use of all necessary means in the areas of deployment of its forces in Sudan. (See article.)

2. Somalia: Ongoing warfare between groups, some of them Muslims reputedly linked to al-Qaeda, and others linked to the U.S., threatens to internationalize this conflict.



3. Palestinian Territories: The Israeli Army has been carrying out increasingly violent actions within the Gaza Strip, the most recent of which killed 19 Palestinian civilians, most of them women and children. The Israeli attacks are aimed, among other things, at preventing the creation of a unity government between Hamas and Fatah within the Territories as a whole.

4. Iraq: The escalating bloodbath, which killed over 100 U.S. soldiers in October, and continues to kill over 100 Iraqis every week, is ongoing, even after the elections.

5. Iran: Negotiations between Iran and the “international community” remain at a stalemate, while the Bush Administration and its allies at the UN try to push through further provocative sanctions leading to military action. U.S. and NATO military deployments in the area show the danger of imminent aggression against Iran.

6. Georgia/Russia: While Russian President Putin and Georgian President Saakashvili are on a path of diplomacy, at present, the Georgians continue to be backed by certain Western forces in their provocative stance—as part of the overall Anglo-Dutch offensive against a revived Russian nation-state.

7. Kyrgyzstan: A U.S.-backed coalition of politi-

cal activists and NGOs is making its third effort this year to bring down the Kyrgyz government of Kurmanbek Bakayev and Prime Minister Feliks Kulov. An opposition rally led to violent clashes with police on Nov. 7, but has been suppressed for the moment.

8. Pakistan/Afghanistan: The U.S. bombing of a *madrassa* (religious school) in the Bajaur tribal region of Pakistan killed over 80 people on Oct. 31, and has set off heated agitation, including threats of suicide bombings, against the Americans. This conflict is a spillover of the increasing aggressivity of the Taliban in Afghanistan, which has taken over an increasing amount of territory. It is considered only a matter of time before the violence also spreads to Kashmir.

9. Sri Lanka: Fighting between the Tamil Tigers and the government has been escalating dramatically over recent weeks, leading to an increasing death toll among civilians.

10. Korea: Neo-con spokesmen in the United States continue to call for military confrontation with North Korea, following its nuclear test, despite China’s announcement that the North Koreans have agreed to come back to the Six-Party Talks.

What Is Really Behind The Crisis in Darfur?

by Lawrence K. Freeman

Lyndon LaRouche, in his Oct. 31 webcast (see box) exposed the current U.S. *cause célèbre* campaign of “stopping the genocide” in Darfur as an ignorant fraud, which is being used to cover up what is actually being done to Sudan and the entirety of Sub-Saharan Africa. Is there genocide going on in Africa? Yes, there is; but it is not what is being propagandized by Hollywood actors, nor discussed on college campuses as the politically correct issue of concern, nor by government officials. What has been going in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (D.R.C.), and is still going on today, is the true face of genocide in Africa, where almost 400,000 people have been dying *every year for the last decade* due to the lack of food, clean water, and basic health care.

There is no doubt that there are ugly and unnecessary killings, and atrocities, taking place in the Darfur region of Sudan, but none of those who profess concern for the people of Darfur have done anything to alleviate the conditions that have led to the current crisis. In fact, wittingly or not, those supporting the “save Darfur” campaign are providing support for Henry Kissinger’s and President Bush’s policy of genocide against the people of Sub-Saharan Africa in particular.

When Lyndon LaRouche and I were in Sudan in January 2001 for a conference on economic development for those countries living along the Nile River system, many Sudanese foolishly thought that they had a friend in the Bush Administration, after suffering the treatment of former Secretary of State Madeline Albright, and her deputy for African Affairs, Susan Rice. LaRouche repeatedly warned Sudanese officials that they should only expect worse treatment from the crowd around the newly installed President Bush. And LaRouche was right! Sudan is now being threatened with a military invasion and/or aerial bombardment in the weeks ahead, as the financier controllers of Cheney and Bush are impelled toward creating yet another failed military conflict.

There is no justifiable reason for such military attacks. Darfur is not the cause for a new military adventure; it will merely be the pretext to have one. The dupes who have taken up the anointed popular cause for Darfur, will find themselves responsible for supporting a new asymmetric war in the “clash of civilizations” that could lead to millions dying in the Horn of Africa.

Genocide in Africa

Henry Kissinger, in 1974, serving as both Secretary of State and National Security Advisor, produced a then-classi-

fied document entitled “National Security Study Memorandum 200: Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security, and Overseas Investment.” The fallacious argument put forth by Kissinger et al., which has remained U.S. policy to this day, is, if developing countries with large deposits of valuable natural resource were allowed to sovereignly develop their economies for their rapidly growing populations, the West would be deprived of these needed resources. NSSM 200 dictated to governments that they must reduce their populations, and if necessary, food aid would be withheld as a weapon of coercion.


Kissinger’s policy was a modernized form of 19th-Century British colonial methods, as enunciated infamously by Cecil Rhodes: Get the natives off the land in order to get the resources under the land. Have you ever wondered why there are no strong nation-states in Africa? To carry out the looting of these valuable resources, as is still being done today, governments and nations, which might resist, cannot be permitted to exist. Infrastructure cannot exist, health care cannot be permitted to exist. How does one carry out population reduction, i.e., genocide, today? Through disease, starvation, war; and the withholding of real economic assistance.

What concern has there been for the deplorable living conditions of the people of Darfur and elsewhere in Sudan—one of the poorest regions in the world, even before the war broke out? None! No one ever discussed Darfur, or knew where it was, before rebel forces attacked government installations in February 2003. For decades the nomadic herdsman and the poor farmers have been struggling to exist in this large arid area, which has been the source of constant conflict, as they fight for scarce supplies of water. To alleviate the source of this conflict would require a program to develop additional billions of cubic meters of potable water for the Horn of Africa, which includes the densely populated nations of Ethiopia and Egypt, along with Sudan. Many thoughtful Africans have come to realize that the next major war in Africa will be fought over water, not oil.

