

EIR


Executive Intelligence Review

April 25, 2008 Vol. 35 No. 17 www.larouchepub.com \$10.00

Then and Now: British Imperial Policy Means Famine
Al Gore: Britain's Malthusian Agent
Cheney Blows Up Iraq, To Prepare Hit on Iran

**To Defeat Famine:
Kill the WTO!**





ΔYNAMIS

THE JOURNAL OF THE LAROCHE-RIEMANN METHOD OF PHYSICAL ECONOMICS

SEPTEMBER 2007 EDITION

MUSIC & STATECRAFT: HOW SPACE IS ORGANIZED

- The Fight about the Infinitesimal

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

AN ARC OF KNOWABILITY: *On Cubic Roots*

by Merv Fansler

Selections from the ANFANGSGRÜNDE


by Abraham Kästner

Kästner's lectures on CUBIC ROOTS and INERTIA

KEPLER'S DISCOVERY, or the HOOFPRIINT of INCOMPETENCE?

by Chris Landry

CHRONOLOGY OF A HOAX: *the Case of "Kepler for Dummies"*



**THE LAROCHE YOUTH MOVEMENT:
REBUILDING SCIENCE, WITHOUT THE HIGH PRIESTS.
DOWNLOAD IN PDF FORMAT at WWW.WLYM.COM**

Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

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

Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*

Managing Editor: *Susan Welsh*

Assistant Managing Editor: *Bonnie James*

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, Paul Gallagher*

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*

Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*

Houston: *Harley Schlanger*

Lima: *Sara Madueño*

Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*

Mexico City: *Rubén Cota Meza*

New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maïtra*

Paris: *Christine Bierre*

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

Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*

Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirms@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: *John Sigerson*

Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly (50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc., 729 15th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. (703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach 1611, D-65006 Wiesbaden, Germany; Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany Tel.: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudekker

Montreal, Canada: 514-855-1699

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, 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.

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

Copyright: ©2008 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.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

The doubling of food prices over the last three years, warned UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon on April 14, “could push 100 million people in low-income countries deeper into poverty.” That’s UN-Speak for famine. While Western consumers are feeling the pinch of rising food prices, there can be no doubt what a doubling of the price of bread or rice means to a poor family in Asia or Africa that already lives at the brink of starvation: It means genocide.

Our *Feature* proves that this is not due to “acts of God” such as cyclones in Bangladesh, or drought in California. The food crisis is the direct result of the World Trade Organization’s free-trade dogmas. Nations have been forced to dismantle subsidies to the farmers that feed their own people; to jettison the traditional, rational view that achieving self-sufficiency in food production is a worthy national goal, even essential for national security. Now, those governments that are curbing exports to protect the food supply for their citizens, such as China and Thailand, are being lashed with the epithet “protectionist.”

This genocide is deliberate British policy, and has been for centuries, as our *British Empire* feature documents. American System economist Henry Carey, an advisor to President Abraham Lincoln, had it right in his study of *The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign: Why It Exists, and How It May Be Extinguished* (1853), from which we excerpt a discussion of British use of famines in India.

The foremost advocates of this Malthusian policy today include Britain’s Prince Philip, Prince Charles, and their friend Al Gore. See *National* for more on how Gore’s biofoolery exacerbates the crisis.

In case you are a new reader of *EIR* who thinks Britain is a has-been power, see the interview with Zimbabwe’s Ambassador to the United States, Dr. Machivenyika J. Mapuranga, on The LaRouche Show. Joining him on the program is a LaRouche Youth Movement member from Zimbabwe, Portia Tarumbwa Strid, reporting from Berlin. They present a precisely articulated view of how and why Zimbabwe is being targeted by the British.

Mark your calendar: Lyndon LaRouche will be delivering a web-cast address from Washington on May 7, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time, at www.larouhepac.com. He will address these topics, in the broad strategic context of global economic-financial breakdown.



Cover This Week

Children from
Bangladesh at a
food distribution
center, 1978.



UNHCR/B. Gysembergh

4 To Defeat Famine: Kill the WTO

Marcia Merry Baker gives an accounting of the crimes of the World Trade Organization era, and of actions by agencies and figures leading up to its formation in 1995. The conditions for today's vulnerability of millions of people to hunger and famine, were masterminded by networks with the intent to subvert nations and cause depopulation. The capstone of the whole downgrading process was the biofuels craze, with Al Gore as the top biofool, campaigning to "save the planet." Don't play the game. Bury the WTO!

15 Lester Brown: Brits' Genocide Spokesman

16 Seedstocks: Cartels Gain Control of Means of Life

17 Bangladesh: Millions Are in Fight for Food

19 Gore Tells the Hungry, Let Them Eat Biofuels

British Empire

22 Then and Now: British Imperial Policy Means Famine

The British Empire developed the deliberate use of famine and food control as the principal means of rule. Paul Glumaz wrote this article in 1991, on the implementation of this policy in India from 1764 to 1914.

24 China's Sun Yat-sen on British Imperial Tyranny

26 The Brits in India: Slavery and Famine

From American System economist Henry C. Carey's *The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign: Why It Exists, and How It May Be Extinguished* (1853), excerpts from Chapter XII, "How Slavery Grows in India."

Economics

32 Behind the Keystone Cops Lies Fascism

The bankers, emboldened at seemingly having survived the first quarter, have begun posturing to the effect that, to quote Lehman Brothers CEO Richard Fuld, "the worst is behind us."

34 Malaysia's Agricultural Breakthrough, Nuclear Desalination To Feed the World

By Mohd Peter Davis, a biochemist at Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Kuala Lumpur.

38 Want to Eat? Crush the WWF!

Prince Philip's Worldwide Fund for Nature may soon become the world's most endangered "species."

40 The Demise of the Debt Economy

A viewpoint from Russia, by economic journalist Felix Goryunov.

45 Business Briefs

International

46 London's Man Cheney Blows Up Iraq, To Trigger War on Iran

Sources in Baghdad and Washington trace the escalation of the campaign in Iraq against Shi'ite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr, back to Vice President Dick Cheney's recent visit to Baghdad. Cheney remains committed to military strikes against Iran, and is looking for pretexts.

48 Ambassador M.J. Mapuranga: Why the British Hate Zimbabwe

Dr. Machivenyika J. Mapuranga, the Zimbabwean Ambassador to the United States, gave this interview to The LaRouche Show on April 12. The host was Lawrence Freeman, and Portia Tarumbwa Strid, of the LaRouche Youth Movement, joined in by telephone from Berlin.

56 Zimbabwe: We Are Not a British Colony

57 Africa's Geography: Vast Food Potential

58 Berlusconi Wins in Italy: Do Not Put New Wine Into Old Bottles

59 Financial Times Issues Death Threat to Tremonti

National

60 Al Gore: Britain's Malthusian Agent

Has former U.S. Vice President Al Gore properly registered with the U.S. Department of Justice as an agent of a foreign government, under the U.S. Foreign Agents Registration Act? A dossier by Scott Thompson and Nancy Spannaus.

Editorial

64 Mass Death Is Not Inevitable!

To Defeat Famine: Kill the WTO

by Marcia Merry Baker

The World Trade Organization—the agency and the thinking behind it—must be killed. We are at the point of famine today, because only 13 years ago, in January 1995, the WTO was allowed to come into existence, resulting from ten years of UN GATT talks (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), 1984-94, on “reforming” world agriculture for free trade. This culminated a process of drastic takedown of world food production potential, from its prior build-up during the FDR period and after World War II. The inevitable result was today’s worldwide food crisis. The WTO was evil from the start. Nations were bullied and threatened into going along with it. Tolerating it today is committing evil.

The following is an accounting of the crimes of the WTO-era, and of actions by agencies and figures leading up to it. What is evident, is that the conditions for the vulnerability of millions of people to hunger and now famine, were masterminded by networks with the intent to subvert nations and cause depopulation. The capstone of the whole downgrading process was the biofuels craze, with Al Gore as the top biofool, campaigning to “save the planet.” Not his own man, Gore is just the pathetic puppet of the neo-British Empire crowd, intent on subverting the system of nation-states itself, now that the financial system is crumbling.

The WTO crime record can be best understood by looking back to the decades and locations where policies to promote agro-industrial production once were in effect—from the 1930s anti-Depression farm programs in the United States, to the food self-sufficiency programs of India, undertaken after its independence from the British Empire in 1947. But then, over the decades, a series of policy downshifts undercut the goal and the gains made, and decreased the volume of available food. Former high-productivity farm regions were depopulated, from the High Plains of North America, to Europe, Australia, and South America. Now one-seventh of the world’s population lacks enough to eat. Against this backdrop, the story of the WTO is one of crimes against humanity, and not an academic “economics” debate.

How to stop the WTO? Nullify it. Withdraw membership. Suspend its codicils, and also those of its multilateral clones, such as NAFTA, CAFTA, and all the rest. There is no way to make any of this so-called “free” (rigged) trade fair or useful. In the face of today’s food emergency, recall what the core WTO liturgy is: Nations must not keep food reserves, because this would be trade-distorting. Nations must not attempt to be food self-sufficient, because this would deny their citizens the



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

The Schiller Institute held this demonstration in Washington on Martin Luther King Day, 1989. The LaRouche movement has, since its inception in the 1960s, spoken out against the genocide policies of the International Monetary Fund, and its latter-day derivatives such as the WTO.

“right to access the world market.” Nations must not support their own farmers, because this harms farmers elsewhere. Nations must not use tariffs, because this denies right-of-access to your citizens by foreign producers. And so on and on. The consequences of this are genocidal, so don’t debate it. Cancel it.

We first look at the scope and recent history of today’s food crisis, and then at the criminal nature of the WTO.

The Food Isn’t There!

Figure 1 shows that world per-capita output of grains of all kinds (rice, wheat, corn, and others) has been falling for 20 years. Whereas in 1986 it was 338 kilograms per person, it went down to 303 by 2006. This decline in no way has been made up for by increasing amounts of other staple food-stuffs—tubers, legumes, or oilcrops, which likewise are in insufficient supply.

Figure 2 shows that in 12 of the last 20 years, less grain has been produced than utilized that year (for all purposes—direct human consumption, livestock feed, industrial and energy uses, and reserves). Accordingly, the amount of carry-over stocks of grain from year to year has been declining to

extreme danger levels. The diversion of food crops into biofuels is the nail in the coffin.

The latest estimate is that worldwide stockpiles of cereal crops of all kinds are expected to fall to a 25-year low of 405 million tons in 2008. That is down 21 million tons, or 5%, from their already reduced level in 2007.


Translated into how many “days of consumption” the diminishing grain supplies represent, the drop is down to less than two months as of 2007, as shown in **Figure 3**. Since this is a generalization, it signifies that in many locations, millions have barely anything or nothing at all to eat.

Thus, behind the hyper-speculation of recent weeks on the agro-commodity exchanges, *there is no product* now to meet the needs of real users—nations, bakers, brewers, consumers. The markets are non-functional.

Another way to put it, is that prices of grains have gone vertical. Prices for “paper bushels” have no relation to real bushels, and you may not find supplies at any price.


For example, the Philippines on April 17 held a rice tender to secure contracts for 500,000 metric tons of rice from international bidders, but only 325,750 mt was offered. The prices ranged from \$872.50 to \$1,220 per mt, and the Philippines

FIGURE 1
World Grain Production per Person, 1950-2006
 (Kilograms)



USDA

FIGURE 2
World Grain Production and Consumption, 1960-2007
 (Millions of Metric Tons)



USDA

National Food Authority had budgetted a maximum of \$900 a metric ton. But they are now short.

As of April, many of the top grain-exporting nations have restricted their product from the world markets in order to protect domestic consumption. Bans on rice exports are in place in Vietnam, China, and India. Wheat exports have been limited from Russia and Kazakstan.

Governments are seeking nation-to-nation deals to secure food flows just for the near future. The Philippines has pledg-

es from Vietnam and the U.S.A. But many more of the poorest nations are simply left without. Food riots are sweeping the globe, from Haiti and Central America, to Africa and Bangladesh.

Those in London who have acted to enforce the “world markets” system in recent years, are now screaming the loudest to denounce governments for trying to withhold grain from trade, and for making government-to-government deals “outside” the markets. Typical is an April 15 report by the British bank HSBC, “The Food Price Scare,” which in 45 pages fulminates against government price, export, and shipment controls. Singling out rice pledges between Vietnam and the Philippines, the HSBC said such measures have “perverse impacts” and will merely prolong the “adjustment process” required to bring inflation down. *The Economist* of London derides government-to-government grain deals as “Cereal Offenders.”


But in contrast to these jackals, the scientific and moral reaction to the fact that world food markets have crashed, and nations are reverting to national-interest impulses, is to shut down the WTO. Especially since the 1999 “Seattle Round,” which was peremptorily shut down amidst tear-gas, rioting, and a lockdown of the city, the WTO has rightly been viewed as a zombie agency—the walking dead. But no one has had the guts to counter the British Empire powers behind it, and bury it.

Commitment to Food for All, 1940-60s

Over the first post-World War II decades, a commitment prevailed to build up the economic activity worldwide to end hunger. This is reflected in even the crudest data measuring the annual production of grains per capita, as shown in Figure 1. From 250 kilograms per person in 1950, it rose to the range of 337 by 1978. In some parts of the world, this effort was built on the productive foundations laid many decades previously, such as in the United States and Canada, Argentina, and elsewhere. European agriculture was rebuilt.

In the United States over the 1800s, especially after the Lincoln Presidency, the farmbelt was extended over larger and larger land areas, with higher organization and productiv-

FIGURE 3
World Grain Stocks as Days of Consumption, 1960-2006



ity per unit area, because of the newly built networks of railroads, mechanized farming, water management, and putting scientific advances into practice—from animal husbandry to chemicals. Over the 1950s and '60s, U.S. yields per acre continued to increase.

For other parts of the world, particularly India, and throughout Africa, the effort to increase food production had to be made over this same period, to make up for the colonial legacy of the lack of infrastructure and farm inputs. It was President Roosevelt's explicit mission to commit the United States to collaborate with this international post-war drive to see newly freed nations prosper.

There were institutional initiatives to further the mobilization for ending world hunger. In 1945 in Quebec City, Canada, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) was founded, later moved to Rome. Its defined mission: to end hunger.

In December 1953, the Atoms for Peace program was announced by President Dwight Eisenhower in a speech to the UN General Assembly. The program had specific technological proposals for advancing agriculture, including nuclear-powered desalination to supply irrigation, and nuclear-powered canal blasting. The guiding concept was that plentiful nuclear power could transform the landscape and create a new "man-made" natural resource base, especially water, for infrastructure and agro-industrial advance.

There were new centers for crop R&D established to breed high-yield seed varieties on a crash basis. Fabulous gains—called the Green Revolution—were made for wheat and corn by the Mexico City-based CIMMYT (International Center for Wheat and Corn Research). Although officially dedicated in 1966, its work started during wartime in 1942, at

the instigation of FDR's Vice President, Henry Wallace, a crop geneticist from Iowa. In Fall 1941, he drove through the countryside of Mexico, the homeland of corn, finding extremely low plant yields. Knowing there would be no wartime funding, Wallace enlisted Rockefeller financing, and corn and wheat research began right away.

In 1960, the International Rice Research Institute was established in the Philippines, and similar public-good R&D centers were set up in Africa, Asia, and the Americas, with specialties including potatoes, beans, and wheat.

There were visions and hopes for the entire globe, even the most extreme climates. FDR himself spoke of making the Sahara Desert bloom. There were plans for even the circumpolar region. In 1944, after a trip across the Bering Strait at the behest of President Franklin Roosevelt,


Vice President Wallace called for an "Agricultural Council of the Far North," to bring together leaders from Scandinavia, the Soviet Union, Canada, and Alaska, to work on expanding farm output in the subpolar regions after the war, to make way for vast new settlements and population.

Despite entrenched networks opposing such a positive worldview—centered in the Anglo-Dutch crowd that had covertly backed European fascism to begin with—there were significant successes and agricultural "firsts" over the post-war decades. One way to appreciate this, is to consider the many national achievements in food self-sufficiency and even abundance.

Mexico. By the early 1950s, CIMMYT developed new seeds which had an inherently 20-40% higher yield than seeds available in 1940 had. With this success, combined with other rural programs, Mexico was a net food exporter in the 1960s. Large water management programs were on the drawing boards to make maximum use of the plentiful Sierra Madre Mountains' run-off, and to launch nuclear power plant development.

India, in 1974, became food self-sufficient, ending the famine legacy from the days of the British East India Company and the Empire. This achievement, reflecting the commitment of government, science, and farm leaders, was built on the country-to-country collaboration with Mexico from the 1960s. As of 1964, Indian and Pakistani farm scientists, trained in Mexico, began field tests with the new CIMMYT Green Revolution wheat seeds on the Indian Subcontinent.