Why Attack Sudan?

Egypt, with a population of 70 million, depends on water from the Nile, which flows South to North, originating in Lake Victoria. In accordance with a 1959 treaty, the 84 billion cubic meters of the Nile are apportioned between the two countries, with Egypt receiving 55 billion cubic meters, and Sudan 19 billion cubic meters. The metropolitan centers of Egypt depend on every drop of that water. A military attack on Darfur would ensure the breakup of the central government in Khartoum, thus voiding the water agreement, which would then lead to the destabilization of Egypt. For over 20 years, the United States, Great Britain, and Israel supported John Garang’s Sudanese People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A), in an effort to foment the division of Sudan between North and South, by manipulating religious differences between Muslims and Christians in line with Samuel Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations.” The Comprehensive Peace

FIGURE 1
The Nile River System



area, and the West has failed to provide the necessary logistics and resources to fully support this effort. With the AU mandate scheduled to come to an end on Sept. 30, 2006, the United Nations passed UN Security Council Resolution 1706 on Aug. 31, 2006, with Russia, China, and Qatar abstaining. This resolution would extend the UN mission in Sudan and deploy 20,600 troops in Darfur with a Chapter VII mandate, which allows troops to aggressively intervene with more military force, than permitted by the current AU contingent they would be replacing. Khartoum correctly rejects this deployment as a violation of its sovereignty and danger to the nation. A compromise was reached, extending the AU mission to the end of the year, now only weeks away. Since UN Resolution 1706 “invites” the consent of the Sudanese government for the deployment of these troops into their country, fools in the Congress and the Executive branch who are calling for such a “full-scale, non-consensual military intervention,” which would be tantamount to an invasion, are in fact advocating war against a sovereign nation, a UN member, and a country that plays a pivotal role in East and Central Africa.

Last month, Rep. Donald Payne, Susan Rice, and Anthony Lake proposed that the United States, with or without the support of NATO, lead a strike against “Sudanese airfields, aircraft, and other military assets. It could blockade Port Sudan, through which Sudan’s oil exports flow. Then UN troops would deploy—by force, if necessary, with U.S. and NATO backing.”

They know not what they wish for—or do they? Such an invasion will trigger new levels of asymmetric warfare, which will escalate the simmering conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia, and reinforce the asymmetric warfare already destroying the nations of Southwest Asia.

Darfur Before It Became a Flashpoint for War

In the months since the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) was signed on May 5, 2006, in Abuja, Nigeria, not only has the fighting not abated, but the killings have gotten worse, as anti-governmental rebels ferociously fight each other, murdering the civilians they once claimed to represent. Some say the DPA died the day it was agreed upon, since it was signed by only one of the two main rebel groups, the Minni Minawi faction of the Sudanese Liberation Movement (SLM), which, according to the International Crisis Group, “increasingly acts as a paramilitary wing of the Sudanese Army,” and not by the other, the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM).

To understand the underlying causes of the crisis in Darfur, one has to look at the history of this region, the cultural, economic, and political forces that have interacted to shape the behavior of these poor people trying to survive under the conditions imposed by Kissinger’s NSSM 200.

Contrary to what you may have heard on the evening news, the warfare has not been caused by ethnic conflict, and has nothing fundamentally to do with Arabs versus Africans. As economic conditions worsen, and people struggle to secure their very existence, so-called ethnicities are manipulated, as

Agreement signed in 2005 brought a formal end to the fighting between North and South, but the peace is still fragile. Darfur is now being used as the next, and perhaps more effective focal point for the dismemberment of Sudan through a new military campaign against the country.

Upwards of 10,000 African Union (AU) troops have been trying to provide some stability to the Darfur region. It is acknowledged that there are too few troops for such a large

groups are set against one another in the struggle to survive. After the severe droughts and famines hit in the 1980s, the previously normal patterns of herdsman and farmers negotiating their access to water, began to change. In impoverished Sudan, which received little meaningful assistance from the West to help resolve the conflicts over water, racial and ethnic bigotry intensified. The continuation of the drought led to increased fighting over diminishing water resources, and as weapons flowed into the area, conditions ripened for the eruption of brutal warfare. Not only in Darfur: Similar kinds of warfare have broken out throughout Sub-Saharan Africa un-

der the extremely oppressive conditions created by the policies of NSSM 200. But the solution to the crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa can never be a military one. Without a state-sponsored investment program for massive infrastructure projects to create more potable water, more gigawatts of electrical power, more hospitals, more schools, and more efficient rail transportation, the conditions for orchestrated deadly conflicts like Darfur will continue.

The immediate danger in the weeks ahead is that the newly elected Democratic members of Congress—even before taking their seats next January—will join a desperate Vice Presi-

LaRouche: Bush and Cheney Plan a New Iraq in Darfur

During his Oct. 31 webcast, leading Democrat and statesman Lyndon LaRouche was asked why he doesn't support military action against Sudan. LaRouche's response, reprinted here, was also issued as a LaRouche PAC leaflet.

First of all, the problem is caused by the United States; the problem of Sudan is caused by the United States. It goes back to the time that, in this case, the current President's father, who may wish to disown the connection, was a Vice President of the United States. And he, with his wife, made a visit to the capital of Sudan, and did some unpleasant things. But he was also involved, as Vice President, in what became known as Iran-Contra. He was a key part in organizing what we call today al-Qaeda, together with the British, because they've got people who are highly religiously motivated in the Arab world, especially in Saudi Arabia, and went to religious people in places such as Sudan and elsewhere, and recruited from Muslim Brotherhood circles, which were religious, people who were enthusiastic for this prospect, which we call al-Qaeda, which was then what the United States organized at the behest of Brzezinski and company earlier, continued by Vice President Bush and by Jimmy Goldsmith of England, and so forth, as what was called the Afghanistan war of the 1980s.