Sudan, the largest nation in Africa, has an arable land base of 200 million acres that could easily be cultivated—equivalent to half the cultivated farmland area of the United States. But as of 1954, at the time of its independence from



worldfoodprize.org

In 1966, Shri C. Dr. Subramaniam, Indian Minister of Food and Agriculture, made the historic decision to import the new high-yield wheat seed developed in Mexico. Going against all critics, who worried about risk, 240,000 hectares were sown. It did spectacularly. India became self-sufficient in cereals by 1974. Shown are the Mexican seed shipments in 1966, with Dr. Norman Borlaug (center), of CIMMYT, who collaborated with Subramaniam, and is considered the father of the Green Revolution.



PIB

Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi (1917-84), during a visit to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. In 1966, Gandhi, to show her support for the controversial introduction of high-yield wheat seeds, planted some in the front flowerbeds of her Ministerial house.

Britain, the challenge was to overcome the colonial legacy of very restricted cotton-growing; barely 7% of Sudan's area was cultivated, with little irrigation. Ambitious plans were laid, in collaboration with Egypt, to create vast improvements in land use and controlled water supply. The keystone project was to channel the flow of the White Nile, part of the Upper Nile system, with the 360-kilometer Jonglei canal. Requiring a long lead time, construction did start in 1980, and was two-thirds complete in three years. (By the mid-1980s, it was thwarted by the Gorey networks described below.)

In the **United States** during these immediate post-war years, improvements in agricultural productivity were achieved. For example, corn yields: Whereas in 1931, the U.S. average corn per acre harvest was 24 bushels—the same as at the time of the Civil War, by 1941, this rose to 31 bushels. By 1980, the U.S. average was 100 bushels an acre, from hybrid seeds, mineral fertilizers, and other advances.

One key principle to this agricultural development process was most explicitly implemented as law in the United States, beginning during the Roosevelt Administration in the 1930s, through the wartime food mobilization drive, and then for a time after the war: the concept that it is in the national

interest for there to be a stable, family-scale farm sector. To achieve this, the government could mandate the price levels that private buyers of farmers' commodities would have to pay, in order for *the farm family to receive an income on a par with their costs of production* (including a decent profit, with which to plough back into the household and farm operation). This was known as a *parity pricing* program. In the case where the government wanted to induce more output, whether wheat, honey, milk, or many other commodities, a parity price over 100% would be set for a relevant time

period. If there appeared to be overproduction, a parity price of less than 100%, would obtain for a specified time.

The last explicit law of this type in the United States was that of 1949, following on 1933 and 1938 parity pricing acts.

Enemies of the right and responsibility of nations to see to their own food supply, bitterly attacked the parity pricing concept with epithets such as “communist,” and “outmoded.” In time, they succeeded in forcing out the parity pricing principle altogether, in favor of the “market forces” pricing concept, the euphemism for privatizing and globalization.

Assault on Nations, 1970s

By the 1970s, the opponents of the principle of a world of thriving nations, had regrouped to conduct multiple assaults



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

A Schiller Institute rally in Washington in 1985 paired a program for feeding Africa, with a technology-driver for the United States and Soviet Union: cooperation on the Strategic Defense Initiative.

on the attempts at national agro-industrial development. One of the most destructive was the 1971 removal of the U.S. dollar from the gold reserve standard, and the launch of a floating-exchange-rate currency system. Nations with trade relations involving farm and other commodities, including agriculture inputs, were thrown into uncertainty. They were hit with terrible terms of trade, in which they had to try to obtain expensive dollars to cover essential imports of machinery or chemicals, and yet sell what they had to export at destructively low prices.

Then came more chaos, in the form of the 1973 Oil Crisis, setting the conditions for price spikes, and spot market speculation. This was orchestrated out of London, with the connivance of Henry Kissinger, then U.S. Secretary of State and National Security Advisor, who boasted at Chatham House in 1982, that he was proud to be an agent of Britain!

The same kind of orchestrated chaos ensued after the 1972 “Great Grain Robbery.” In this episode, sizable Russian purchases were made on U.S. grain markets—through the usual world grain cartel companies. Then, during the ensuing period of price spikes, U.S. farmers were subjected to heavy propaganda that they could best succeed on “free markets.” Kissinger struck a new cartel-serving shipping treaty, that opened U.S. ports to foreign carriers for future free trade.

All the while, a network of supranational commodity cartel companies, interconnected with Anglo-Dutch financial circles, was tightening its grip on world food flows, from farm to table. The lineage of the leading firms traces back about 250 years, to patterns of control over grain flows in Russia,

Europe, North Africa, and related. The major names are legendary, including André, Louis-Dreyfus, Bunge, Continental/Fribourg, and Cargill. Later, ADM—plus in Europe, Nestlé, Unilever, Castle & Cook, and more. Along with Big Oil, these Big Grain firms extended their control over the most basic necessities. *Merchants of Grain* was the name of the 1979 exposé book by Dan Morgan, then and still at the *Washington Post*, which covered much of the history and mid-century doings of these transnationals. Carefully omitted were the political/financial connections, referred to as “synarchist,” by U.S. intelligence during World War II.

The case of Argentina shows the typical way these companies moved for control. In the immediate post-World War II years, efforts to develop Argentina, by investing the foreign sales of its grain, back into agro-industrial capacity, were undertaken by the Juan Perón government. In 1948, Perón established the Argentine Institute for the Promotion of Trade (IAPI), institutionalizing the right of the government to control the cereals trade for its goals of raising finances for industrialization. This policy came under fierce attack from the grain cartel companies. With the connivance of U.S. Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman, the IAPI was ended, as soon as Perón was ousted in 1955. The grain-control operations of the cartel firm Bunge y Born soon re-established control, becoming known as “The Octopus,” for its far-reaching domination of commodities in Argentina and Brazil, from paint to food.

A few facts from the Cargill story are exemplary of the cartel process globally. Cargill Co., the world’s largest grain

company, is privately owned and based in the Minneapolis, Minnesota suburb of Minnetonka. It was founded by Scotsman William Cargill, in Conover, Iowa in 1865, and has been run, since the 1920s, by the billionaire MacMillan family. The Cargill operations arose through strategic acquisitions of grain-handling, storage, and transportation infrastructure, in the flow of the output of the U.S. grainbelt to domestic processing centers, and to ports for foreign shipment. The Cargills and MacMillans had a chokehold on the Mississippi Basin “grainshed” at Minneapolis-St. Paul and other points. Their widely diversified holdings ranged from steel and shipbuilding, to salt, fertilizer, and orange juice. During World War II, when the Old World commodity powers moved extensively into North America, Cargill expanded its control over commodity flows. In 1947, it opened big grain facilities in Puerto Rico; in 1948 it built big grain elevators in São Paulo and Paraná, Brazil. In North America, it built a huge, ice-free port on the mouth of the St. Lawrence River at Baie-Comeau.

Cargill’s domination came not only from physical positioning, but from political clout, mostly by stealth and menace. Indicative is that in 1956, Cargill set up its world office in Geneva, Switzerland, called Tradax, Inc. One veteran Cargill officer involved was Pearsall Helms, whose brother Richard, later became director of the CIA. Cargill’s Africa operations are run out of Europe.

‘Farms and People Pollute’

The clincher to all this economic warfare against nations, was the post-1968 culture of pessimism, epitomized by the founding of Earth Day in 1970. The theme was that the Earth’s resources were depleting, and population must be curbed. In 1968, Paul Ehrlich’s book *Population Bomb* was released. William Paddock, unofficial State Department advisor (1975-80), wrote *Famine 1975*, saying that famine was inevitable. In 1972, the Club of Rome was founded, releasing the book *Limits to Growth*, to assert, by computer simulation, that the world’s limits to growth had been reached, and zero growth must be enforced. A slew of media operations and new agencies were mobilized to pound on this message. With the rock-drug counterculture under way as part of the campaign, the degradation operation proceeded.

In 1974, several key events in agriculture policy occurred. A World Food Conference was convened in Rome, to address



Coordinación de Material Gráfico

Mexican President José López Portillo (1920-2004) launched a national food-sufficiency policy and called for the construction of 20 nuclear power plants in Mexico. His aspirations were blocked by London and Wall Street.

how to defeat hunger. However, Secretary of State Kissinger was sent at the last minute to represent the United States, after an orchestrated scandal cancelled the trip of Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz—an “old school” farm advocate. Instead of addressing the need to rev up agriculture capacity, Kissinger’s theme was that nations should try to help the needy with a little food aid. Meantime, in December, he signed a secret National Security Study Memorandum (NSSM 200), calling for the deliberate suppression of 13 strategically important nations, so that they would not be using up resources that the United States and its allies want. The nations were India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nigeria, Egypt, Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Colombia.

Along with these specific and other government actions, a set of non-governmental agencies was created, to proliferate propaganda that the Earth’s resources are limited, technology is dangerous and can’t overcome scarcity, etc. In 1974, the Worldwatch Institute was established in Washington, D.C. (see Appendix). In 1982 the World Resources Institute was founded, headed by Gus Spaeth, to issue pseudo-scientific tracts saying that expanding the food supply and population destroys the environment. Al Gore is on their board today.

Over the 1970s, there were intense operations by the World Wildlife Fund (founded in 1961), run in tandem with the Conservation Foundation (a U.S. continuation of a pre-World War II Europe-based, eugenicist “nature” society). In 1991, the two merged, and subsequently became known as the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF).

Their assault on food and agriculture was profound. They

mounted a campaign to force governments to remove land from agricultural production, in the name of “conserving” scarce resources. In the United States, an entirely new program was established, the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). As of today, it has over 30 million acres locked up, out of a crop base of 365 million acres. The “Wetlands Reserve” is taking still more land out of production.

Lyndon LaRouche led a pitched battle over the 1970s against these networks, operations, and especially the science fakery. As a Presidential candidate in 1976, he was on the ballot in 26 states, under the U.S. Labor Party banner. The symbol of his agro-industrial campaign was a high-tech tractor. Over 1979-80, local tractor protests occurred; and a huge tractorcade of farmers streamed into Washington, D.C. to protest the takedown of the U.S. farm sector. Their immediate burden came from a crushing debt load caused by underpayment for their commodities, and double-digit borrowing costs.


Other statesmen continued the fight. On March 18, 1980, Mexican President José López Portillo called for a national food self-sufficiency policy, called the Mexican Food System. He called for building 20 nuclear power plants. On food, he said, “The objective of the Mexican Food System is to reach self-sufficiency in each of the key subsystems of national nutrition: grains, edible oils, fruits, vegetables, meat, fish, milk, and eggs....” It wasn’t to be.

Mad Cow Loosed, 1980s

Over the 1980s, an even greater onslaught came against national agriculture, industry, and energy programs, led by the “Mad Cow” in office in Britain, Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990. Her government was the world model for radical privatization schemes, deregulation of government functions, and privateering free-trade practices.

For the record: Even her epithet, “Mad Cow,” came about, due to London’s ideological free-trade practices. The BSE brain-wasting disease—bovine spongiform encephalopathy, called Mad Cow—broke out for the first time ever, in Britain, around 1986, and was widely exported. Veterinarians attribute the occurrence directly to the Thatcher government’s malfeasance. Soon after she was elected, a national livestock sanitation board asked the government to intervene to prevent any tainted sheep matter from being cycled elsewhere into the livestock feed chain, because there was at the time in the U.K., a widespread outbreak of sheep scrapie, TSE (transmissible spongiform encephalopathy). Thatcher and Agriculture Minister Lord Peter Walker refused, on the grounds that the animal feed sector should “regulate itself.” Within six years, after tainted matter continued to be blended into animal feed, the species jump from sheep to cows occurred.

Internationally, private cartels expanded their chokehold all along the food chain over the 1980s, under the pressure by the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and other institutions, to follow the Thatcher model of non-regulation and privatization. The World Bank began phasing out any of its




The Schiller Institute in 1989 exposed the set-aside programs, which paid U.S. farmers not to produce food.

limited, effective loans for infrastructure for low-income nations to build up agriculture potential. Instead, the World Bank began funding privatization schemes, including the Felix Rohatyn-type, “public-private partnerships.”

Part of the pseudo-science cover for this was that, “small and local is better, and more sustainable.” For example, an October 1984 report of the World Bank, “Toward the Sustainable Development of Sub-Saharan Africa,” called for large-scale water projects to be “re-examined”—meaning cancelled—given the “extreme shortage of resources.”

Year after year, more farmland was being removed from food production, due to erosion, salination, or to insane set-aside programs, all the while that cartel companies were pushing nations to agree to cash crops for foreign markets. Less and less food was being produced per capita internationally.

In October 1982, the U.S. Congress granted the Commodity Credit Corp. of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) discretion to convert government grain stocks to gasohol fuel, and kicked off the ethanol promotion program, giving Cargill and ADM multi-billions for government-subsidized ethanol. The next year, an unprecedented U.S. food output reduction program was enacted, called “Payment-in-Kind,” in which farmers were given claim chits for government-controlled surplus corn stocks, in exchange for idling



Lyndon LaRouche addresses a Food for Peace conference in Chicago, Dec. 20, 1988. Two months earlier, he appeared in a half-hour national TV broadcast, "The Winter of Our Discontent," which highlighted the food crisis worldwide, and proposed East-West cooperation to deal with it.

EIRNS

30-50% of their corn acreage. Then, during the very same 1983 crop season, a 50-year drought hit, and that entire year's corn harvest fell by 50% from its recent previous levels.

LaRouche warned of the consequences of continuing this insanity. Addressing the underlying question of science, he released a book in 1983, *There Are No Limits to Growth*. He conferred on the crisis in Argentina in 1984, with scientists and political leaders, and with other world leaders. During the U.S. Presidential race, he released two national half-hour TV shows on the crisis. One was titled, "The Food Shock of 1984."

But the same year, the GATT was used as the venue for an all-out attempt at a one-world trade treaty, to make it even easier for the private, neo-British-East-India-Company networks to subvert nation-serving agriculture. An opening round of trade talks began at Punta del Este, Uruguay, aimed at "reforming" agriculture trade, by coercing nations to remove tariffs, export controls, and national regulations. Over the next ten years, a drawn-out sequence of conferences were held in Montreal and elsewhere, attended not only by national government officials, but by Cargill, ADM, major banks, and non-governmental agencies. Finally, nations succumbed, and the date was set for January 1995, for the World Trade Organization to start up.

In Fall 1988, after another devastating drought in the U.S. corn belt, the Schiller Institute's "Food for Peace" effort was initiated, to fight internationally against the GATT/WTO drive, and for national development. (Documents from this work are available at www.schillerinstitute.org/food_for_peace/ffp_main_page.html.) LaRouche spoke in October in

West Berlin, and at a Food for Peace conference in Chicago in December, pointing to the prospect of the split-up of the Soviet bloc, and calling for international collaboration to recommit to restoring agro-industrial capacity. (See *EIR*, April 18, 2008.)

The degree to which nations' food security was being undercut, was apparent by how much they were being coerced to become food import-dependent. *EIR* did a study of the food-sufficiency status of the 13 nations named in 1974 by Kissinger and the British, to be hit by the food weapon. Two points in time were compared—1963 and 1990—for how self-sufficient each nation was for certain food staples. A few representative examples:

The Americas: Mexico was 100% self-sufficient in cereals in 1963, and down to 79% in 1990; 104% self-sufficient in beans in 1963, and down to 85% in 1990; in oils, 110% self-sufficient in 1963, and down to 57% in 1990.

Africa: Egypt was 84% self-sufficient in cereals in 1963, and down to 62% in 1990; 112% self-sufficient in beans in 1963, and down to 88% in 1990; in oils, 103% in 1963, and down to 90% in 1990.

Indian Subcontinent: India continued its self-sufficiency following 1974, and even conducted selective food exports. But Pakistan saw declines. Bangladesh went from 106% self-sufficiency in 1963 down to 87% in 1990; in beans, from 100% down to 88%; in oils, it increased from 71% self-sufficient to 83%. (See article on the Bangladesh crisis today, p. 17.)

Southeast Asia: The Philippines declined in cereals self-sufficiency from 83% in 1963, down to 80% in 1990; in beans,

from 97% down to 47%; and oils, from 266% down to 101%.

China achieved self-sufficiency over the 1960s to 1990 period, with intent to make even more improvements to upgrade nutrition levels, for which the nation has been singled out for attack as “overusing scarce resources.” However, the loss of farmland to aridity and residential sprawl, began to present a threat to future food output gains. The area of China’s arable/permanent cropland base declined from 101.6 million hectares in 1970, down to 95.67 million ha in 1990. This loss came from erosion, dryness, sprawl, and other factors.

Toward Famine, 1990s

Thus, the decade of the 1990s should have been the time to restore and redouble nation-serving agro-industrial measures, given the increasing hunger and food shortages in Africa and elsewhere, and also the urgent need to continue the successes of India and China, home to 2 billion people. However, the very opposite came to pass. A sequence of free-trade pacts accelerated the degradation of agricultural potential and lack of food self-sufficiency. In 1989, the Canadian-U.S. Free Trade Pact went into effect, followed in 1994 by the North American Free Trade Act (NAFTA). In January 1995 came the WTO. Later there would be the Caribbean Free Trade Act (CAFTA), and others in Europe and Africa.

In 1991, Europe saw the largest farmer demonstrations against low prices and free trade in history, focussed against the GATT/WTO plans, in Paris, Luebeck, Strasbourg, Rome, and many other locations. In Spring 1993, the largest farmer demonstrations ever took place in Argentina. But the lock on public policy by the globalizers remained in place.

One of the ugliest manifestations of the cartel free-trade, food-control system, was the increasing “global sourcing” of food to feed the United States and Europe. In the process, farmers were ground under in both the importing and exporting regions.

In the United States by 1995, fully 13% of food consumption was imported, way up from 9% in 1980. Some categories have soared—for example, fish and shell-fish. In the early 1980s, 51% of U.S. consumption of these foods was imported; today, 78%. Dramatic rises also occurred for fruits, juices, and nuts. In the early 1980s, 21% of U.S. consumption of these foods was imported (much of it being tropical, such as bananas), but today, this has risen to 31% overall, and includes huge quantities of non-tropical products, such as apple juice. Today, approximately 50% of U.S. apple juice comes from China, and other fruit juices from Turkey, South Africa, and Asia.

The food flows from Africa to Europe have grown similarly. Besides the tropical cocoa and coffee, there are large shipments of “mid-latitude European” products, including green beans and flowers from East Africa, as well as fruits and vegetables from South Africa.

On a world scale, the major processor cartels moved to

FIGURE 4
Western Hemisphere Soybean Crop Area:
80% World Production, 90% World Exports



Source: EIRNS/2004


impose gigantic monoculture regions, for their domination of key oil and grain crops and products. **Figure 4** shows the huge area turned over to soybeans in Argentina and Brazil by 2004. By 2008, over 45% of all arable land in Argentina is in soy cultivation. This is the analog of the British East India Company’s practices of decreeing where and how cash crops would be grown—indigo, cotton, jute, and whatever else the Empire desired.

The present-day monoculture is abetted by the unprecedented changes in patent law, giving sweeping rights to agro-cartel companies for introduction of seeds and methods of genetic bioengineering: Cargill/Monsanto, Dupont/Pioneer, and others (see Appendix). As for the leading participants in WTO “free” trade, the degree of concentration is also a dramatic irony. Cargill and ADM are two of the top firms dominating over 65% of all soy trade. They are also among the top three dominating over 80% of U.S. corn exports. Cargill, ADM, and only two others control 60% of the terminal grain-handling facilities in the United States.

The misery and want connected to this vast WTO-era degradation of agriculture is manifest in the death rate in Africa,

FIGURE 5
World Food Aid, 1991-2006


(Millions of Metric Tons)



Source Data: World Food Programme's International Food Aid Information System.

FIGURE 6
U.S. Corn Use for Export as Food, and Fuel Ethanol, 1980-2006

(Millions of Metric Tons)



including HIV/AIDS, and suffering among some 900 million people in 70 countries.

Given the rage at the perpetrators of this harm, it is no wonder that in 1999 the “Seattle Round” of the WTO talks, ended in a bust. The conference was disbanded with no results, as various developing nations refused to go along with the free-trade dictates. This outcome was in order. Nevertheless, the WTO continues to stalk the world.

In November 2001, in Qatar, the current WTO Doha Round was begun. Its continuing goal is to yet further lower national “barriers” to borderless trade, on behalf of the British Empire. At subsequent Doha Round talks in Cancun, Hong

Kong, and Geneva, stand-offs among nations have continued.

Biofuels and Genocide, 2000s

As of the turn of the century, the lack of adequate food and necessities for millions of people was at desperation levels. Yet far from taking even minimal measures, major governments and UN institutions stood by as even the level of tonnage of annual food aid dropped. (Figure 5). Then came the genocide program: biofuels.

An evil axis of neo-conservatives and neo-greens combined to bumrush governments into passing laws setting national mandates for how much biofuel must be blended into gasoline and diesel fuel in coming years. The Energy Law of 2005 in the United States sets these goals. The same year France passed such a law, and now dozens of nations have followed suit.

Gigantic neo-plantations for gasohol have been concentrated in the Americas—across the corn belt in the U.S.A., and the cane belt in Brazil. The big players are the usual cartels and financial circles behind globalization, including Cargill, ADM, Bunge, George Soros, and Bill Gates.

Al Gore is acting as head cheerleader in the biofuels parade, in lock-step with neo-cons such as George Shultz and James Woolsey, who use “energy independence,” instead of the Gorey “save-the-planet” pitch, to promote the bio-energy fraud. (See article, page 19.)

There are even proposals for two dedicated biofuels pipelines: a 1,700-mile ethanol pipeline from Iowa to New York Harbor; and in Brazil, an 800-mile pipeline from the inland state of Goias, through Minas Gerais, to the port at Paulinia/São Paulo. These proposals don’t represent agricultural “infrastructure” any more than Nazi work-camps represented factories.

Fully 24% of the U.S. corn crop this year (September 2007 to 2008) is expected to go into corn ethanol, according to the USDA. The previous year it was 18%. The volume of U.S. corn used for ethanol now exceeds the amount of U.S. corn going for export to the world human food chain (Figure 6.)

These are the parameters of today’s epic famine danger. There is no “fix” to this threat, by staying within the frame-



A newspaper website from Al Gore's home state of Tennessee ran this apt cartoon, which shows how Gore is viewed.

work of the markets game of the last 30 years, and the WTO. The harm done was not the result of “misguided” policies. It was intentional, and of the same degraded outlook toward mankind that gave us the British East India Company and the British Empire years ago. Many of today’s food-control networks are, in fact, lineal descendents. Al Gore is their hired hand in mass murder.

End the evil. Don’t play the game. Bury the WTO!

Christine Craig prepared the data and graphs in this article. Contact the authors at marciabaker@larouche.com.

Appendices

Lester Brown: Brits’ Genocide Spokesman

British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, appearing with George W. Bush on April 17, told the press that there were several causes for a “severe global food crisis,” but he could only think of one to declare: “Asian populations increasing their quality of food consumption.” Not two decades of British/

WTO attacks on nations’ food sufficiency policies; not the current hundred-billion-dollar wild speculation on food commodities by hedge funds; but China and other “overpopulated” Asian countries’ desire to eat!

Prime Minister Brown—echoed next day even more brutally by German Chancellor Angela Merkel—was putting out the Malthusian British policy; for two decades the Brits’ leading “modern Malthus” targeting Asian and African populations has been an American, Lester R. Brown. Prime Minister Brown was repeating the lie that genocidalist Lester Brown (no direct relation) and his Worldwatch Institute, World Resources Institute, etc. have been putting out for decades. It was in the early and mid-1990s that Lester Brown set up Worldwatch, with Rockefeller Foundation money. Garnering global publicity and wide foundation backing with so-called “state of the world reports,” Brown seized on the slowing of a 40 years’ science-driven tripling of world grain output, to claim that human food production would never grow again. In a May 6, 1996 press conference, for example, Brown compared the human species to “rats in a cage” or

amoebae in a petri dish whose population can rise, but then must collapse from failure of nutrition. “Any biology student knows about the S-shaped curve” of such populations, he said.

At that press conference—and many others during that period—Lester Brown harped on three basic lies whose combined intent was genocidal. First, that a renewed commitment to funding basic agricultural science breakthroughs like the “Green Revolution” would be fruitless, due to finite biological “carrying capacity” of the Earth, and world grain production was immediately going to go into a fall—in reality, it has continued to rise. Second, that *China, in particular*, must fail to feed itself, and must eat up the world’s substance—it has actually remained a net food exporter until this year. And third, that due to Asia and Africa, the human population was growing by 90 million or more per year—a claim about 20% higher than the reality well known to UN demographers.

Aspen Roots of Worldwatch

Lester Brown, a U.S. Agriculture Department official in the 1970s (fawning press have falsely called him “an agronomist” when spreading his anti-China slanders), was initially trained at the Aspen Institute, before setting up the Worldwatch Institute in 1974. The Aspen Institute links are critical. Aspen was founded by Robert Maynard Hutchins, the long-time chancellor of the University of Chicago, and the leading

American ally of the late Lord Bertrand Russell. Russell, whom Lyndon LaRouche has called “the 20th Century’s most evil man,” was the international socialist who advocated the elimination of science and the systematic elimination of the darker-skinned races—when he wasn’t urging preventive nuclear war against Russia. Aspen is one of the leading Malthusian snake-pits in the world, peddling the idea of “food as a weapon.”

Brown is also a longtime Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) member; and board member of the top U.S. anti-China think-tank, the Institute for International Economics, founded by Lehman Brothers globalist Peter Peterson and run by C. Fred Bergsten.

By the mid-1990s, Brown was consistently, publicly lying that Chinese food consumption threatened the world’s food supplies—as in this 1996 speech reported by Reuters:

“‘China is becoming a huge sponge, buying almost everything—cotton, sugar, rice, corn and wheat,’ Brown said. . . .”

“In 1990, China grew 329 million tons of grain and consumed 335 million tons, with the gap covered by net imports of 6 million tons, Brown said in a report.

“China is expected to add 490 million people to its population between 1990 and 2030, swelling it to 1.6 billion, he wrote. Brown projects that China’s grain demand will in-

crease to 479 million tons in 2030.”

These were falsehoods, for which the Chinese scientific establishment angrily took Brown on. China continued to be a net *exporter* of food to the rest of the world until 2007.

The young Brown’s infatuation with the ideas of Parson Thomas Malthus, the English anti-population propagandist (1766-1834), on the payroll of the British East India Company, was one of Brown’s qualifications for getting funded in 1974 to run the Worldwatch Institute, by the financial backers of the zero-growth, anti-population movement, most notably the Rockefellers.

In the foreword to his 1972 book, *Man and His Environment: Food*, co-authored with Gail Finsterbusch (New York: Harper and Row), Brown writes: “Thomas Malthus was probably the first to detect worldwide population pressure and to identify world population growth as a problem. When he published his essay on *The Principle of Population* in 1798, he defined the population problem primarily in terms of food supplies and the threat of famine. For almost 200 years men have perceived the population-food problem in these terms, asking, ‘Can we produce enough food to feed anticipated human numbers?’ . . . The relevant question is no longer, ‘Can we produce enough food?’ but ‘What are the environmental consequences of attempting to do so?’”

The idea of “Asian overeating” because, as Chancellor Merkel put it, many people in India now eat two meals a day and China’s population drinks milk, is imperial, genocidal lying, and Brown has been its spokesman for 30 years. The British/WTO policy of “feeding markets, not people” and starving agricultural scientific research, has brought on today’s famine threat.

—Paul Gallagher and Marcia Merry Baker

EIR SPECIAL REPORTS

Peace through Development in Africa's Great Lakes Region: Proceedings of A Seminar in Walluf, Germany

The 148-page report incorporates the proceedings of a seminar addressed by Lyndon LaRouche and sponsored by *EIR*, the Schiller Institute, and the Forum for Peace and Democracy, in Walluf, Germany on April 26-27, 1997. An extensive appendix details infrastructure projects which would spur the development of Africa.

\$100

148 pages Order# EIR 97-003


ORDER FROM:--

EIR News Service, Inc.

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

Or toll-free phone 1-888-EIR-3258

Order online at <http://www.larouchepub.com>



Seedstocks: Cartels Gain Control of Means of Life

The current drive by global “free market” cartels to control the means of life through control of patented seedstocks goes back some 40 years. So today’s promising biotechnology and genetic engineering breakthroughs are being nipped in the bud by the imperial cartels, as pliant regulators and lawmakers codify that control. The World Trade Organization was spawned out of the 1994 Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to act as enforcer. The WTO’s website boasts that it is “the only global international body dealing with the rules of trade between nations.”

The U.S. tradition, under natural law, has been to *not* patent plants or livestock. As part of that tradition, in the 1920s and 1930s, Henry A. Wallace, founder of Pioneer Hy Bred and FDR's first Secretary of Agriculture, for example, explicitly stated opposition to any form of patenting of seeds.

But in the post-war years, with the "free marketeers" chiseling away at the general welfare protections of the Roosevelt era, five conglomerates came to dominate world seedstocks: Cargill, Monsanto, Dow, Bayer, and Syngenta.

The first time any plants were given protection as intellectual property was under the 1930 Plant Patent Act (PPA). This act was designed to protect nurseries and breeders who produced mainly ornamental plants, such as asexually reproduced flowers, and some fruits. The Plant Patent Act did not offer the more strict protection of an industrial patent, but it did protect specific varieties that were created and claimed by the inventor, by restricting others from marketing his variety. The 1930 act specifically prohibited the patenting of any food crop plants, recognizing that these patents could threaten the food supply.

In 1970, the first version of the Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA) was introduced, which greatly expanded protection to all plants that were distinct and new. This was not a patent, but merely a certificate, which gave protection to specific varieties of crop seeds for the first time, for periods of up to 25 years. Under the PVPA of 1970, farmers and breeders could save and replant protected seed, resell it, and carry out research using it.

In 1980, the U.S. Supreme Court made a landmark decision in *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, ruling that living organisms could be patented. The decision allowed the patenting of genetically engineered microbes, which opened the door to the patenting of any life form.

In 1985, the U.S. Patent Office ruled that plants could now be protected under the powerful industrial patent. The industrial patent does not have any exemptions for farmers or for research, so any use of a patented plant or seed without specific license from the patent holder would be considered violation of the patent. This patent decision is the basis for the new weapon to control agricultural production and research that the cartels have pushed to the limit.

In 1994, the PVPA was amended in accordance with the regulations under the GATT. The changes to the act made it illegal for farmers to resell or exchange any seed of protected crops. The GATT agreement also forces the developing nations to recognize the patents and protections on plants and living organisms held by other GATT member countries. This allows the cartels to deny developing countries' farmers access to advanced biotechnology, and instead forces them to pay huge licensing fees to use any patented seeds.

Bangladesh

Millions Are in Fight for Food

by Ramtanu Maitra

On April 12, about 20,000 garment workers in Bangladesh's capital city of Dhaka, fought pitched battles with the police, protesting against the jacked-up price of rice that has led to starvation diets for millions. Three days later, at least 15,000 Bangladesh garment factory workers went on strike to call for higher wages, as food prices in the impoverished nation soared.

What is happening in this 145-million person nation in South Asia is perhaps the first phase of a world food crisis brought about by the irresponsible, if not downright genocidal, policies formulated through the World Trade Organization and that "mother of all economic miracles"—globalization.

The present Bangladesh food crisis was exacerbated by Cyclone Sidr, which swept across the country last December, destroying 418,000 hectares of the rice crop. Official estimates claim the cyclone destroyed as much as 800,000 metric tonnes of rice. This is on top of another 600,000 metric tonnes destroyed by the floods of last Summer's monsoon. The overall shortfall in food products caused by these two calamities was close to 3.0 million metric tonnes for the year.

Bangladesh was forced to cover the shortfall on the world market, buying most of it from the cartels at high prices. Because of the WTO regulations—which should be summarily set aside by the Bangladeshi authorities—these higher prices were passed on to the consumers. And because a very large section of Bangladeshi consumers is extremely poor, and cannot afford any amount of food price rise, a famine-like situation has developed in large parts of rural Bangladesh. The government is selling locally produced rice at a discount but cannot, under WTO rules, do the same with imported rice,

Make Bangladesh Food Secure

There cannot be any question that meeting the food requirements of the population must remain the key objective of the government. This is particularly important for Bangladesh, where natural disasters, like floods and cyclones, visit the country with unflinching regularity, destroying significant amounts of the crops every year.

Over the years, Bangladesh, once described as perpetually short of food, had succeeded in producing almost all the food it needs. This highly vulnerable South Asian country—a net

importer of wheat and some rice—last year produced 30.5 million tonnes of rice, more than half of it during the main Winter season harvest.

Farmers this season have tilled almost all their land to cultivate rice, in hopes of better prices, and to meet the shortfall caused by last Summer's floods and the devastating cyclone. The latest reports indicate that the farmers have succeeded in producing almost all the food that the nation will need. And the government has also begun buying rice from farmers to build a 1.5-million-tonne buffer stock to tackle future emergencies.

In addition, neighboring India has agreed to ship 400,000 tons of heavily discounted rice to Bangladesh, but it could take weeks for the rice to arrive, and officials are uncertain that it will be enough to meet the present crisis.

None of this may ease hunger or food riots, in the short term or in the long-term future, because the authorities in Dhaka have shown little understanding, or instinct, to push back the internationally generated wave of globalization and the diktats laid down by the WTO. Instead, they have adopted "practical economics" to virtually starve their own people and throw the nation into a state of chaos.

Garment Sweatshops: 'Practical Economics'

In this context, it is important to note that the rioters in Dhaka were the garment workers. In the wake of the 2001 global recession, when the wave of globalization reached almost every nook and cranny of the world, Bangladesh's leaders were goaded by the example of China's "economic miracle" and the country's own free-market economists: They opted for relying on foreign countries as a market for exports and as a source of remittances. International seminars were held, and thick papers were presented, pointing out that globalization and free trade have opened up a golden opportunity for Bangladesh's millions to earn foreign exchange reserves and stabilize the Bangladeshi currency, the taka. This was the "practical economics" which the Bangladeshi political leaders embraced with open arms.