So, in this period, the United States in the person of Vice President Bush at that time, and others, had this grand war going over there, and they used people from the Arab world, particularly religious Arabs, particularly Saudi connections and so forth, to conduct this war in Afghanistan, which we are still experiencing at the present time—what they did then. It was a war on the underbelly of the Soviet Union, which was in a sense a bad idea. We had a better approach to this than they did, to deal with this—the Soviet

Union. So in this process, that happened.

Now, at the time that President Clinton was leaving office—and I think his administration had a very poor comprehension of Africa, in practice. And I think I have a much better comprehension of the problems of Africa—though I'm not perfect on the subject—than he does, still. Though I think his ideas have improved greatly, and I think his Administration served him badly, particularly on the Africa question as in the case of Uganda and so forth; I think he was very badly served by many people in his Administration, in the State Department at that time, and this is part of the problem.

But, I was last physically in Sudan at the end of January of 2001, and I ran into a buzz saw. I was there doing work on the question of water. I'd been there a number of times before. I was very familiar with the problems in the country, and the complexity of these problems, which this problem of Darfur is a reflection of, but a reflection of something else specifically. If you want to deal with the question, you have to deal with it honestly.

First of all, the objective of some people, recognizing that the key to the whole area, from the so-called Lake Victoria (which I think is a name that ought to be changed, to some respectable name), all the way to the Mediterranean Sea, that this area is governed now by a water agreement which involves Egypt, on the measurement of the Nile water. Now, the objective was, the imperialist objectives, were to destroy Egypt. How? If you break the Nile water agreement by splitting off parts of these micro-state creations in this area, then you will break the water agreement, and then what will happen is Egypt will blow up, and the entire Arab world will blow up!

'Bush Is Not Your Friend'

So, looking at these things as isolated human interest things, is a mistake, because it is sophistry; it's ignoring the problem. Now, as I said, I was there in January of 2001. What I ran into was a buzz saw. The Arabs coming out of Saudi Arabia, of Prince Bandar and so forth, told the people

dent Cheney in launching yet another war against an Islamic nation. Cheney's masters are looking for a pretext to create a new asymmetric war as part of their regime change/permanent war strategy. Since some Democrats are more "gung ho" for militarily intervening into Darfur, if more thoughtful heads don't prevail, the Democrats could squander their hard-fought election victory, and end up in their own quagmire in the deserts of Sudan. As LaRouche concluded in his answer to a question, during the Oct. 31 webcast: "People should listen to me, and talk to me a little more about these things, and then they wouldn't make those mistakes."

in Sudan that they had a friend in George Bush, George W. Bush, and the George W. Bush Administration. And I said, No. I said George W. Bush is here to *destroy* your country! He's not your friend. But they said, no, the Clinton Administration made a mess of the place. Bush is going to make it better. And I said, he's going to destroy you. And it happened. It's been destroyed.

Now, this crisis down there is a product of what the Bush Administration has done, and the ignorance on the Africa question on the part of Clinton's own administration. Clinton's own administration made a *mess* of Sudan policy. It was not the cause of the problem, but it made a mess of the whole thing, failing to understand, because of very bad advisors on this question of this area. And, as I said, I think the former President would recognize today that some of his former advisors served him very badly on this question. And this mess is created by Bush, so why don't you clean up the Bush Administration? And then we can settle the Darfur thing.

Yes, it *is* a problem, but it's a problem which is *orchestrated*. You want to treat this thing, you want to solve it? You're *not* going to solve it, not by those methods. You may think you have excellent intentions, but it's not going to work. You don't understand the area. And you have to understand this area, and not just by intelligence reports, you have to understand the *people*, you've got to understand the *history*. You've got to understand Egypt. You've got to look at what some people thought about *Museveni*. You want to understand the problem in Darfur? Look at Museveni! And look at what the Clinton Administration's attitude was on Museveni. That's where mistakes were made. And the problem is, the former President has to look at this this way. You cannot be so attached to the idea of doing a humanistic act, that in the course of doing what is ostensibly with humanistic intention, becomes a contribution to a disaster, again. And that's what the problem is.

People should listen to me, and talk to me a little more about these things, and then they wouldn't make those mistakes.

Beilin in Washington Pushes for Peace Plan

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Yossi Beilin, the head of Meretz Yachad, the leading pro-peace opposition party in Israel, spoke at the New America Foundation in Washington, D.C., on Nov. 9, giving an impassioned and very well-reasoned perspective on a peaceful solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the larger Middle East crisis.

Beilin began his presentation by reviewing the deep frustration of pro-peace activists over the current state of affairs. He presented several very concrete initiatives that could move rapidly towards a two-state solution, but first he made the more general argument that the fact that there are weak governments in Israel, Syria, Lebanon, and the Palestinian Authority, should not be held up as an excuse to do nothing. In fact, Beilin argued, weak governments, like Israel's post-Lebanon war Olmert government, or the Palestinian Authority's post-Hamas election Abbas government, have nothing to lose. Therefore, since they have already lost the political support of the mass of their people, why not take a bold initiative for peace?

Beilin pointed out that the Syrian President, Bashar Assad, has made it clear that he wants to negotiate a peace deal with Israel. So far, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert is balking, and has refused to open talks, in part because of pressure from Washington not to negotiate with terrorists. Beilin assailed the idea that there should be preconditions on peace talks, pointing out that former Prime Ministers Yitzhak Rabin, Shimon Peres, and even Benjamin Netanyahu, negotiated without preconditions.