What happened subsequently in Bangladesh is not altogether unlike what happened in India during the same period, although India is a nation with wide-ranging agro-industrial capabilities. In India, the selling items were Information Technology and pharmaceuticals. India had a small, but very well qualified group of professionals, who made these sectors successful and made a dent in the world market. But it did precious little for the hundreds of millions of Indians living in rural areas who were eagerly awaiting electrical power, water, transportation, communication networks, health care, and other aspects of the basic physical infrastructure necessary to utilize the productive power of labor.

In Bangladesh, even worse policies were adopted as "practical economics." A garment industry was set up primarily as sweatshops where thousands work to sew and finish tex-

tiles. The objective was to make money in the quota-free global trade regime. Export Promotion Zones (EPZs) were set up around Dhaka (where the trouble now brews), and a wage structure was set up which kept almost 2 million Bangladeshi workers on the verge of hunger and poverty. It was said then, and is still said even now, that this very low wage structure is necessary in order to keep the product price below that of the Chinese, to remain competitive.

The garment industry contributes 76% of the country's total export earnings. "While garment profits thrived on cheap labor at the best of times, cheap labor is now seen as the key to its survival," pointed out one Bangladeshi economic analyst.

Because the sweatshops were bringing in foreign exchange, Dhaka encouraged investors to set up more and more sweatshops. In return, the government guaranteed to keep the wage structure low enough to make the products "competitive" with similar products. From time to time, the garment workers rebelled, but the rebellions were quelled physically, as well as by promises of negotiations to implement a higher wage structure in the future. Investors made clear to the authorities in Dhaka that the proposed higher wage structure would result in the shutdown of many of the factories. "Profit these days rarely exceeds 3% of the yearly turnover," claimed a representative of the owners to the media.

The basic minimum monthly salary of a garment worker is only \$25, and a kilogram (2.2 pounds) of rice used to cost 35 taka (50 cents), normally enough to feed a family of four for a day, but not much more. However, prices for rice have doubled in Bangladesh in the past year. As a result, a majority of Bangladeshi households spend nearly 70% of their income on food, despite the government subsidies for locally produced rice.

Whither Agro-Industrial Infrastructure?

The practical economics implemented by the authorities in Dhaka not only led to starvation and the potential for uncontrollable chaos in the country; it did much worse. Bangladesh has to get out of being a nation where 60% of the workforce depends on agriculture and move to an agro-industrial nation. In order to do that, Dhaka will have to adopt real economics, and not practical economics.

The key to doing that is to make the nation a foolproof food-secure nation. To accomplish this, the powers-that-be will have to do what is necessary: develop the country's basic physical infrastructure. This includes self-sufficiency in power generation; an adequate agricultural and domestic water supply; water and rail-based transportation; education and health care for all; and communication access to the remotest corners of the nation. All these ingredients, done right, will lay a solid foundation for an agro-industrial nation.

Such a policy is a far cry from the rat-trap of the present

sweatshop-based foreign-exchange-earning policy, with its high cost of degradation of the human labor involved, including the threat of hunger and starvation. In order to get the ball rolling, Dhaka will have to buck the WTO and its diktats, and ignore the crocodile tears shed by the international promoters of the WTO, because of Bangladesh's burgeoning food crisis.

To begin with, on April 14, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon warned that a rapidly escalating global food crisis has reached emergency proportions and threatens to wipe out "seven years of progress in the fight against poverty." He called for short-term emergency measures in many regions to meet urgent food needs and avoid starvation, and for longer-term efforts to significantly increase production of food grains.

The rapidly escalating crisis of food availability around the world has reached "emergency proportions," Ban said. "The World Bank has estimated that the doubling of food prices over the last three years could push 100 million people in low income countries deeper into poverty."

Dismantle the WTO

A day before Ban's warning, World Bank President Robert Zoellick had appealed to governments to quickly provide the UN World Food Program with \$500 million in emergency aid by May 1. Zoellick also said that the international community has "to put our money where our mouth is," to deal with rapidly rising food prices that have caused hunger and deadly violence in several countries.

Dhaka, and other nations around the world, must realize that if Ban Ki-moon or Zoellick had really meant "to put our money where our mouth is," the first action they would take is to dismantle the WTO in its present form. Because they would not even dare to suggest such an anti-establishment action, their remarks are merely the shedding of crocodile tears. In other words, it would be wise to recognize that these tears are shed by a carnivore.

The WTO policy not only has forced nations to push sweatshops for foreign exchange instead of investment in food-security, but it has created the present situation where a starving nation cannot even find food in the world market to buy. As a result, the inadequate amount of existing food in the world market is now in the hands of the speculators, who are busy stuffing their pockets by starving millions.

The WTO is the single largest obstacle blocking nations from producing ample food for their citizens. It is responsible for the destruction of agriculture in many developing countries by ruling against government subsidies for "expensive" products. In short, the WTO is in the process of putting up food for worldwide auction—whoever can afford to buy it, should be the consumer.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was reincarnated as the WTO in 1995. GATT had stated flatly

in a 1984 document what the WTO powers-that-be still widely acknowledge, that "agriculture had become the most heavily protected and distorted sector in the world economy, with consequent substantial negative effects on international trade and particularly on those developing countries that are heavily reliant on agriculture for their economic development."

In essence, the WTO diktat states that producing food for millions of people in any country should be considered at par with making any widget or toy. By now, the authorities in Dhaka should realize that the survival of citizens and stability of any nation depend on easily available food to everyone. Food and physical security are the two bedrocks on which a nation is built. To keep a nation teetering on the verge of food insecurity, as the WTO demands, through its diktat for non-subsidized farming, is a recipe for disaster.

Gore Tells the Hungry, Let Them Eat Biofuels


by Cynthia R. Rush

There is a backlash growing around the world against British agent Al Gore's fascist dictate to starving nations: "Let them eat biofuels." As U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche has said, the combination of starvation, food shortages, and hyperinflation have become the single most important issue in the world today.

The people of Central America and the Caribbean are enraged at rising food prices and scarcity, a situation that Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega has termed "explosive." The Honduran government has just declared a national emergency to deal with the food crisis, and Guatemala is preparing to do the same. Tensions in Haiti, where food riots erupted recently, continue to run very high. At the just-concluded regional conference of the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Brasilia, one delegate after another got up to denounce the idea that Brazilian President Lula da Silva is insanely defending: that biofuels represent the answer to underdevelopment, poverty, and unemployment.

Echoing statements made by former Cuban President Fidel Castro last year, that the push for biofuels is the "internationalization of genocide," Cuban representative José Arsenio Quintero angrily told the FAO delegates that "it is *ethically unacceptable*, that areas of food production be converted to energy production."

Bolivia's delegate called for an immediate suspension of any new biofuels projects in the region, while insisting that food security must be the top priority of all nations. Numerous delegates warned that the political stability of their nations



“Gore-gantua” demands that people give up eating, while he gets fatter by the day, swallowing up the profits from his hedge-fund and grain cartel operations. Here, Daumier’s cartoon of the French King Louis-Philippe, as Rabelais’ Gargantua.

was at risk, and urged that financial resources be made available immediately to assist them in producing more basic grains to guarantee their food supply.

Biofuels, by Any Other Name

It is against this backdrop of hunger, poverty, and intense human suffering that Gore and his speculator friends are demanding that nations give up eating, give up reproducing themselves, and prepare to die. This is what he means by “saving the planet.”

He likes to coyly pretend, that biofuels aren’t his thing. When he attended the First Biofuels Congress of the Americas in Buenos Aires, Argentina in May of 2007, he piously warned about the “dangers” of biofuels, urging his audience of financiers and agri-business magnates to exercise great caution in producing them, lest they endanger valuable forests unnecessarily and further harm the environment. If not pursued carefully, he intoned, biofuels could also drive food prices up.

This was just Al Gordo’s usual flatulence speaking. As far back as December 1998, at the Third Annual Farm Journal Conference, then-Vice President Gore stated, “The more we can make this home-grown fuel [ethanol] a successful, widely used product, the better off our farmers and our government will be.”

Today, Jello-Head is in league with a network of hedge-fund managers, speculators, international grain cartels, and other species of financial predators who, like Gore, share the British financier oligarchy’s Malthusian worldview. Among them are mega-speculator George Soros, who’s pouring bil-

ions of dollars into Brazilian ethanol, and Royal Dutch Shell, which sponsored an April 15 conference on “Global Energy Challenges: Implications for the Americas,” on the potential for biofuel development in the Western Hemisphere.

This is the same crowd that fueled the growth of the global speculative derivatives bubble, and now that it’s evaporating, has focussed their greed on the international biofuels racket, to create an equally unstable biofuels bubble. No one should be fooled into thinking that what these vultures propose has anything remotely to do with a real concept of physical economy.

The rant that Fat Al gave at the 2007 Buenos Aires conference, when he said that population growth and economic development had “spoiled” nature in some South American countries, was music to the financiers’ ears. Reflecting the same racism he shows toward Africa, Gore cited the case of Bolivia, next to Haiti the poorest country in the hemisphere, with a largely indigenous population, as an example of “too much” development!

This is why he keeps getting regular invitations to be the star speaker at international biofuels conferences, such as the March 2007 World Biofuels Markets Congress in Brussels, the May 11, 2007 First Biofuels Congress of the Americas in Buenos Aires, and the conference in Santiago, Chile the same day, entitled “Global Warming and Climate Change: The Time To Act Is Now.” His own hedge fund, the London-based Generation Investment Management, has had no qualms about investing in one of Spain’s major biofuels companies, Abengoa.

Nazi Bedfellows

In Ibero-America, Gore's alliances tell a particularly sordid tale. On two occasions in 2007, he teamed up with banking and political interests linked to the Bush family, and to the late Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet, both to espouse his global warming fraud, and provide a platform for the financiers who are wittingly using biofuels and "defense of the environment" to impose the plantation and slave-labor economy their City of London masters demand.

Take the case of the Santiago, Chile conference. Gore's invitation to speak there came from multi-billionaire magnate Sebastián Piñera, the failed 2005 Presidential candidate, and the driving force behind the creation, in Chile, of the National Committee of Support for Al Gore's Candidacy for the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize. Sebastián, who with affiliated companies, paid a whopping \$200,000 to bring Gore to Chile, is the brother of fascist José Piñera, Pinochet's former Labor Minister, who, in 1981, privatized Chile's once excellent state-run social security system.

Sebastián Piñera poses as a touchy-feely humanist and environmentalist. But he owes his fortune and existence to the brutal free-market regime that Pinochet's University of Chicago-trained economists imposed on the country, after George Shultz and fascist banker Felix Rohatyn helped overthrow Salvador Allende in the bloody September 1973 coup.

The other sponsor of the conference was the right-wing daily *El Mercurio*, whose owners, the Edwards family, have served the British Empire dating back to the 19th Century. In 1973, editor Agustín Edwards was a leading organizer of the Pinochet coup.

Given these facts, LaRouche asked at the time, whether Gore weren't travelling to Chile to help Piñera overthrow President Michelle Bachelet. Piñera was leading a vicious campaign to force Bachelet out of office, putting himself forward as the man who could save Chile from the "chaos" he said she had created. What he meant by that, was that Bachelet's efforts—albeit timid ones—to move Chile away from the brutal economic model imposed by Pinochet's "Chicago Boys," and still largely intact today, would not be tolerated.

As LaRouche observed on April 9, 2007, "We have not yet gotten to the bottom of the Nazi connection behind the late dictator Pinochet from Chile. The Nazi is dead but Nazism is not. And we see this in the attacks coming from various quarters on President Bachelet, which are obviously coming from the undead fascists of the Nazi tradition of the late dictator Pinochet."

Bush's Gore

After his appearance in Santiago in May 2007, Gore flew to Buenos Aires, where he jumped into bed with the Inter-American Ethanol Commission (IEC), the entity founded in 2006 by former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, and the major

sponsor of the First Biofuels Congress of the Americas. The IEC is at the center of many of the ethanol ventures now being promoted around Ibero-America. An ardent defender himself of free trade, Gore embraces Jeb Bush's notion of using multinational ethanol deals to "energize" the debate on hemispheric free trade.

No matter that that debate is effectively dead. It makes a good talking point for the IEC, which argues that the continental "integration"—that is, elimination of sovereignty—that might have been achieved through the Bush Administration's failed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), is now possible through ethanol! The IEC is a key driver behind the newly launched "Bioenergy Alliance," whose members reportedly include "the leading ethanol producers of the Americas."

This apparatus, with heavy Brazilian input, is now embarking on a major biofuels offensive in Central America and the Caribbean, whose populations are starving. Thinking themselves very clever, these killers plan to use this impoverished region as the base from which to significantly increase, and then export, biofuels to the United States, to get around the United States' 54-cent-a-gallon tax on Brazilian ethanol. If exported to the U.S. from a nation such as Guatemala, which is particularly targeted, ethanol can enter the U.S. tariff-free, because of Guatemala's participation in the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI).

The Brazilian involvement with IEC and the Bush-Gore lovefest, is—tragically—lawful. In the speech he gave April 16 before the FAO conference in Brasilia, President Lula da Silva vowed that, despite world starvation, he intends to act as a spokesman for the British Empire's genocidal biofuels drive. He had the nerve to lie that "more people are eating better" in the world than ever before.

LaRouche responded that it is clinically insane for Lula to make this assertion, and warned that the Brazilian President could find himself in mortal danger from his own policy, if he continues to put himself forward as the British Empire's agent on this matter.

In his address, Lula insisted there is no relationship between biofuels production and food scarcity or high prices. Repeating the British free-trade mantra, he instead blamed today's food crisis on "distortions" in the market, protectionism and farm subsidies in the advanced sector, and high oil prices. His solution? Expand free trade by ramming through the Doha Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO)—whose free-trade policies created the crisis in the first place.

UN Special Reporter Jean Ziegler called biofuels a "crime against humanity." Lula insanely described them as an instrument of "social and economic transformation" in poor countries, generating jobs and income. "This is a project in which I deposit great hope," he said, especially for the future of poor African, Asian, Central American, and Caribbean nations.

Then and Now: British Imperial Policy Means Famine

by Paul Glumaz

The current outbreak of food shortages and famine internationally should come as no surprise to anyone who knows the history of British imperial free-trade policy. To buttress that point, we present here indictments of that policy by two leading statesmen with personal knowledge—Abraham Lincoln’s economic advisor Henry Carey, and the founder of modern China, Sun Yat-sen—in addition to this overview article, written in 1991, from the archives of the LaRouche movement.

Before Hitler, there was Britain, and the British famine policy in India.

As many look with horror at the starvation now being induced in Africa by agencies such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), and the grain cartels, few know that in a previous century the British pioneered all these techniques in India. What follows is a brief outline of the British famine policy in India from 1764 to 1914, and how the British developed the deliberate use of famine and food control as the principal means of rule.

To understand the question of famine in India, one must first start with the fact that India’s climate is characterized by the monsoon, in which a region’s weather follows the pattern of a dry climate for most of the year; then comes a period of rains, which is the monsoon. At least once in the course of a decade, the monsoon fails to arrive in any given region.

Traditional agriculture in India and other countries always planned for this by laying aside foodstocks at the village level, which ensured that there would be adequate food in drought years. The central administrative authority, whether it was a Hindu prince, or the Moghul court, would suspend taxes for that period of economic insecurity. Prior to British rule, it was

understood that famine needed to be avoided if the central authority was to have any legitimacy as the ruler of an area. The British changed all this.

As B.M. Bhatia writes in his 1967 book, *Famines in India*: “From about the beginning of the eleventh century to the end of the eighteenth there were 14 major famines in India.” This is roughly two per century. Under the period of East India Company rule from 1765-1858 there occurred 16 major famines, a rate eight times higher than what had been common before. Then, under the period of British Colonial Office rule from 1859 to 1914, there was a major famine in India an average of every two years, or 25 times the historical rate before British rule! The rest of the world’s population was growing due to technological progress, but the population of India remained at approximately 220 million for over a century prior to 1914.

Deliberately inducing a major famine more or less every two years, was, for over half a century, the backbone of British colonial policy in India.

The history of the British in India is a history of the deliberate creation of famines. Such famines resulted from the policies of the East India Company. Those policies included looting through “tax farming,” usury, and outright slavery of the indigenous population.

As we shall see, a limit to this rapine was reached in the middle of the 19th Century, leading to the first struggle for Indian independence, which began with the Sepoy Mutiny. Following that revolt, a new policy was developed by the British Colonial Office, which took over all the operations of the East India Company. The new policy revolved around creating famines in selected regions on a continuous basis, with the goal of creating a mass of starving people who could be used as slave labor, needed by the British to build the infrastructure of British rule.



Under the British East India Company (1765-1858), and after 1858, the British Empire, India was subjected to unimaginably cruel oppression, resulting in numerous—and needless—famines, in which millions upon millions died. Shown: From 1876 to 1878, seven million Indians died of starvation, as the British overlords exported food from the Subcontinent to feed the armies of the Empire.

East India Company Rule

The British East India Company began the administrative takeover of India in 1764-1765. The company was appointed *diwan*, or governor, over the area of Bengal by the collapsing Moghul Empire. The British entered India as the administrative rulers and tax collectors of the Moghul court.