Beilin ridiculed the Bush Administration's refusal to engage in any diplomacy with Syria, and pointed out that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's last trip to the region was a total fiasco, because she would not talk with Damascus, Hamas, or Hezbollah.

'No Need to Start From Scratch'

The second half of Beilin's opening remarks were directed at the opportunities for a final settlement. "There is no need to start from scratch," he said, reviewing the series of peace negotiations that followed from the 1991 Madrid peace talks. He said that the most fair and comprehensive agreement was the one worked out by Bill Clinton in the closing months of his Presidency, but that the Bush Road Map and Oslo Accords also offered concrete steps to peace, which he itemized precisely. The third option, which Beilin



Aviel Luz

*Yossi Beilin:
Israel's
government has
nothing to lose by
taking a bold
initiative for peace.*

has advocated, involves the convening of a Madrid II conference. Madrid I was a great success, he said, because there was nothing to vote on; all the key agreements were hammered out in advance of the conference. Beilin concluded by saying that if the Bush Administration decides to invest the last two years of the Presidency on an Israeli-Palestinian peace agreement, Bush should appoint a special emissary to move it to fruition. But, he emphasized, if the United States is not interested, then the regional parties must take it upon themselves—as was the case with Oslo and with the Israel-Jordan peace agreements.

The first two questions from the floor, both from *EIR*, dealt with the economic dimensions of peace and the prospects of a broader regional peace agreement, also encompassing a solution to the mess in Iraq. Beilin acknowledged the importance of an economic benefit from peace, but noted that Shimon Peres had argued for years that the economic cooperation had to precede the peace agreement, and this had not worked out. He did not dispute the vital role of economic growth and cooperation, but said the situation is such now that a two-state solution must be achieved. Beilin also commented that he saw the arrest and jailing of Palestinian leader Marwan Barghouti as a gigantic mistake by the Israelis: He should be released from jail now, Beilin said, even though he was probably the architect of the intifada.

WEEKLY INTERNET
AUDIO TALK SHOW

The LaRouche Show

EVERY SATURDAY

3:00-4:00 p.m. Eastern Time

<http://www.larouchepub.com/radio>

Beilin also lamented the appointment of Avigdor Lieberman to the Olmert cabinet, noting that such a racist in Israel is “bizarre,” and equating him with France’s Jean-Marie Le Pen and Austria’s Joerg Haider, who appeal to a xenophobic, terrified portion of the population.

Interview: Yossi Beilin

William Jones and Jeffrey Steinberg spoke with Beilin in Washington on Nov. 9.

EIR: What has been the reaction among Israelis to the proposal for a new Madrid peace conference? I know that you have put forward the proposal and other people have given it some support.

Beilin: I cannot say that there has been a lot of enthusiasm about a new Madrid conference. There is a will to make peace and the question is, how you are going to make it? . . . Madrid is a technical issue; it is not a substantial one. What I can say is, there is some support for it, but I must admit it is not overwhelming.

EIR: Do you think this would dovetail with some of the other proposals out there, such as the Abdullah Plan, which is now being revived by many of the moderate Arab countries?

Beilin: The Abdullah Plan is now being taken more and more seriously than before, I believe. And if there is an international conference, one of its phases might be the Abdullah Plan.

EIR: A few days ago there was a proposal by Martin Indyk calling for an “axis of peace” against the “axis of evil.” What he was essentially saying is that the U.S., Europe, the Sunni Arab states, and Israel should ally and line up against Iran, possibly in support of U.S. military action against Iran. And I worry that war in Iran is still on the mind of some people in Washington, and they’re putting “Israel-Palestine” and other things on the table along with the desire to get de facto support for a military strike against Iran. I was shocked that even Akiva Eldar [of *Ha’aretz*] and the *al-Hayat* Bureau Chief here were giving some support to this idea, that there is some credence to a military operation against Iran that may have to be agreed to.

Beilin: I do believe that any military action should be the last resort, and I believe that we have so much to do before such an idea gains credence.

EIR: Do you think there will be greater support in the new Congress for the Madrid proposal?

Beilin: Maybe. I believe that the Democratic Congress will be more enthusiastic about peace in the Middle East and the international conference might be an idea accepted by the majority.

The Poet and The Slain Statesman

by Dean Andromidas

In ancient Greece, the true statesmen were the poets, because true statecraft could not be left in the hands of mere politicians. Through their immortal tragedies, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides labored to save Greece, while Pericles and Demosthenes, through their sophistry, labored to destroy it. Commemorating the 11th anniversary of the political assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, at a time of profound moral and political crisis in Israel, demanded a poet, not a mere politician.

One hundred thousand Israelis filled Tel Aviv's Rabin Square on Nov. 4 to hear only one speaker, David Grossman. One of Israel's leading writers and poets, Grossman was an appropriate choice to commemorate the slain peace-maker, because he has used his art to bring together Israelis and Palestinians. His choice was important for another reason: He lost a son in the recent Lebanon war. Although Grossman initially supported the war, within days, he and authors Amos Oz and A.B. Yehoshua held a press conference calling on the government to accept Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Sini-ora's call for a ceasefire. Two days later, his son was killed in action in southern Lebanon.

One witness to the event, commentator Nehemia Strasler, wrote in the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz*, that contrary to those who tried to belittle the rally by claiming few would show up, "tens of thousands, including many teenagers, stood in silence, hanging on every word in the long and chilling speech. . . . He laid before them an entire plan of action—'yes' to speaking to the Palestinian people, and 'yes' to [Syrian President] Bashar Assad's peace feelers." Grossman spoke eloquently and with biting words of Israel's "hollow leadership" and the necessity for Israel to accept the "Peace of No Choice." His powerful, politically incorrect speech looked deep into the "abyss" into which Israel has sunk. It was not a "feel good" speech, but hit hard in the gut, to say either "act" or become part of Israel's self-destruction.

Thirteen years ago, on Sept. 13, 1993, on the White House lawn, with President Bill Clinton looking on, Rabin shook the hand of Yasser Arafat, chairman of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, putting into effect the Oslo Peace Accords. Those Accords promised not only to end the 100-year-long conflict in which Arabs and Jews have been embroiled, but laid the foundations of a Palestinian state living in peace, side-by-side with Israel. Echoing Lyndon LaRouche's Oasis Plan for a Middle East Peace, the "economic annexes" of that docu-

ment laid out a program of regional economic projects, including water desalination plants, transport projects, and the establishment of industrial zones.

By the end of 1999, the "Oslo process" should have ended with the establishment of a Palestinian state. But that was not to be, because Israeli hard-liners Ariel Sharon and Benjamin Netanyahu, the latter the personal protégé of George Shultz, launched a campaign not only against the Accords, but also of incitement against Rabin personally. On the night of Nov. 4, 1995, moments after he addressed a huge peace rally of 200,000 people, which had filled his heart with hope and determination to complete the Oslo process, Rabin was cut down by a Jewish assassin's bullet. Rabin lost his life for his courageous struggle, but Israel, now, 11 years later, is on the verge of losing all hope.

We present here lengthy excerpts of Grossman's Nov. 6 speech, because it gives an insight into the way many Israelis see the moral crisis of their nation. More importantly, as a speech written by a poet, it has a universality that expresses the moral and political crisis facing the Western world today. Grossman's biting critique of Israel's "hollow leadership" is written in words appropriate to almost every leading government in the West. His call for peace is no sophistry, but echoes the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia, in which a true peace aims at assuring the happiness of your former enemy.

Documentation

Grossman: Israel Is Squandering Its Miracle

The annual memorial ceremony for Yitzhak Rabin is the moment when we pause for a while to remember Rabin the man, the leader. And we also take a look at ourselves, at Israeli society, its leadership, the national mood, the state of the peace process, at ourselves as individuals in the face of national events.

It is not easy to take a look at ourselves this year. There was a war, and Israel flexed its massive military muscle, but also exposed Israel's fragility. We discovered that our military might ultimately cannot be the only guarantee of our existence. . . . I am speaking here tonight as a person whose love for the land is overwhelming and complex, and yet it is unequivocal, and as one whose continuous covenant with the land has turned his personal calamity into a covenant of blood.

I am totally secular, and yet in my eyes the establishment and the very existence of the State of Israel is a miracle of sorts that happened to us as a nation—a political, national,

human miracle. I do not forget this for a single moment. Even when many things in the reality of our lives enrage and depress me, even when the miracle is broken down to routine and wretchedness, to corruption and cynicism, even when reality seems like nothing but a poor parody of this miracle, I always remember. And with these feelings, I address you tonight.

“Behold land, for we hath squandered,” wrote the poet Saul Tchernikovsky in Tel Aviv in 1938. He lamented the burial of our young again and again in the soil of the Land of Israel. The death of young people is a horrible, ghastly waste.

But no less dreadful is the sense that for many years, the State of Israel has been squandering, not only the lives of its sons, but also its miracle; that grand and rare opportunity that history bestowed upon it, the opportunity to establish here a state that is efficient, democratic, which abides by Jewish and universal values; a state that would be a national home and haven, but not only a haven, also a place that would offer a new meaning to Jewish existence; a state that holds as an integral and essential part of its Jewish identity and its Jewish ethos, the observance of full equality and respect for its non-Jewish citizens.

How Did This Happen to Israel?

Look at what befell us. Look what befell the young, bold, passionate country we had here, and how, as if it had undergone a quickened aging process, Israel lurched from infancy and youth to a perpetual state of gripe, weakness, and sourness. How did this happen? . . . How do we continue to watch from the side as though hypnotized by the insanity, rudeness, violence, and racism that has overtaken our home?

One of the most difficult outcomes of the recent war is the heightened realization that at this time there is no king in Israel, that our leadership is hollow. Our military and political leadership is hollow. I am not even talking about the obvious blunders in running the war, of the collapse of the home front, nor of the large-scale and small-time corruption.

I am talking about the fact that the people leading Israel today are unable to connect Israelis to their identity. Certainly not with the healthy, vitalizing, and productive areas of this identity, with those areas of identity and memory and fundamental values that would give us hope and strength, that would be the antidote to the waning of mutual trust, of the bonds to the land, that would give some meaning to the exhausting and despairing struggle for existence.

The fundamental characteristics of the current Israeli leadership are primarily anxiety and intimidation, of the charade of power, the wink of the dirty deal, of selling out our most prized possessions. In this sense they are not true leaders, certainly they are not the leaders of a people in such a complicated position that has lost the way it so desperately needs. . . .

Look at those who lead us. Not all of them, of course, but many among them. Behold their petrified, suspicious, sweaty conduct. The conduct of advocates and scoundrels. It is pre-



www.aurora-israel.co.il

David Grossman, who lost his son in the Lebanon war, addressed 100,000 Israelis, commemorating the assassination of former Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. He called on Israel to do whatever it takes to make a peace settlement with the Palestinians. Grossman was an initial supporter of the war.

posterous to expect to hear wisdom emerge from them, that some vision or even just an original, truly creative, bold and ingenious idea would emanate from them. When was the last time a Prime Minister formulated or took a step that could open up a new horizon for Israelis, for a better future?

Mr. Prime Minister, I am not saying these words out of feelings of rage or revenge. I have waited long enough to avoid responding on impulse. You will not be able to dismiss my words tonight by saying a grieving man cannot be judged. Certainly I am grieving, but I am more pained than angry. This country and what you and your friends are doing to it pains me.