As tax collectors, the previous supposedly “rapacious” Moghul agents, had collected the marketable equivalent of £818,000 sterling from the area of Bengal. In 1765-66, the first year of East India Company diwanship, the company was able to collect the equivalent of £1,470,000; and by 1790-1791, this figure had risen to £2,680,000. According to Jean Beauchamp’s *British Imperialism in India*, Warren Hastings, the company’s chief officer in India, wrote the following to the company’s board of directors in London:

“Not withstanding the loss of at least one-third of the inhabitants of the province, and consequent decrease in cultivation, net collections of the year 1771 exceeded those of 1768. . . . It was naturally to be expected that the diminution of the revenue should have kept an equal place with the other consequences of so great a calamity. That it did not was owing to its being violently kept up to its former standard.”

The great calamity mentioned was perhaps the worst famine in Indian history, which struck the provinces of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. It is estimated that no fewer than 10 million perished from starvation. The severity of this famine was a direct result of East India Company looting.

Tax Farming

What the Company had done to increase the tax revenue was to set up a system of “outsourcing” the right to tax the

land. This is what is known as “tax farming.” The tax collector had the right to obtain as much tax as he could get, since he had bought these rights at auction. In turn, the one who was taxed, the registered landholder, called *zamindari*, was allowed to extract whatever he could for himself and for the tax collector from the poor peasant who worked the land.

The *zamindari*, who was subject only to the payment of the company’s taxes, essentially had complete power over all the land and all its cultivators.

Through this looting system, the Company left nothing in reserve for the times when the monsoons would fail. In addition, little or no maintenance was allowed for the cultivators’ infrastructure, such as the irrigation works.

The results were horrendous, as more of India’s land area came under Company rule.

The drain of wealth from India based on a tax-farming system, the destruction of native textile industry by the “free market” dumping of British textiles, and the plantation economy of opium, led eventually to a fierce resistance from the communal based population.

This finally led to the Sepoy Mutiny of the *zamindaris* and others, especially those who lived in areas not totally under Company control. It almost broke the British Empire.

In the end, the East India Company was relieved of its rule in India and was replaced by a governor-general, and a colonial administration. The commission which recommended this change concluded that the problem was the lack of a transportation and communications infrastructure, necessary to hold subject such a vast country. Also, the commissioners concluded, there was a need for an Indian ruling class that would function as intermediaries for the British colonialists.¹

Slave Labor Policy

Britain’s colonial overseers agreed on the need for the development of a rudimentary infrastructure to increase the efficiency of their rule, and looting of India. But the Empire had a problem. The proposed grid of railroads and large-scale irrigation works was too expensive, from the colonialists’ point of view. So, the decision was made to force the already plundered Indian population to pay for these development projects.

This presented another serious problem. India, at that time, did not have a landless laboring class which could provide a pool of cheap labor for such projects. The caste system of India was all-encompassing. As Bhitia documents, the ritu-

1. See Eric Stoakes, “Traditional Elites in the Great Rebellion of 1857,” and “Some Aspects of Revolt in Uper Doab,” in E.R. Leach’s *Elites in South Asia*.

al distribution of goods at the communal level, based on caste and guild relations, made it undesirable for families and individuals to leave this system, especially to become slaves for the British railroad and irrigation projects.

The British solution to this problem was “famine relief.” To build the railroads, the British set up “famine relief works.” A famine would create the condition, such that, faced with certain death from lack of food, an Indian would be forced to “choose” to go to a famine relief center, much like a starving famine victim in Africa would do today. However, once having done this, the individual lost his caste relations and privileges. Then he was told that if he wanted to continue to eat, he

must work, building the railroad in exchange for food.

At these projects, less than minimum subsistence was the norm, much like a Nazi forced-labor concentration camp. As yesterday’s famine victims dropped dead from exhaustion and slow starvation on the railroad or irrigation project, today’s famine refugees were making their way into this so-called famine relief system. This system would today be labeled euphemistically, the “recycling” of the work force.

With the advent of railways, it became easier for traders to buy up food and other goods when they were cheap, and in some cases, even when costly, and export them to England—much in the same manner as the British let the Irish starve dur-

China’s Sun Yat-sen on British Imperial Tyranny

In his book *The Vital Problem of China*, written in 1917, as a polemic against China joining the British (and the United States) in the Great War (World War I) against Germany, modern China’s Founding Father Sun Yat-sen (1866-1925) writes that Germany stands accused of mistreating Belgium and Luxembourg. But, he notes:

“Every year, England takes large quantities of foodstuffs for her own consumption from India, where in the last ten years, 19 million people have died of starvation. It must not be imagined for a moment that India is suffering from underproduction. The fact is that what India has produced for herself has been wrested away by England. . . . Is that any better than submarine warfare? . . . Nominally, of course, the British are not plundering, but in fact the exorbitant taxation and tyrannical rule in India are such as to make it impossible for the natives to maintain their livelihood; it is nothing but plunder on a grand scale.”

Sun says that England accuses Germany of asserting that “Might makes right,” but asks: “Is it right for England to rob China of Hong Kong and Burma, to force our people to buy and smoke opium, and to mark out portions of Chinese territory as her sphere of influence? [Sun notes that England has declared as its “sphere of influence” within China, all of Tibet, Sichuan, and the Yangtse Valley—28% of China’s land area.] If one really wants to champion the



Library of Congress


cause of justice today, one should first declare war on England, France and Russia, not Germany and Austria. . . . But China does not want to declare any war.”

Sun reports that the British waged war against France in the late 18th Century, “not because England wanted to redress any possible wrongs suffered,” but purely a policy of “rallying the weaker countries to crush the strongest, . . . simply because France in the reigns of Louis XIV and Louis XV was the strongest country in Europe. . . . In order to maintain her own interests, England cannot allow any country on the European Continent to grow too strong, and when any other country grows too strong, she must get all other countries to join her in overthrowing that country.”

“When another country is strong enough to be utilized, Britain sacrifices her own allies to satisfy its desires, but when that country becomes too weak to be of any use to herself, she sacrifices it to please other countries.”

Britain’s relation to its friends, wrote Sun, is like a farmer to a silkworm: “After all the silk had been drawn from the cocoons, they are destroyed by fire, or used as fishfood.”

With this sense of the evil imperial character of the British, Sun forecast, correctly, that, were China to join the war on the side of the Allies, then “whether the Allies will win or not, China will be Britain’s victim.” In fact, at the Versailles Conference after World War I, Britain divided up China as spoils for those nations which had joined them in the war on Germany. He added: “It is lamentable that the would-be victims should be so willing to place themselves at the disposal of Britain and allow themselves to be tortured and mangled.”—*Michael Billington*



The first struggle for Indian independence began with the Sepoy Mutiny in May 1857. Following that revolt, a new policy was developed by the British Colonial Office; it began creating famines in selected regions, with the goal of creating a mass of starving people who could be used as slave labor. Here, British troops looting in Lucknow, after the rebellion.

ing the potato famine, rather than allow the wheat, barley, and rye grown in Ireland for England to be used to feed the Irish.

Under these conditions, the nature of famines and scarcities began to change. Whereas in the past, famine had been a regional phenomenon, under this British policy food became scarce throughout the country, hitting the poorest in a devastating manner. It was these famine-stricken poor who then continued to supply the labor for the relief-works.

The Rise of Usury

The development of the railroads also helped to develop a class of Indian money-lenders, who became the intermediaries for the British. This allowed for the British to control even areas which were not affected by crop failures.

Such areas were hit with multiple increases in prices because of the demand placed on their food from other areas of the country. Money-lenders would then sell British goods to Indians at inflated prices, and buy their grain at low prices. Then they would sell that grain at high prices, either on the international market, or back to the same people in times of famine.

Since these transactions were carried out largely on a credit basis, vast segments of the population became debt slaves to the money-lenders, if they were fortunate enough to escape having to work on famine relief projects. In addition, the British played this system of debt-slavery off against the traditional caste and guild system, which had never had to deal with such a monstrosity.

This system brought to the fore a class of money-lenders who became the power through which the British were able to

offset, in part, the resistance within India to their rule coming from the communal base.

The spread of famine throughout India can be measured in the expansion of the railroad system. There were 288 miles of rail in India in 1857; 1,599 miles in 1861; and 3,373 miles in 1865. By 1881, there were 9,891 miles; there were 19,555 miles by 1895; and 34,656 miles by 1914.

With the expansion of the railroads, and “famine relief” which built the railroads, the exports of food grains rose rapidly. The export of rice grew from 12,697,983 hundred-weight in 1867-68, to 18,428,625 hundred-weight in 1877-78. Wheat exports grew 22-fold during this same period, from 299,385 hundred-weight to 6,373,168 hundred-weight. The criminal nature of this policy is clearly seen, since 1876-78 were major famine years. The export of rice reached 30.3 million hundred-weight, and wheat reached 30.3 million hundred-weight in 1891-92.

The worst famine was in 1896-97, which affected 62.4 million people. This resulted,

among other things, according to Bhatia, in “civil commotion and unrest in Bombay against continuing exports of food grains from the presidency at a time when the people faced the threat of famine. The government of India, however, refused to change its food policy and steadfastly clung to the view so far held that, ‘even in the worst conceivable emergency, so long as trade is free to follow its normal course, we should do far more harm than good by attempting to interfere...’”

Does this sound all too familiar? The [George H.W.] Bush Administration has proclaimed a New World Order based on “free trade” and an end to the “restrictions” imposed by national sovereignty. As food and other basic resources increasingly come under the control of Euro-Anglo-American cartels, most of the world is slated to become much like India was under the British.

Bush’s New World Order is in fact nothing new, and the principal instrument of rule in this new world order is scheduled to be famine, and “famine relief” projects for the victims.

If people don’t wake up, a day will come when you may lose your cherished low-paying job, and find yourself homeless and on the soup line—only you will be told there’s no slop to eat, unless you join a work gang.

Slave labor, famine, and government-protected drug lords, like the British East India Company, are to be your masters in this New World Order. It has been done before!

Now maybe you will think twice when you view the British Broadcasting Corporation’s films of the “glorious days of the British Raj in India” which you see on PBS. British policy in India was nothing less than deliberate genocide. We face the same policy today, this time on a global scale.

The British in India: Slavery and Famine


Here are excerpts from Henry C. Carey, The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign: Why It Exists, and How It May Be Extinguished (1853), Chapter XII, "How Slavery Grows in India."

...Nearly a century has now elapsed since, by the battle of Plassey, British power was established in India, and from that day local action has tended to disappear, and centralization to take its place. From its date to the close of the century there was a rapidly increasing tendency toward having all the affairs of the princes and the people settled by the representatives of the company established in Calcutta, and as usual in such cases, the country was filled with adventurers, very many of whom were wholly without principle, men whose sole object was that of the accumulation of fortune by any means, however foul, as is well known by all who are familiar with the indignant denunciations of Burke.¹ England was thus enriched as India was impoverished, and as centralization was more and more established.

Step by step the power of the [British East India] Company was extended, and everywhere was adopted the hindoo principle that the sovereign was proprietor of the soil, and sole landlord, and as such the government claimed to be entitled to one-half of the gross produce of the land. "Wherever," says Mr. Rickards, long an eminent servant of the Company,

"The British power supplanted that of the Mohammedans in Bengal, we did not, it is true, adopt the sanguinary part of their creed; but from the impure fountain of their financial system, did we, to our shame, claim the inheritance to a right to seize upon half the gross produce of the land as a tax; and wherever our arms have triumphed, we have invariably proclaimed

1. "The country was laid waste with fire and sword, and that land distinguished above most others by the cheerful face of fraternal government and protected labour, the chosen seat of cultivation and plenty, is now almost throughout a dreary desert covered with rushes and briars, and jungles full of wild beasts. . . . That universal, systematic breach of treaties, which had made the British faith proverbial in the East! These intended rebellions are one of the Company's standing resources. When money has been thought to be hoarded up anywhere, its owners are universally accused of rebellion, until they are acquitted of their money and their treasons at once! The money once taken, all accusation, trial, and punishment ends."—Speech on *Fox's East India Bill*.




Library of Congress

Henry Carey, the chief economic advisor to Abraham Lincoln, was the leading proponent of the American System of political-economy, and enemy of the anti-human British system.

this savage right: coupling it at the same time with the senseless doctrine of the proprietary right to these lands being also vested in the sovereign, in virtue of the right of conquest." —*Rickards' India*, vol. i, 275.

Under the earlier Mohammedan sovereigns, this land-tax, now designated as rent, had been limited to a thirteenth, and from that to a sixth of the produce of the land; but in the reign of Akber (16th century) it was fixed at one-third, numerous other taxes being at the same time abolished. With the decline and gradual dissolution of the empire, the local sovereigns not only increased it but revived the taxes that had been discontinued, and instituted others of a most oppressive kind; all of which were continued by the Company, while the land-tax was maintained at its largest amount. While thus imposing taxes at discretion, the Company had also a monopoly of trade, and it could dictate the prices of all it had to sell, as well as of all that it needed to buy; and here was a further and most oppressive tax, all of which was for the benefit of absentee landlords.

With the further extension of power, the demands on the Company's treasury increased without an increase of the power to meet them; for exhaustion is a natural consequence of absenteeism, or centralization, as has so well been proved in Ireland. The people became less able to pay the taxes, and



Under British rule, Indian cultivators were forced to produce for export, and heavily taxed, while denied necessary infrastructure, like roads, to move their products to market. As one observer noted, "In this predicament, the cargo of cotton lies sometimes for weeks on the ground, and the merchant is ruined." Shown: Indian and European merchants trade at the Bombay cotton market, ca. 1870.

as the government could not be carried on without revenue, a permanent settlement was made by Lord Cornwallis, by means of which all the rights of village proprietors, over a large portion of Bengal, were sacrificed in favour of the Zemindars, who were thus at once constituted great landed proprietors and absolute masters of a host of poor tenants, with power to punish at discretion those who were so unfortunate as not to be able to pay a rent, the amount of which had no limit but that of the power to extort it. It was the middleman system of Ireland transplanted to India; but the results were it first unfavourable to the Zemindars, as the rents, for which they themselves were responsible to the government, were so enormous that all the rack-renting and all the flogging inflicted upon the poor cultivators could not enable them to pay; and but few years elapsed before the Zemindars themselves were sold out to make way for another set as keen and as hard-hearted as themselves. That system having failed to answer the purpose, it was next determined to arrest the extension of the permanent settlement, and to settle with each little ryot, or cultivator, to the entire exclusion of the village authorities by whom, under the native governments, the taxes had uniformly been so equitably said satisfactorily distributed. The Ryotwar system was thus established, and how it has operated may be judged from the following sketch, presented by Mr. Fullerton, a member of the Council at Madras:—

“Imagine the revenue leviable through the agency of one hundred thousand revenue officers, collected or

remitted at their discretion, according to the occupant’s means of paying, whether from the produce of his land or his separate property; and in order to encourage every man to act as a spy on his neighbour, and report his means of paying, that he may eventually save himself from extra demand, imagine all the cultivators of a village liable at all times to a separate demand, in order to make up for the failure of one or more individuals of the parish. Imagine collectors to every county, acting under the orders of a board, on the avowed principle of destroying all competition for labour by a general equalization of assessment, seizing and sending back runaways to each other. And, lastly, imagine the collector the sole magistrate or justice of the peace of the county, through the medium and instrumentality of whom alone any criminal complaint of personal grievance suffered by the subject can reach the superior courts. Imagine, at the

same time, every subordinate officer employed in the collection of the land revenue to be a police officer, vested with the power to fine, confine, put in the stocks, and flog any inhabitant within his range, on any charge, without oath of the accuser or sworn recorded evidence of the case.”²

Any improvement in cultivation produced an immediate increase of taxation, so that any exertion on the part of the cultivator would benefit the Company, and not himself. One-half of the gross produce may be assumed to have been the average annual rent, although in many cases it greatly exceeded that proportion. The Madras Revenue Board, May 17th, 1817, stated that the “conversion of the government share of the produce (of lands) is in some districts as high as 60 or 70 per cent. of the whole...”³

The tendency thus far has been, as we see, to sweep away the rights not only of kings and princes, but of all the native authorities, and to centralize in the hands of foreigners in Calcutta the power to determine for the cultivator, the artisan, or the labourer, what work he should do, and how much of its products he might retain, thus placing the latter in precisely the position of a mere slave to people who could feel no interest in him but simply as a tax-payer, and who were represent-

2. Quoted in Thompson’s Lectures on India, 61.

3. Rickards’ *India*, vol. i, 275.

ed by strangers in the country, whose authority was everywhere used by the native officers in their employ, to enable them to accumulate fortunes for themselves....


[Further on, Carey shows that the cotton, and other agricultural products, that Indian farmers are forced to produce for export, to pay the ever-increasing taxes, are often left to rot on the ground, rather than reaching markets:]

“In this predicament the cargo of cotton lies sometimes for weeks on the ground, and the merchant is ruined.”

“So miserably bad,” says another writer, “are the existing means of communication with the interior, that many of the most valuable articles of produce are, for want of carriage and a market, often allowed to perish on the farm, while the cost of that which found its way to the port was enormously enhanced; but the quantity did not amount to above 20 per cent. of the whole of the produce, the remainder of the articles always being greatly deteriorated.”

It will scarcely be difficult now to understand why it is that cotton yields the cultivator but a penny per pound. Neither will it be difficult, seeing that the local manufacturers have everywhere been ruined, to understand why the producer of the more bulky food is in a condition that is even worse, now that the consumer has disappeared from his side. If the crop is large, grain is a drug for which scarcely any price can be obtained; and if it is small, the people perish, by thousands and ten of thousands, of famine, because, in the existing state of the roads, there can be little or no exchange of raw products. In the first case the cultivator is ruined, because it requires almost the whole crop to pay the taxes. In the other he is starved; and all this is a necessary consequence of a system that excludes the great middle class of mechanics and other working-men, and resolves a great nation into a mass of wretched cultivators, slaves to a few grasping money lenders. Under such circumstances, the accumulation of any thing like capital is impossible. “None,” says Colonel Sleeman, “have stock equal to half their rent.” They are dependent everywhere on the produce of the year, and however small may be its amount, the taxes must be paid, and of all that thus goes abroad nothing is returned. The soil gets nothing. It is not manured, nor can it be under a system of absenteeism like this, and its fertility everywhere declines....

The soil is being exhausted, and every thing necessarily goes backward. Trees are cut down, but none are planted; and



The British deliberately caused famines in India, in order to force the indigenous population into relief works, such as road-building. The tenant-laborer, writes Carey, “is mercilessly turned from his land and his mud hut, and left to die on the highway.” Here, Indians on their way to the relief works, published in the London News, 1874.

the former sites of vast groves are becoming arid wastes, a consequence of which is, that droughts become from year to year more frequent....

In former times extensive works were constructed for irrigating the land, but they are everywhere going to ruin—thus proving that agriculture cannot flourish in the absence of the mechanic arts:

“In Cavendish, very many bunds [river-banks formed for purposes of irrigation] which were kept in repair under former governments, have, under ours, fallen to decay; nevertheless, not only has the population increased considerably under our rule, but in 1846 or 1847, the collector was obliged to grant remission of land tax, because the abundance of former years lay, stagnating in the province, and the low prices of grain from that cause prevented the ryots from being able to pay their fixed land assessment”⁴

We have here land abandoned and the cultivator ruined for want of a market for food, and wages falling for want of a market for labour; and yet these poor people are paying for English food and English labour employed in converting into cloth the cotton produced alongside of the food—and they are ruined because they have so many middlemen to pay that the producer of cotton can obtain little food, and the producer of food can scarcely pay his taxes, and has nothing to give for cloth. Every thing tends, therefore, toward barbarism, and, as in the olden time of England and of Europe generally, famines

4. Chapman’s *Commerce and Cotton of India*, 97.

become steadily more numerous and more severe, as is here shown:—

“Some of the finest tracts of land have been forsaken, and given up to the untamed beasts of the jungle. The motives to industry have been destroyed. The soil seems to lie under a curse. Instead of yielding abundance for the wants of its own population, and the inhabitants of other regions, it does not keep in existence its own children. It becomes the burying-place of millions, who die upon its bosom crying for bread. In proof of this, turn your eyes backward upon the scenes of the past year. Go with me into the north-western provinces of the Bengal presidency, and I will show you the bleaching skeletons of five hundred thousand human beings, who perished of hunger in the space of a few short months. Yes, died of hunger in what has been justly called the granary of the world. Bear with me, if I speak of the scenes which were exhibited during the prevalence of this famine. The air for miles was poisoned by the effluvia emitted from the putrefying bodies



Queen Victoria, Empress of India, ruled over a people broken by poverty, inhumane treatment, famines, and despair. As one British author wrote: “And this occurred in British India—in the reign of Victoria the First. Nor was the event extraordinary and unforeseen. Far from it: 1835-36 witnessed a famine in the northern provinces; 1833 beheld one to the eastward; 1822-23 saw one in the Deccan. They have continued to increase in frequency and extent under our sway for more than half a century.”

of the dead. The rivers were choked with the corpses thrown into their channels. Mothers cast their little ones beneath the rolling waves, because they would not see them draw their last gasp and feel them stiffen in their arms. The English in the city were prevented from taking their customary evening drives. Jackalls and vultures approached, and fastened upon the bodies of men, women, and children, before life was extinct. Madness, disease, despair stalked abroad, and no human power present to arrest their progress. *It was the carnival of death!* And this occurred in British India—in the reign of Victoria the First! Nor was the event extraordinary and unforeseen. Far from it: 1835-36 witnessed a famine in the northern provinces; 1833 beheld one to the eastward;

1822-23 saw one in the Deccan. They have continued to increase in frequency and extent under our sway for more than half a century.”⁵

The famine of 1838 is thus described by Mr. George Thompson, late M.P., on the testimony of a gentleman of high respectability:

“The poorer houses were entirely unroofed, the thatches having been given to feed the cattle, which had nevertheless died; so that cattle had disappeared altogether from the land. He says that a few attenuated beings, more like skeletons than human creatures, were seen hovering about among the graves of those who had been snatched away by the famine; that desertion was everywhere visible, and that the silence of death reigned. In one of the villages, he says, an old man from whom they had bought a goat during their former visit, in 1833, was the only survivor of the whole community except his brother’s son, whom he was cherishing and endeavouring to keep alive, and these two had subsisted altogether upon the eleemos-

ynary bounty of travellers. The courier of Lord Auckland had informed this gentleman that when the governor-general passed through that part of the country the roads were lined on either side with heaps of dead bodies, and that they had not unfrequently to remove those masses of unburied human beings, ere the governor-general could proceed onward with his suite; and that every day from 2000 to 3000 famishing wretches surrounded and followed the carriages, to whom he dealt out a scanty meal; and on one occasion the horse of the courier took fright, and on the cause being ascertained—what was it? It was found to be the lifeless body of a man who had died with his

5. Thompson’s Lectures on India, 57

hand in his mouth, from which he had already devoured the fingers.”⁶

The more severe the pressure on the poor ryot, the greater is the power of the few who are always ready to profit by the losses of their neighbours. These poor people are obliged to borrow money on their growing crops, the prices of which are regulated by the will of the lender rather than by the standard of the market, and the rate of interest which the cultivators pay for these loans is often not less than 40 or 50 per cent.

A recent traveller says of the unfortunate cultivator—

“Always oppressed, ever in poverty, the ryot is compelled to seek the aid of the mahajun, or native money-lender. This will frequently be the talukdhar, or sub-renter, who exacts from the needy borrower whatever interest he thinks the unfortunate may be able to pay him, often at the rate of one per cent. per week. The accounts of these loans are kept by the mahajuns, who, aware of the deep ignorance of their clients, falsify their books, without fear of detection. In this way, no matter how favourable the season, how large the crop, the grasping mahajun is sure to make it appear that the whole is due to him; for he takes it at his own value. So far from Mr. Burke having overstated the case of the oppression of the ryots, on the trial of Warren Hastings, when he said that the tax-gatherer took from them eighteen shillings in every pound, he was really within the mark. At the conclusion of each crop-time, the grower of rice or cotton is made to appear a debtor to his superior, who thereupon—provided the ryot appears able to toil on for another season—advances more seed for sowing, and a little more rice to keep the labourer and his family from absolute starvation. But should there be any doubt as to the health and strength of the tenant-labourer, he is mercilessly turned from his land and his mud hut, and left to die on the highway.”

This is slavery, and under such a system how could the wretched people be other than slaves? The men have no market for their labour, and the women and children must remain idle or work in the field, as did, and do, the women of Jamaica; and all because they are compelled everywhere to exhaust the soil in raising crops to be sent to a distance to be consumed, and finally to abandon the land, even where they do not perish of famine. Mr. Chapman in forms us that—

“Even in the valley of the Ganges, where the population is in some districts from 600 to 800 to the square mile, one-third of the cultivable lands are not culti-

vated; and in the Deccan, from which we must chiefly look for increased supplies of cotton, the population, amounting to about 100 to the square mile, is maintained by light crops, grown on little more than half the cultivable land.”⁷

Elsewhere he tells us that of the *cultivable surface of all India one-half is waste*.⁸

...It could not be too universally known,” said Mr. Bright in the House of Commons,

“That the cultivators of the soil were in a very unsatisfactory condition; that they were, in truth, in a condition of extreme and almost universal poverty. All testimony concurred upon that point. He would call the attention of the house to the statement of a celebrated native of India, the Rajah Rammohun Roy, who about twenty years ago published a pamphlet in London, in which he pointed out the ruinous effects of the zemindary system, and the oppression experienced by the ryots in the presidencies both of Bombay and Madras. After describing the state of matters generally, he added, ‘Such was the melancholy condition of the agricultural labourers, that it always gave him the greatest pain to allude to it.’ Three years afterward, Mr. Shore, who was a judge in India, published a work which was considered as a standard work till now, and he stated that ‘the British Government was not regarded in a favourable light by the native population of India,’—that a system of taxation and extortion was carried on ‘unparalleled in the annals of any country.’ Then they had the authority of an American planter, Mr. Finnie, who was in India in 1840, and who spoke of the deplorable condition of the cultivators of the soil, and stated that if the Americans were similarly treated, they would become as little progressive as the native Indians. He might next quote the accounts given by Mr. Marriott in 1838, a gentleman who was for thirty years engaged in the collection of the revenue in India, and who stated that ‘the condition of the cultivators was greatly depressed, and that he believed it was still declining!’ There was the evidence of a native of India to which he might refer on this subject. It was that of a gentleman, a native of Delhi, who was in England in the year 1849, and he could appeal to the right hon. baronet the member for Tamworth in favour of the credibility of that gentleman. He never met with a man of a more dignified character, or one apparently of greater intelligence, and there were few who spoke the

7. Chapman, 22.

8. Ibid, 25.

6. Ibid. 185.



Library of Congress

During the terrible famine of 1838, according to one reporter, millions of pounds of rice and other edible grains were exported from Calcutta, to feed the kidnapped Indian Coolies, who had been sent to the Mauritius, to work in the fields. Here, Coolie children pick tea in Ceylon (Sri Lanka).

English language with greater purity and perfection. That gentleman had written a pamphlet, in which he stated that throughout his whole line of march from Bombay he found the Nizam's territories better cultivated, and the ryots in a better state of circumstances, than were the Company's territories, or the people residing within them, who were plunged in a state of the greatest poverty; and he concluded his short, but comparatively full, notice of the present deplorable state of India, by observing that he feared this was but the prelude of many more such descriptions of the different portions of the Company's dominions which would be put forth before the subject would attract the notice of those whose duty it was to remove the evils that existed."

We have here confirmation of the correctness of the views of Colonel Sleeman, that the condition of the people under the local governments is better than under the great central government. Heavily as they are taxed, a small part only of the

proceeds of taxes goes, in these cases, to Calcutta on its way to England, whereas, of the enormous salaries paid to English governors and judges, nearly the whole must go abroad, as no one consents to serve for a few years in India, except on such terms as will enable him to accumulate a fortune and return home to spend it. In further confirmation of this we have the facts so fully given in Mr. Campbell's recent work, (*Modern India*, chap. xi.,) and proving that security of person and property increases as we pass from the old possessions of the Company, and toward the newly acquired ones. Crime of every kind, gang robbery, perjury, and forgery, abound in Bengal and Madras, and the poverty of the cultivator is so great that the revenue is there the least, and is collected with the greatest difficulty—and there, too, it is that the power of association has been most effectually destroyed....

[In 1838,] there was a dreadful famine in India; but, "during the prevalence of this famine," as we are told,—

"Rice was going every hour out of the country. 230,371 bags of 164 pounds each—making 37,780,844 lbs.—were exported from Calcutta. Where? To the Mauritius, to feed the kidnapped Coolies. Yes: to feed

the men who had been stolen from the banks of the Ganges and the hills adjacent, and dragged from their native shore, under pretence of going to one of the Company's villages, to grow in the island of Mauritius what they might have grown in abundance upon their own fertile, but over-taxed land. The total amount of rice exported from Calcutta, during the famine in 1838, was 151,923,696 lbs., besides 13,722,408 lbs. of other edible grains, which would have fed and kept alive all those who perished that year. Wives might have been saved to their husbands, babes to their mothers, friends to their friends; villages might still have been peopled; a sterile land might have been restored to verdure. Freshness and joy and the voices of gladness might have been there. Now, all is stillness, and desolation, and death. Yet we are told we have nothing to do with India."⁹

9. Thompson's, 187.

Behind the Keystone Cops Lies Fascism

by John Hoefle

It was a bit of a wild week, beginning with the weekend meetings of the G-7 finance ministers and central bankers, and the associated Spring meetings of the IMF and World Bank, and ending with the announcements of billions more in losses by major U.S. financial institutions. The G-7 issued its usual bland communiqué saying nothing of relevance, while the IMF and World Bank hinted at deeper problems but did nothing. That is to be expected, since these public meetings are essentially dog-and-pony shows, designed to calm the markets and the public. The real action, as always, was behind the scenes.

The bankers, emboldened at seemingly having survived the first quarter, have begun posturing to the effect that, to quote Lehman Brothers CEO Richard Fuld, “the worst is behind us.” Such comments are intended, in part, to soothe the public and the markets, in the hope that the suckers can be lured into buying again, so the banks can unload more of their worthless paper on their customers. Considering what these CEOs know about the holes in their own balance sheets, it is fraud of the first order. Fraud, however, is but a small part of the problem.

The bigger problem, as we have often emphasized, is that the financial crisis is but one aspect of a much larger crisis: the breakdown of civilization itself, as reflected in the assault by the oligarchic forces which control the British Empire on the nation-states, and what little remains of national sovereignty in the world. The so-called financial crisis does not exist as a separate issue, because the system has died; it is being kept “alive” in a zombie-like state by a combination of trillions of taxpayer dollars and an accounting system designed to hide the losses.

Behind the Keystone Cops-like layer of incompetent bumbling by the bankers and their “regulators,” lies a very nasty plan. Take the soaring price of food and oil, the food riots, the global warming hoax, the wars breaking out across the planet, the battle over natural resources, the vapidness of the

Presidential campaigns, and put it all together; what you get is an assault on civilization itself by something very old and ugly, the imperial model trying to reassert its supremacy.

Studies, and Lies

The predictable response to any major disaster is for some august group to announce a study of the problem. There have been a flurry of studies of the financial crisis announced so far, among them Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson’s blueprint for regulatory reform; the Financial Stability Forum’s recommendations and options papers; Gerald Corrigan’s counterparty risk management study; and one by the Institute for International Finance, to name but a few. In general, these studies purport to examine the current “subprime crisis/credit crunch” problems with an eye toward heading off the next crisis. Implicit in that, of course, is the assumption that the financial system will recover, an assumption that the bankers would dearly love the public to believe, and would love to believe themselves.

The bankers’ public statements reflect this optimistic lie. Lehman’s Fuld, quoted above, is one example. J.P. Morgan Chase CEO Jamie Dimon claims that the crisis is “maybe 75% to 80% over”; Morgan Stanley CEO John Mack says the turmoil will last “a couple of quarters” longer; and Goldman Sachs CEO Lloyd Blankfein says, “We’re closer to the end than the beginning.”

These statements can be taken more than one way, though, and you can bet that the real subject of many of these studies is actually how to manage the death of the financial system and control the transition to the global corporatism of the new order. Paulson’s blueprint, for example, would impose the British model of (de)regulation, while the Financial Stability Forum and the IMF have called for governments to bail out the banks at taxpayer expense.

The New Poodle

Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair was known as “Bush’s poodle,” whereas it was Blair who was really manipulating the gullible George Bush, in much the same way Margaret Thatcher had manipulated his father. Now we have a new poodle in Prime Minister Gordon Brown, deployed to the United States to hook the dumb Americans into yet another British trap. In a three-day visit, Brown met with Bush, the leading Presidential contenders, Fed chairman Ben Bernanke, and a group of prominent Wall Street financiers.

Brown’s April 16 meeting with some two dozen bankers in New York followed a meeting the previous day with bankers in London, amidst reports that the Bank of England was planning some sort of bailout of the U.K. mortgage market. Depending upon which report you read, the Bank of England is either planning on buying up British mortgage-related securities with government money, or planning to take in such securities as collateral for loans, much as the Fed is already doing. Given the level of duplicity in such matters, we place little credence in the details, but Brown’s trip would appear to be a significant escalation of the British drive to lure the U.S. Government into a suicidal attempt to bail out the banks through government purchases of securities related to U.S. mortgages and other debt.

Like Enron

The way in which the bankers are handling this affair is reminiscent of the way in which they handled the demise of Enron. Enron, as the reader may remember, was rather suddenly discovered in 2001 to have significant problems which “nobody saw coming.” Enron was a “black box” whose inner workings were hidden from all, which suddenly blew up, due to corruption by insiders. That was all a lie, however, and the “discovery” of Enron’s problems was actually the beginning of a well-crafted takedown of a company which had already died. It is worth noting, for those who believe that the banks are still solvent, that Enron was number seven, ranked by revenue, among U.S. corporations in 2000, and rose to fifth in 2001, despite its demise, and was widely considered as being among the best managed of American companies.