A Future Without Unresolved Conflict

Trust me, your success is important to me, because the future of all of us depends on our ability to act. Yitzhak Rabin took the road of peace with the Palestinians. . . . Rabin decided to act, because he discerned very wisely that Israeli society would not be able to sustain itself endlessly in a state of an unresolved conflict. He realized long before many others that life in a climate of violence, occupation, terror, anxiety, and hopelessness, extracts a price Israel cannot afford. This is all relevant today, even more so. We will soon talk about the partner that we do or do not have, but before that, let us take a look at ourselves.

We have been living in this struggle for more than 100 years. We, the citizens of this conflict, have been born into war and raised in it, and in a certain sense indoctrinated by it. Maybe this is why we sometimes think that this madness in which we have lived for over 100 years is the only real thing, the only life for us, and that we do not have the option, or even the right, to aspire for a different life. Maybe this would



whitehousehistory.org

Prime Minister Yitahak Rabin came to the realization that constantly fighting the Palestinians would provide no long-term future for Israel. Shown here is Rabin shaking hands with PLO leader Yasser Arafat in 1993 at the White House, after the signing of the Oslo Accords, with President Clinton looking on.

explain the indifference with which we accept the utter failure of the peace process, a failure that has lasted for years and claims more and more victims. . . .

And these are partly the cause of Israel's quick descent into the heartless, essentially brutal treatment of its poor and suffering. This indifference to the fate of the hungry, the elderly, the sick, and the disabled, all those who are weak, this equanimity of the State of Israel in the face of human trafficking or the appalling employment conditions of our foreign workers, which border on slavery, to the deeply ingrained institutionalized racism against the Arab minority.

The calamity that struck my family and myself with the falling of our son, Uri, does not grant me any additional rights in the public discourse, but I believe that the experience of facing death and the loss, brings with it a sobriety and lucidity, at least regarding the distinction between the important and the unimportant, between the attainable and the unattainable.

[Grossman then speaks of the necessity for a peace initiative, asking what Israel's approach to a Hamas-led Palestine should be.]

Keep strangling them more and more, keep mowing down hundreds of Palestinians in Gaza, most of whom are innocent civilians like us? Kill them and get killed for all eternity?

[No, he responds, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert must:]

Speak to their deep grief and wounds, acknowledge their ongoing suffering. . . . The power of simple human compassion, particularly in this, a state of deadlock and dread. Just once, look at them not through the sights of a gun, and not

behind a closed roadblock. You will see there a people that is tortured no less than us. An oppressed, occupied people bereft of hope. . . . Take a look at the overwhelming majority of this miserable people, whose fate is entangled with our own, whether we like it or not. . . .

Make the Bravest Possible Offer

Talk to them, make them an offer their moderates can accept. . . . Approach them with the bravest and most serious plan Israel can offer. . . . We have no choice and they have no choice.

And a peace of no choice should be approached with the same determination and creativity as one approaches a war of no choice. And those who believe we do have a choice, or that time is on our side do not comprehend the deeply dangerous processes already in motion. . . .

Maybe, Mr. Prime Minister, you need to be reminded, that if an Arab leader is sending a peace signal, be it the slightest and most hesitant, you must accept it, you must test immediately its sincerity and seriousness. You do not have the moral right not to respond.

Disagreements today between right and left are not that significant. The vast majority of Israel's citizens understand this already, and know what the outline for the resolution of the conflict would look like. Most of us understand, therefore, that the land would be divided, that a Palestinian state would be established.

Why, then, do we keep exhausting ourselves with the internal bickering that has gone on for 40 years? Why does our political leadership continue to reflect the position of the radicals and not that held by the majority of the public? It is better to reach national consensus before circumstances, or God forbid, another war, force us to reach it. If we do it, we would save ourselves years of decline and error, years when we will cry time and again: "Behold land, for we hath squandered."

From where I stand right now, I beseech, I call on all those who listen, the young who came back from the war, who know they are the ones to be called upon to pay the price of the next war, on citizens, Jew and Arab, people on the right and the left, the secular, the religious, stop for a moment, take a look into the abyss. Think of how close we are to losing all that we have created here. Ask yourselves if this is not the time to get a grip, to break free of this paralysis, to finally claim the lives we deserve to live."

Beijing Summit Puts Spotlight on Africa

by William Jones

In the largest diplomatic gathering ever held in Beijing, 48 African leaders, including 26 Presidents and 6 Prime Ministers, gathered Nov. 3-6 at the 2006 Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC). The summit is the climax of an intense diplomatic effort by China to establish a close working partnership with the nations of Africa. China is enhancing its traditional role as the largest developing country, in order to assist other developing countries on the path to economic development. This contrasts sharply with the major powers of the developed world, including the United States, who have largely written off Africa as a target for development, and left it to suffer rapacious plundering by the international financial cartels.

The fact that most of Africa's 53 countries attended the Beijing Summit, mostly at a head-of-state or head-of-government level, shows how successful the Chinese diplomacy has been.

Numerous delegations of Chinese officials have been criss-crossing the African continent over the last six years, bringing with them investment and teams of experts to assist the African nations in the areas of energy, infrastructure, medicine, and agriculture. The Chinese are also bringing their own technology and know-how to bear on the problems of Africa. In April, President Hu Jintao himself visited three African countries, while in June Premier Wen Jiabao made a whirlwind tour of seven African nations. Egypt's President Hosni Mubarak and Ethiopian President Meles Zenawi co-chaired the Beijing event, which was hosted by President Hu.