The takedown of Enron began with the *Wall Street Journal*, which identified several off-balance-sheet vehicles run by Enron chief financial officer Andy Fastow and others as



IMF photo
British Prime Minister Gordon Brown has been deployed by London to hook the dumb Americans into the British trap.

mechanisms by which the company was looted. The *Journal* and other press hammered away at this, establishing from the beginning who was to blame—a key part of any cover-up. An Enron investigation of these charges was initiated, led by a long-time board member and Lazard banker, which established that Fastow and company were indeed to blame; that was followed by a series of criminal investigations, guilty pleas, and convictions.

The whole scenario, from discovery to convictions, was a carefully scripted fraud designed to hide the way in which Enron was a giant shell game, run by some of the most powerful bankers in the world, as a vehicle for smashing the regulation of the electricity industry, and allowing the bankers to create the same kind of market rip-off in electricity they had created in the oil market. Enron itself was a longtime client of Lazard, and its board included Lord John Wakeham of N.M. Rothschild, who had been the energy czar under Margaret Thatcher, when Thatcher and Rothschild brought Enron in to the U.K. as part of British electricity deregulation. Far from being a black box, Enron was a bankers’ looting ground; the supposedly secret off-balance-sheet vehicles were marketed by Wall Street, and counted some of the leading bankers on the Street as investors.

Look at the so-called “subprime crisis” from this perspective: a problem suddenly discovered, the perpetrators immediately identified, the banking system itself the *victim* of unscrupulous crooks. The details may be different, but the method is the same, and in both cases, what is covered up is the central role of the banks in running the operation.

The portrayal of the financial crisis as a “housing crisis” is critical to the orchestration of a bailout, providing a “protect the homeowner” cover for what is actually a bailout of the banks. That much is easy to see, though not publicly admitted. It allows the Fed, the Treasury, and the Congress to aid the banks in the name of protecting the “little guy,” and seducing many ordinary people into believing that these measures actually do help protect their home values and other financial assets. With a nod and a wink, lots of people climb aboard the bailout bandwagon.

What very few understand, even among the bankers, is that there is a deeper level to this game, in which the bailout itself is a trap. The bailout, as a financial strategy, cannot possibly work, because the financial system has already failed, and like Humpty Dumpty, cannot be put back together again. There are quadrillions of dollars of derivatives bets and other financial claims that can never be paid, because the capacity to pay them does not exist. Should the governments attempt to “print” money in sufficient quantities to save the banks, the result will be a hyperinflationary blowout of the dollar, of the U.S. economy, and of the nation itself. The British poodles may not understand this, but the controllers of the Bank of England certainly do. The Redcoats burned Washington once, and now they wish to burn the whole nation to the ground.

Malaysia's Agricultural Breakthrough, With Nuclear Power, Can Feed the World

by Mohd Peter Davis

Mohd Peter Davis is a bio-chemist, working at the Institute of Advanced Technology, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Kuala Lumpur. To read more on the theoretical background for his work, see "Biosphere Technology in the Nuclear Age," 21st Century Science & Technology, Fall-Winter 2006. The author can be reached at mohd_peter@hotmail.com.



World agriculture was developing rapidly, until the destruction in 1971 of Franklin Roosevelt's Bretton Woods Agreement, which had provided the economic stability for the post-war boom. In the previous 17 years, world milk production had increased by 49%, and world meat production by nearly 100%. The visionary "Atoms for Peace" program, promising cheap electricity and abundant desalinated water, was inspiring the world with the "green revolution" to end world hunger.

Reflecting this scientific and technological progress, Dr. K.L. Blaxter from the Rowett Research Institute in Aberdeen, Scotland, ended his review of world agriculture on a very optimistic note: "I share the view ... that agriculture and animal production resources of the world are perfectly adequate to cope with foreseeable demands"

What this dedicated scientist did not foresee, was the intention by the British Empire to destroy world agriculture. In 1974, U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, who later admitted in a public speech at Chatham House in England that he was a longtime British agent of influence, wrote a secret report (National Security Study Memorandum 200) to protect "our resources" in Africa and Third World countries and to use food as a weapon to control population growth.

In NSSM 200, Kissinger envisaged "large-scale famine of a kind not experienced for several decades—a kind the world thought had been permanently banished."

As the now-declassified NSSM 200 makes clear, the food crisis and the food riots now being reported daily in the world media, and the impending mass starvation in developing

countries, have been carefully engineered and have little to do with droughts, climate change, "global warming," or the two-centuries-old lie by Thomas Malthus of "too many people," which is peddled to this day by the green environmental movement.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., has warned for decades that the willful destruction of agriculture is part of the British Empire's "Great Game," a continuation of both World Wars and the Cold War against Russia, to establish "globalization," which is merely a euphemism for world empire. To break down any resistance to this plan, the British Empire's intention is to return to the war, famine, and disease of Europe's 14th Century, thereby reducing the world population from 6.5 billion to what it considers a "sustainable" 1 billion, or even less. Essentially, the British Empire's Great Game is a killing game, on a scale never before seen in history.

This insanity and genocide must be stopped. The adoption of LaRouche's call for a New Bretton Woods among the four major powers—America, Russia, China, and India—which other nations can join, will provide the new financial architecture for urgently doubling world agriculture along the lines originally envisaged by the "Atoms for Peace" program.

Malaysia has an important role to play in vastly increasing the quality of grass required to feed the animals that can provide protein for the world population, and in maximizing the conditions of life for those animals, as described below.

Food Security the Nuclear Way

The aim of providing world food security is just as simple and straightforward as the definition put forward by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in 1983: "Access for all people at all times to adequate food for a healthy and active life."

Developing the technology to end world poverty and feed the present world population of 6.5 billion can become the noble task which unites the entire world scientific community. If the British Empire and its genocidal intentions are defeated, the world population is likely to grow to a healthy 9 billion by 2050. With agricultural scientists and engineers back on the job, under a New Bretton Woods, the Atoms for Peace program can be enthusiastically revived to achieve world food security in a remarkably short time.



**World Breakthrough :
Malaysian Grass Farms**

**CUT GRASS
EVERY
35 DAYS FOR
3 YEARS
Fed to sheep,
goats, cattle,
milking cows
in cool
climate sheds**

**GREAT
increase in
Meat and Milk**

**WITH NUCLEAR DESALINATED WATER
DESERTS TRANSFORMED TO ANIMAL FARMS**

Photos courtesy of Mohd Peter Davis

The first task is providing adequate water.

During the colonial period, new lands were opened up in Asia, the Americas, Africa, India, Australia, and New Zealand for world agricultural commodities (cotton, wool, rubber, tea) and food (cereals, rice, lamb, beef, milk). These agricultural industries have relied, not so much on renewable rainfall, but heavily on underground fossil water, left over from previous ice ages. This underground water is now almost depleted. A good example is Australia, essentially a desert continent, which was prevented from going nuclear in the 1960s and is now stranded without the capacity to produce cheap desalinated water to replace its fossil water.

Once a world leading agricultural exporter of wool, meat, and wheat, Australia cannot withstand the natural droughts, and its agriculture is now in a pitiful state. Farmers, whose grandfathers—and their grandfathers before them—had carved out highly productive farms from the inhospitable Australian outback, have lost hope, and many are committing suicide. The irony is that Australia, the thirsty continent, is surrounded by oceans of water and is sitting on the world’s largest reserves of uranium. With a revival of its “lucky country” post-war optimism, a nuclear Australia could, within a decade or so, become a gigantic food supplier for the world.

Africa can lead the way! Africa has suffered extreme technological apartheid, but now South Africa has outflanked its former colonial masters with its pioneer design for a Pebble Bed Modular Reactor (PBMR), now under way. The South Africans intend to mass produce this small, inherently

safe nuclear reactor, as well as the nuclear fuel, and place the reactors exactly where needed to supply electricity and desalinated water throughout Africa. The PBMR is the hope of Africa and “could transform the famine-ravaged continent into the bread basket of the world,” to use the words of Portia Tarumbwa Strid, (“British Destabilization of Zimbabwe,” *EIR*, April 11, 2008).

This African scientific optimism is shared in India. During the April 2008 India-African Union Summit, the Director-General of the UN Industrial Development Organization, Kandeh Yumkella,

said that a solid India-Africa collaboration in agriculture can feed the world, drawing on the huge success in the Indian green revolution of the 1970s and 1980s in grain production. “This is indeed possible,” Yumkella said. “India has the capacity and technology, and Africa has the land and labour.”

This collaboration would allow Africa to industrialize its agriculture, increase production, and prevent the 50% post-harvest losses that are now occurring.

Increasing Animal Production

The human body has a biological daily requirement of 1 gram of protein per kilogram of body weight. (One kilogram equals 2.2 pounds.) A 60-kg person therefore requires 60 grams of protein per day. It is very difficult to supply this amount of protein by eating vegetables and grains. It is best supplied by meat, milk, and eggs, and the transition to this higher quality diet, particularly during the 20th Century, has greatly improved the stature, health, and longevity of populations, at least in more developed countries. However, to achieve this worldwide, means that the population of domestic animals has to be a similar size to the human population.

For example, one sheep will supply the protein requirement for a family of five for only two weeks. A good milking cow will provide 20 liters of milk per day, containing enough protein to feed only three families per day. (One liter is 1.057 quarts.) With the fossil water running out, the supply of grass in traditional and colonial animal-grazing systems is insufficient to support the billions of sheep, goats, cattle, buffalo,

and milk cows required to feed the world population. These grass-eating ruminants are increasingly being fed human food, especially wheat and corn.

The non-ruminants, pigs and poultry, and the egg industry also rely predominantly on corn, but this is necessary because there really is no practical alternative feed for the highly efficient food industries that raise these animals. So our domestic animals are directly competing with humans for corn and wheat.

Producing ethanol biofuel from corn has further removed up to 20% of the corn from American and Western European food supplies. This energetically useless and evil destruction of food must stop immediately.

The world desperately needs a new, large-scale source of grass as animal feed, to replace the wheat and corn inefficiently fed to ruminants. (Animals in barns require 14 kg of corn, a human food, to produce 1 kg of beef or lamb.)

Solution: Malaysian Grass Farms

In the nick of time—and against all the prevailing agricultural practices—a Malaysian livestock entrepreneur, N. Yogendran, has just established a giant farm, which provides about five times more highly nutritious grass per hectare per year, compared to the best New Zealand pasture land. Prototype grass farms have proved that cut grass fed to sheep, goats, cattle, and milk cows in Malaysian climate-controlled houses dramatically overcomes the barriers to successful animal production in the humid tropics.

Despite determined attempts since British colonial days to establish modern animal production in Malaysia, the rainforest has always won. Land cleared from the rainforest and sown with improved pastures soon becomes overgrown with inedible jungle species. In addition, the parasite disease load on grazing domestic animals is unrelenting and uncontrollable.

Grass farms “leapfrog” over these problems by isolating domestic animals in climate-controlled houses and feeding them with young cut grass. The rainforest climate supports the highest rate of biomass production in the world. The humid equatorial climate can now be harnessed to produce enormous quantities of fresh grass per hectare for feeding animals, 365 days of the year.

Malaysian agriculturalists are just beginning to appreciate the worldwide potential of this beautifully simple innovation. There is no reason that grass farms for feeding housed ruminants can not be quickly established throughout the humid tropics. This new animal-production system can also spread to the dry tropics, as nuclear-powered desalinated water becomes available. The only other missing ingredients, plant minerals and nitrogen fertilizers, are easily supplied.

All this is bad news for Al Gore and Prince Philip’s environmentalists, who hysterically claim that man-made carbon dioxide and global warming, and the presence of too many



N. Yogendran (who is 6 feet tall) standing in 3-foot grass, which took only 38 days to grow on his Malaysian Grass Farm. Grass cut at this age is perfect for feeding ruminants. The grass can be cut ten times per year for three years before re-ploughing and re-seeding

people, are destroying the planet. Ironically, the perpetually warm, humid tropical climate, with abundant year-round rainfall, plenty of sunlight, and naturally high concentrations of carbon dioxide from rotting vegetation, provides the perfect conditions for highly productive “sustainable” grass farms, without the use of pesticides, for potentially growing more than enough “organic” domestic animals to feed Southeast Asia.

Science, it seems, has out-greened the greenies!

All Flesh Is Grass

To appreciate the importance of grass farms, it is necessary to give a brief outline of ruminant nutrition. Grass is quite useless for human nutrition, because we cannot break down cellulose into its glucose units. However, young “Spring” pasture grass of selected and improved species is perfect for ruminant animals, which have been domesticated from wildlife species and artificially selected during 10,000 years of agriculture. Grass-eating domestic animals, complementing a much older fish diet, have served as a major source of protein for man.

Sheep, cattle, buffalo, goats, and cows have a special type of stomach, the rumen, which, when full of grass, can account for 20% of body weight. In this large organ, young grass (but not so easily old grass) is fermented by quadrillions of anaerobic bacteria of diverse species. The multiplying bacteria double about every 30-60 minutes, break down the cellulose, and live on some of the energy.

Most of the energy from cellulose, however, is excreted in the form of volatile fatty acids, which are absorbed into the blood stream and serve as the complete energy source for the animal. Protein for the ruminant animal is provided by the bacteria that get squirted into the small intestines for digestion into amino acids (in the same way as humans digest meat with

enzymes). So the rumen is not so much a food-digesting organ as a food-producing organ. A cow is a walking fermenter, producing microbial food for itself from grass.

Ruminant animals can survive, but not gain weight on old grass, mature plants, or leaves, which become chemically protected (lignified), and resist microbial digestion. This rapid maturation of a juvenile plant to avoid getting eaten is the secret of how grass, plants, and trees can survive and recolonize barren lands after ice ages. Sheep and cattle on poor pastures can spend up to 18 hours per day searching for the young blades of grass, until rain and Spring temperatures again provide a plentiful supply of young grass.

For most of the year in temperate climates, ruminants are merely surviving, not growing. Yogendran's Malaysian grass farms overcome all the seasonal problems of grass and animals in temperate climates and allow for all-year-round weight gain, reproduction, and milk production. In the humid tropics, the grass is cut every 30 to 40 days, when it is about 3 feet high and still highly digestible when fed to animals in barns. After this time, the grass becomes less and less digestible.

For the grass farm, particular species of grass are chosen that can be harvested about ten times per year for up to three years. The grass is then ploughed back to rejuvenate the soil. New sprouts of grass emerge in days from the old roots, and are supplemented with seeds to establish a packed carpet of grass. This prevents seeds from the large diversity of jungle plant species from germinating, much like a garden lawn keeps out weeds. With correct management to supply minerals and nitrogen fertilizer, the grass farms can be sustainable without exhausting the soil.

Water is not a limitation in this climate, for it is recycled almost daily in a rainforest by transpiration from trees and other plants, followed by rain, creating vast reserves of underground water. The soil is nearly always moist, and irrigation of grass farms is not usually necessary. To really gear up production of ruminant meat and milk, underutilized agricultural land and old rubber or oil palm plantations can be turned into grass farms, within six months, surrounded by well-separated villages, each for the intensive production of a different species of ruminant in animal housing.

A grass farm is, therefore, a modular animal production unit, which can be rapidly established throughout the humid tropical regions of Southeast Asia, West Africa, and the Amazon. As the developing world gears up with the small PBMR nuclear reactors that South Africa intends to mass produce, and the thorium reactors that India is now urgently developing, the new animal production system can spread throughout the dry tropics, making use of nuclear-powered desalination.

Climate-Controlled Animal Housing

Under British colonial rule, and up to the present, Malaysian researchers have put great effort into adapting the highly

productive temperate breeds of domestic animals to the humid tropics, but these pure breeds do not perform in the harsher climate. Persistent attempts to mass produce cross-bred ruminants, more adapted to the humid tropics, using traditional grazing methods, have proved very disappointing; and Malaysia, with only 26 million people to feed, is only about 25% self-sufficient in ruminant meat, and less than 5% self-sufficient in milk.

Entrepreneur Yogendran, after 25 years of self-funded ex-

The best sheep farms in New Zealand can carry up to 25 sheep per hectare throughout the year. One hectare of grass in Malaysia's new grass farms can support 82 sheep throughout the year.

periments, has developed a stunningly simple solution. Instead of continuing the futile attempt to change animal biology, he changes the animals' environment! He air freights the most genetically improved breeds of sheep, cattle, and milk cows from around the world to Malaysia, and immediately trucks them to fully enclosed climate-controlled animal houses, located on his prototype grass farms. The economical, light-weight animal houses are maintained throughout the year at 25 to 29°C (77 to 84°F), ideal for maximum animal production. This perfect indoor climate is achieved not by electricity-guzzling air-conditioning, but by evaporative cooling using strong suction fans. At one end of the building, these fans draw in warm outside air (35°C maximum—95°F—in the humid tropics). The air cools down as it is forced through large pads dripping with water. The high ventilation rate also serves to keep the animal houses fresh, dry, clean, and odor free, at all times improving the contentment and well-being of the animals.