In his opening speech on Nov. 4, President Hu presented a number of measures that China planned to take to promote Sino-African Cooperation. These included: 1) doubling China's assistance to Africa by 2009, from its 2006 level; 2) providing \$3 billion in preferential loans and \$2 billion in preferential buyer's credits to the continent in the next five years; 3) setting up a \$5 billion development fund to encourage Chinese investment in Africa; and 4) cancelling all the interest-free government loans to the most heavily indebted poor countries in Africa, which matured at the end of 2005. In addition, President Hu promised to train 15,000 African professionals, to set up 10 special agricultural technology demonstration centers, to build 30 hospitals and 100 rural schools, to dispatch 300 youth volunteers and 100 agricultural experts to Africa. Addressing some African concerns that Chinese products will compete with their own domestic pro-

duction, China has also agreed to increase, from 190 to 440, the number of export items from the least-developed countries in Africa to which China grants zero-tariff treatment.

A Way Out of Poverty?

China of course has its own particular interests in helping Africa. With its growing population of over 1.3 billion people, China needs to secure its raw materials and energy resources in order to maintain the rate of growth necessary to overcome the still-rampant poverty in the largely rural country. But for the African nations, this is definitely not a one-way street. China has provided its own experts and capital for major projects in most of the African nations. China, like the United States, has had no colonial tradition, and therefore has achieved a great degree of trust among these developing nations, not only as a source of credit and capital, but as a successful model of a developing country that has begun to work its way out of poverty. The United States, on the other hand, has tended, especially since the death of President Kennedy, who was revered in Africa, to ally itself with the former colonial nations, and has thereby, to a great extent, squandered the goodwill it once had.

The Forum on China-Africa Cooperation was set up in October 2000, and has held two ministerial conferences, one in Beijing, and one in Addis Abeba. This continues a tradition that goes back to 1944, when Zhou Enlai took the initiative to hold a conference of African and Asian nations to discuss the issues of independence and development in the Third World.

The third and final day of the summit included an entrepreneurs' conference, attended by 1,500 entrepreneurs representing over 400 Chinese and African firms. Dozens of agreements were signed, totalling \$1.9 billion, in areas such as infrastructure, telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, energy, and mining. The parties decided they will set up a Joint China-Africa Chamber of Commerce. China will establish three to five trade and economic cooperation zones in Africa over the next three years. In his address to the entrepreneurs' meeting, Premier Wen promised to double trade between China and Africa by 2009.

The conference also was the occasion for dozens of bilateral meetings between Chinese and African leaders.

While the promise of the Beijing Summit has dramatically refocused the world's attention on Africa, with a pivotal role for China as the largest developing country, it would be an illusion to think that China alone, with its own immense problems of poverty and underdevelopment, will be able to do more than make a dent in the problems facing Africa. Under the present bankrupt financial system, Africa has been condemned to die. Only if the powers of the West, particularly the United States, return to sanity, and focus their efforts on aiding the infrastructural development of Africa, can the effects of decades of neglect and genocide be remedied.

Calderón Has That Old Sinking Feeling

by Dennis Small

This week's "Impeccably Bad Timing Award" was won, hands down, by Mexico's official President-elect Felipe Calderón, who arrived in Washington, D.C., on Nov. 8 for a high-profile, two-day visit with U.S. President George Bush—one day after the Bush-Cheney Administration's spectacular drubbing at the polls in the U.S. midterm elections. One is reminded of the glassy-eyed matron on the *Titanic*, who steps onto the ballroom floor and insists on dancing with the ship's captain—at exactly the point that the *Titanic* is going under. You have to wonder which of the two is crazier.

But then again, Calderón's dance card isn't exactly over-subscribed these days. In fact, the man who was proclaimed the official winner of the July 2 Presidential elections in Mexico, after fraud and irregularities on a scale that even made Karl Rove blush with pride, can hardly show his face in public in Mexico, without a gigantic security deployment that militarily occupies the conference hall or meeting place before he arrives. He is hated by the population.

For example, the day before leaving for Washington, Calderón was whisked into a meeting with businessmen of the Mexican Foreign Trade Council, where he proclaimed that his administration would concentrate on fighting "crime and terrorism," and that this battle "could even cost human lives." Given that Calderón's international Synarchist sponsors have instructed him to follow the Bush-Cheney lead in all matters, some in Mexico were left wondering if this newly announced war on terrorism would also include water-boarding and other torture techniques pioneered by Dick Cheney et al.

Calderón and his handlers have been very tight with the Bush Administration, and those behind it, for some time. For example, on Sept. 12-14, Calderón's top foreign policy advisors, including Arturo Sarukhan, participated prominently in a forum in Alberta, Canada, on the "deep integration" of the U.S. and Mexico on the energy and military fronts, which was co-chaired by none other than George Shultz, the godfather of the Bush-Cheney Administration.

Calderón, alas, is not alone.

First and second runner-up for the "Bad Timing" award were also won by Ibero-American governments which, like Mexico, have ignored Lyndon LaRouche's warnings about the end of globalization, and have chosen instead to jump on board the *Titanic* with all four feet. For example, Colombian

President Alvaro Uribe is also scheduled to visit Washington in mid-November, to lobby the Administration and Congress for rapid approval of a suicidal Free Trade Agreement that he has been negotiating with the United States. As we explain elsewhere in this issue, one of the significant facets of the U.S. elections was that they were a mandate *against* free-trade economics—a fact which President Uribe is about to learn, the hard way.

And then there's the case of Peruvian President Alan García, who is also desperate to drink the poison of a free-trade accord with the United States, and has named the ultra-free-trader Hernando de Soto as his representative to negotiate the matter with the United States. De Soto was also scheduled to travel to Washington in mid-November on that assignment, and had a scheduled meeting with . . . none other than Donald Rumsfeld. Oops.

'Two Governments'

While Mexico's illegitimate President-elect Calderón was in Washington, waltzing on the deck of the *Titanic*, the man who actually won the July 2 elections, Andrés Manuel López Obrador, was touring Mexico and meeting with the country's poor. López Obrador has launched a national organizing tour across Mexico's 2,500 municipalities in the lead-up to his announced inauguration as "legitimate President of Mexico" on Nov. 20.

Speaking on Nov. 3, López Obrador stated forcefully that "the neo-fascist right wing is mistaken, if they think that they will hold power until the year 2030." He went on to explain that the mission of the legitimate government which he will head is to protect the Mexican people from foreign-dictated "structural reforms," the dismantling of the social protection system set up by the Mexican Revolution of 1910, and the looting of the national patrimony, which the "dogmatic and fundamentalist" power elite is determined to continue. This is a reference to international financial circles' insistence on the privatization of Mexico's national oil company, Pemex, and the Federal Electricity Commission.

This is not going to be a "symbolic," or shadow government, he explained, but "a government truly of the people, for the people, and with the people. . . . Let it be heard far and wide: the defense of the interests of the people and of the national patrimony do not permit wavering or indecisiveness."

López Obrador repeated this message on Nov. 5, at rallies in three cities in the state of Hidalgo, which drew 2,000, 1,000, and 5,000 supporters, respectively—orders of magnitude more than Calderón is capable of mobilizing. López Obrador explained that, as of Dec. 1, when Calderón is scheduled to be inaugurated, "there will be two governments: a spurious one with its puppet President, and a legitimate one, that of the Mexican people."

The elections in the United States have brought López Obrador's promise that much closer to becoming reality.

It's the Economy, Stupid!

There was no more telling indication that President George W. Bush is not in the real world, than his comment at his Nov. 8 press conference, that he didn't understand why the "great economy" did not result in a Republican electoral victory. It's no wonder that our loopy President doesn't get it. The question is: Do the Democrats? Do they realize that we stand on the edge of financial disintegration that will take the entire world into hell on Earth, or do they believe in the fairy godmother called the stock market?

Now that the Democrats have taken the majority in both Houses of Congress, there can be no more stonewalling by the Democratic leadership on the question of reviving the U.S., and world, economy with FDR-style measures. Impeachment is definitely a first item of business, but it must go hand-in-hand with reversing the Administration's disastrous policy of free trade, which has let the productive core of U.S. industry, and its infrastructure, disintegrate into collapse.

How the question of economic policy is going to be addressed by the Democrats can already be foretold in broad strokes. There is going to be an all-out brawl between two factions: On the one side will be the spokesmen for Felix Rohatyn, who has already positioned himself as the "reformer"; on the other will be supporters of the LaRouche approach, for bankruptcy reorganization and government intervention to put the nation to work building up our vital transport, power, and water infrastructure. Which side wins, will determine whether the U.S. economy survives.

It is in this context that political activists must now begin to more seriously pay attention to LaRouche's leadership, starting with his post-election webcast on Nov. 16. LaRouche has already broadly circulated a legislative plan for a recovery of the U.S. economy, named the "U.S. Economic Recovery Act of 2006." There, in the context of the discussion of the ripping-apart of the U.S. auto industry, LaRouche proposes the following first steps:

1. Identify the immediately threatened productive facilities, and the manpower that is either still there, or recently associated with production there.

2. Divide the principal body of operatives associated with the plants, into two major categories: those associated with production of the product issued from those

premises, and those associated with machine-tool design capacity.

3. Identify the most crucial national infrastructure projects which are required in order to increase the net income of the nation per capita and per square kilometer, faster than the rate of annual amortization of the investment.

4. Move to create a Federal Public Corporation, by Act of Congress, to adopt elements of the automotive industry which can be retooled, and put to work, rebuilding the nation's economy.

It's not surprising that the Rohatyn types, and their comrades on the Republican side, are prepared to fight to the death to prevent a program such as that put forward by LaRouche. Rohatyn, like George Shultz, represents a brand of synarchist banker which is determined to maintain control over governments, and populations, for the benefit of their own power. Global cartels, cheap (slave) labor, and privately controlled infrastructure are all hallmarks of this system. They are even willing to flirt with "soaking the rich" in order to achieve their objectives, as long as the *control* lies with the globalized banking establishment.

To fall for the Rohatyn trap, would mean the Democrats marching straight into a new fascist world order, and those who try to promote the FDR-LaRouche model are surely going to come under fire. It was not for nothing that the Rohatyn forces did their best to ensure that the Democrats did not win a smashing landslide on Nov. 7. A landslide would have emboldened the Democrats even more to act on behalf of the general welfare of the people—rather than according to the bankers' bipartisan agenda.

The Democratic victory on Election Day was a precondition for the radical change in policy that must take place in the U.S. government—and the double impeachment of Cheney-Bush will be another. But any person concerned with the future of humanity had better be thinking long and hard about how to put LaRouche's economic reconstruction program on the agenda *now*. This economy is gone—and only a U.S. government dedicated to an FDR approach can create a future fit for our children and grandchildren to thrive.


SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review
EIR Online

EIR

gives subscribers one of the most valued publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today.



EIR Online

issued every Monday, includes early access to most of the print magazine, as well as fast-breaking communications from LaRouche, up-to-the minute world news, and a special historical feature.

I would like to subscribe to **Executive Intelligence Review**

U.S.A. and Canada:

- \$396** for one year
- \$225** for six months
- \$125** for three months

SPECIAL OFFER

- \$446** for one year
EIR Print plus EIR Online*

Outside U.S.A. and Canada:

- \$490** for one year
- \$265** for six months
- \$145** for three months

SPECIAL OFFER

- \$540** for one year
EIR Print plus EIR Online*

Standard Class shipping. Please call for First Class rates.

I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online***

- \$360** for one year
- \$60** for two months

EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouche.com/eiw

Call **1-703-771-1907** (toll-free)

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____ E-mail address* _____

* **E-mail address required for EIR Online subscriptions**

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____