Suitably vaccinated animals under these fully enclosed hygienic conditions are virtually disease free. The "animal rights" advocates, if they are sincere about animal welfare, should visit these new Malaysian animal houses! Enclosed, climate-controlled "bio-security" animal housing offers a practical way forward for replacing Asian and African backyard farming, where domestic animals and human beings now live side by side in poverty, the humans picking up and efficiently spreading any infectious diseases from the animals.

Mass Producing Intensive Animal Farms

The latest giant grass farm in Malaysia was established in a remarkably short time from old pasture land, which had

become overgrown with secondary jungle. The failed animal-grazing project was ploughed in October 2007, and planted with an improved species of grass in November. The first batch of 285 pregnant cows arrived on one cargo plane from Australian high-tech breeding farms in April 2008. They adapted within days to their cool “Hilton Hotel” animal houses, loved the cut grass, and are all set to calve in June, with commercial milk production expected by August 2008.

A New Zealand automatic milking turntable for 50 cows has been built, and new climate houses are under construction for the next batch of cows from Australia. This good business model, from idle land to marketable milk and calves in one year, with a return on investment within 3 and 1/2 years, is now attracting large investors. If Malaysia’s “plantation companies,” no longer owned by the British, decide to mobilize their huge resources, milk and meat production in the humid tropics could move with lightning speed.

Given the political will, there can be no doubt regarding Malaysia’s ability in this large-scale agricultural venture. Malaysia has vast colonial experience in rubber plantations which put it on the world map; and since the 1960s, Malaysia has planted 4.3 million hectares of oil palm and become the world’s largest producer of palm oil. Malaysia has the resources to rapidly mass produce these intensive animal farms throughout its territory, and to assist its neighbors in climatically suitable parts of Indonesia, Thailand, and the Philippines to do the same.

With a crash science program modelled on what America used to do under Roosevelt during World War II, and Kennedy during the Apollo Project, Malaysia can lead the way in providing urgently needed supplies of milk, beef, lamb, and goat meat for Southeast Asia. As nuclear power comes on stream, and desalinated water becomes plentiful, the Malaysian animal production system can spread to other developing countries in the dry tropical regions.

As in the post-war period, agricultural scientists are able to find the solutions to end world hunger. The only obstacle standing in the way is the British Empire, which in its death agony is preparing frantically to kill up to 90% of the world’s population in World War III and the intended famine and diseases which will follow such a war. This lust for genocide has been stated forthrightly by Prince Philip, president of the World Wildlife Fund: “In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation”

The long overdue and final defeat of this totally evil British Empire will recapture the Atoms for Peace program for all humanity. World food security can then be easily achieved, as forecast by the great Russian biogeochemist V.I. Vernadsky, in his speech opening the Radium Institute in Petersburg in 1922: “Soon man will have atomic power at his hands. This is a power source which will give him a possibility to build his life just as he wishes.”

Want to Eat? Crush the WWF!

Prince Philip’s Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) itself may soon become the world’s most endangered “species,” as peoples across the globe rise up to defend their right to eat.

This Anglo-Dutch imperial strike force, originally founded as the World Wildlife Fund by the fanatic crusader against human life, British Crown consort Prince Philip, and his royal buddy, the card-carrying member of the Nazi Party, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, has designated 19 chokepoints of the world economy over which it intends to seize control by 2015. Visit the WWF-USA’s website (www.worldwildlife.org), and under “Where We Work,” you will find the world map shown here, identifying, in bright orange, the 19 priority areas in which the WWF wants to greatly reduce, if not outright exclude, human activity, in the name of “environmental conservation.”

Behind the map is a war plan against the human race.

Start with the large orange blotch lying over the **Bering Sea**, which the WWF demands be “conserved” from human activity, even as they acknowledge that its icy waters provide more than 50% of the U.S. fish catch. With this designation, the WWF declares war against the plans underway to build a tunnel across the Bering Strait, unifying the Eurasian continent with the Americas through the global land-bridge of high-speed railroads which humanity requires to secure its future existence.

Next, consider the targets in North America: the great grain belts of the **Northern Plains** of the United States and Canada, and the Tennessee/Cumberland and Mobile Basins of the **Southeastern U.S. rivers and streams**; Mexico’s **Gulf of California**, located between Baja California and the north-west states of Sonora, Sinaloa, and Nayarit, and the **Chihuahua Desert**, stretching from the southern United States into central Mexico.

The WWF has already succeeded in limiting fishing in the Gulf of California, which supplies 60% of Mexico’s fish catch, and it now aims to block construction of the Northwest Hydraulic Plan (PLHINO), which could nearly double Mexican grain production. Were the vast North American Power and Water (NAWAPA) water management system likewise be built and connected to the PLHINO, the entire barren Great American Desert, of which the Chihuahua desert is but a part, could be transformed into one large Imperial Valley, through irrigation.

Control of the **Mesoamerican Reef**, extending from the tip of Mexico’s Yucatan peninsula down to Honduras, would establish its grip on Central America.

Control of the Amazon

In South America, the WWF wants control over nothing less than the **Amazon River Basin**, the gigantic area covering the heartland of this continent, which contains one-fifth of the world's fresh-water and a wealth of other resources. Proper damming of such Amazon Basin rivers as the Madeira, for example, could open 30 million new hectares for grain production in the interior of the continent, while North-South and East-West transcontinental rail and waterways must be built across the Amazon to transform the entire continent.

The **Valdivia forests**, extending from Chile into Argentina, and the Galapagos Islands are also targetted.

In Africa, too, the WWF seeks to secure control over the entire continent, by seizing the central **Congo Basin** for itself, and flanking that point of control by blocking development in the **Namibia Desert** and **Coastal East Africa**, with **Madagascar** thrown in.

Six enormous areas in Eurasia have been selected by the Anglo-Dutch Empire, as the bases from which it hopes to prohibit what must become the great motor of the global economy for decades to come: the development of that great landmass and its peoples. They start with nothing less than the **Amur River**, the 2,750-mile river (called the Heilong in Chinese), which the WWF is determined to ensure remains the longest undammed river in the Eastern Hemisphere. Forming much of the Russia/Chinese border, the Amur-Heilong was the scene of a previous military conflict between those two great nations, which the WWF would love to see again. It adds to that the **Eastern Himalayas**, with their obvious strategic importance.

The most densely populated areas in the world follow: **Borneo and Sumatra**, the areas most promising for development in Indonesia, which never fully recovered from the 1997-98 looting by George Soros and his friends, are on the list. The **Coral Triangle**, the strategic seas encompassing the

The WWF's website advertises its "Adopt a Vampire Bat" program: "They have 22 teeth but use only about half of the sharpest ones for feeding. They peel back a small sliver of skin on their featherless or hairless prey and use long tongues to lap up the blood."

Worldwide Fund for Nature

Philippines and eastern Malaysia and Indonesia, and form the "inland sea" necessary to develop if the island nations of Southeast Asia are to be integrated into Asia's mainland. Likewise, the WWF wants to stop dams, industries, and water transport along the entire **Mekong River**, which rises in Tibet and flows through Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam.

Lastly, China's great **Yangtze River Basin**, the source for both great development projects (like the Three Gorges Dam), and for moving water to the arid north of China is targetted. The WWF admits that the Yangtze River system provides water to one-third of all Chinese, but claims it as their own.

The Demise of the Debt Economy

by Felix Goryunov

Felix Goryunov, a Russian economic journalist who has been observing the world economy for over 30 years, contributes his view of the potential for a change for the better in Russian-American relations—not so much because new leaders will soon take office in both countries, but because the global financial crisis demands it. “There is some hope that a new New Deal, to follow after the recession’s impact changes Americans’ political mind-set, will incorporate a realistic, rather than a belligerent U.S. stand in global affairs,” writes Goryunov.

Even against the backdrop of a strained last meeting between Presidents Bush and Putin in Sochi on April 6, Russian Foreign Ministry official Alexander Kramarenko wrote in a similar vein, in an April 2 article for Kommersant. As head of the ministry’s Planning Department, Kramarenko said that “the change of administration in the Kremlin gives the Americans a pretext and an opportunity to review their Russia policy in a positive tone,” in the direction of “a radically different approach to Russian-American relations.” He added that the U.S.A. “needs to be prepared to deal with Russia as an equal, taking each other’s interests into account, to the benefit of both sides.”

Our guest commentator concentrates on the role of the U.S. “military-industrial complex,” whose activity has been of central concern to Soviet and Russian strategists since the same Cold War period, in which President Eisenhower warned about it as an entity within the United States. At the same time, Felix Goryunov’s attention to the systemic nature of the current world economic crisis—what EIR readers know as the handiwork of the London-centered financial oligarchy that persisted after the ostensible demise of the British Empire—and the damage it has inflicted on the U.S. economy, inclusively, points to areas of common interest between Russia and the United States.—Rachel Douglas

Journalism is a rewarding profession for those who like to feel at home in the corridors of power. And who are happy not only to be kept informed, but also to spill the beans—when asked. This is why I have subscribed to the London *Economist* for over 30 years. No other media are better informed of what top Western politicians are doing, what they intend to do in the future, and why. So it came as no surprise when I saw the issue of Aug. 19, 1978, with President Jimmy Carter, Prime Minis-

ter Harold Wilson, and Chancellor Helmut Schmidt dancing in military uniform on the cover. It bore the title, “All the fun of rearmament,” which was decoded in the lead editorial as “Rearming without tears.”

The beans spilled by the *Economist* were new only in their flagrant manner of declaration of intent. Though all of NATO’s big three—the United States, Britain, and Germany—are governed by left-of-center parties, the weekly wrote, they have a record of raising defense spending more than their opponents do. Since their economies are running at below capacity, reflation via rearmament could have distinct appeal for governments, because higher defense spending is a reasonably efficient, if not the most efficient, way to boost growth. But a no less important advantage of this economic policy, the *Economist* reckoned, is that a Soviet attempt to cope with the rearmament challenge will take even bigger bites out of Soviet consumers’ butter. Thus, Russia could have a problem on its hands.

Rearmament: With and Without Tears

By that time, the Soviet Union already had the problem of declining economic growth, along with and because of the ever-mounting cost of the arms race. A new round would be a fearful menace to the sustainability of “real socialism.” Nonetheless, the die-hard Stalinist Dmitry Ustinov, a Politburo member in charge of the military-industrial complex, who knew no other ways than force to settle international issues, convinced Leonid Brezhnev one year later to interfere in the Afghans’ internal squabbles. The Soviet Politburo made an exceptionally expensive Christmas present to the NATO weapons industries. At the end of December 1979, the Soviet Army invaded Afghanistan. After that, the strategy of bleeding the Soviets through the arms race started to deliver at high efficiency and speed, and became a vital factor in eventual breakdown of the U.S.S.R.

The collapse of the Soviet Union, together with “The Soviet Threat,” which since World War II had been the main pretense for milking the U.S. taxpayer, at first seemed to be a serious blow to the military-industrial establishment. But the loss of its best friends among Soviet generals, who were also interested parties in the arms race, was soon compensated for in the form of small wars and the enlargement of NATO to the east. There was Desert Storm in Iraq in 1991, the bombing of



Mikhail Estafiev

Above: Soviet troops withdraw from Afghanistan in 1988. Right: American forces in Iraq. “What now divides American and Russian politicians is their assessment of the lessons of history,” Goryunov writes.



U.S. Army

penditures have provided an artificial and tenuous prosperity dependent on an increasing level of debt, since militarism produces neither consumer nor capital goods to generate further economic activity.” This excerpt from an article subtitled “Reaganomics continues a process that Roosevelt’s New Deal interrupted,” was published by the *Progressive*, an American monthly, in June 1981. The magazine also confirmed the fact that, despite the blessing from top NATO leaders in 1979 for the reflation of their countries’ economic capacities through rearmament, the 1981-82 recession lasted 16 months and turned out to be rather painful for the 9 million Americans who lost their jobs.

History repeats itself with fresh evidence on the severe economic impact of the Bush Administration’s adventure in Iraq. In the article “War’s Price Tag,” published in March by the *Los Angeles Times*, Joseph Stiglitz, winner of the 2001 Nobel Prize in economics, and Linda J.

Serbia in 1999, the NATO operation in Afghanistan since 2001, and another war in Iraq, which was launched in 2003. The gains from weapons supplies to Eastern Europe were less rewarding, but still lucrative enough to be worth the launching of orchestrated propaganda that Russia’s imperial ambitions were a threat to its neighbors.

According to published figures, U.S. military spending in 2007 amounted to \$548 billion, which was 19% of the total Federal budget, and equivalent to 4.4% of U.S. GDP. When compared with the Vietnam war, which was swallowing annually 9% of the GDP, the current military outlays may be considered “painless” for the U.S. economy. The problem with the American military posture, however, is that it has made the economy addicted to Washington’s warmongering policies. Though the defense bill of \$648.8 billion for 2008, approved by the U.S. Senate, dwarfs Russia’s annual military budget of \$36.8 billion, many American politicians forget the importance of being earnest, when they speak of a resurgent Russian threat.

“Since World War II, the domestic market has primarily been sustained by \$2.3 trillion in military spending. These ex-

Bilmes, a lecturer on public finance at Harvard University Kennedy School of Government, revealed their findings that the real cost of the Iraq War will easily reach \$3 trillion in today’s money. This funding, which is borrowed on international markets, will make the Federal debt still more burdensome.

Also quite relevant to the West’s rearmament policies, initiated 40 years ago with the aim of weakening the Soviet Union economically, is NATO’s current onslaught on its former territory and neighbors. The media hullabaloo about American ABM deployment in the Czech Republic and Poland, as well as the recent abortive attempt to drag Georgia and Ukraine into NATO, somehow misses one important point. Any former Warsaw Pact country that joins the Alliance must rearm to match its standards. That is, they have to scrap Soviet-made arms and equipment and replace them with those made by NATO-country manufacturers. This multi-billion rearmament business comes not only without tears, but with guaranteed money gains for weapons companies, as well as generous handouts to the politicians and generals in the recipient countries, who are helping to push the deals through.

Such deals would hardly be scrutinized, although the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 contains many provisions that prohibit the bribery of foreign officials for greasing arms purchases. The Congressional committee that discussed the Act before its adoption specified that there could be “perfectly legal payments, such as for promotional purposes and sales commissions.” See the difference with bribes? No? Neither do I.

Living Beyond One’s Means

The United States could afford to reinforce its military muscle because it was not the only one paying for it. Since the middle of the 1970s, the U.S. capital markets were flooded with foreign cash by international investors in businesses and real estate, thus allowing weapons manufacturers to borrow cheaply. But a real bonanza for the American military-industrial complex came in 1978, when the Carter Administration initiated and enacted the Exchange Stabilization Fund. The fund started to issue series of Treasury bonds to be sold overseas, in order to prevent a fall of the dollar on international markets. Named Carter bonds, these securities soon became a major funding vehicle for covering U.S. Federal budget deficits.

Now, the degree of America’s international indebtedness is staggering. Of the \$9.2 trillion in total Federal government debt outstanding at the end of 2007, \$5.1 billion was sold to the public in the form of Treasury bonds or Treasury bills. About \$2.4 trillion of the latter sum is owned by foreigners. Foreign interests have more control over the U.S. economy than Americans, said David Walker, the U.S. Comptroller General. The huge holdings of American government debt by countries such as China and Saudi Arabia could leave a powerful financial weapon in the hands of countries that may be hostile to U.S. corporate and diplomatic interests, he reckoned.

As a matter of fact, the Treasury’s indebtedness is only part of the picture. According to Gillespie Research/Federal Reserve, foreign interests own about \$9 trillion of U.S. financial assets, including 13 percent of all stock, 13 percent of agencies, and 27 percent of corporate bonds. The major provider of money for home mortgages, Fannie Mae, borrows about a third of its investment funds from outside of the United States. (Aleksei Kudrin, Russia’s Finance Minister, recently disclosed that some money from the country’s Stabilization Fund, may be invested in a Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac facility.) So it is no wonder that the Grandfather Economic Reports, which compile and popularize data on U.S. indebtedness, admit: we have become a nation of debt-junkies, living beyond our means more than ever before.

It is not only the U.S. Treasury that is vulnerable to foreign indebtedness (the largest holders of T-bonds are Japan, with \$581 billion, and China at \$477 billion), but also the U.S. Federal Reserve. Hoards of dollar reserves overseas are a con-

stant threat to the U.S. global financial position as owner of the world’s major reserve currency. The list of biggest dollar holders in February 2008 was topped by China (\$1.6 trillion), Japan (\$1 trillion), Russia (\$502 billion), and India (\$306 billion). At the end of 2007, 63.7% of official currency reserves were held in greenbacks and 26.4 percent in euros. But, with the steep depreciation of the dollar after the U.S. Federal Reserve started to cut interest rates last Autumn, the ratio is changing in favor of the euro and, to a smaller degree, such currencies as the British pound sterling and the Chinese yuan.

The cheaper dollar is arousing concern among such big holders as the Arab members of OPEC, who manage the world’s largest sovereign wealth funds. Last Summer, Gulfnews.com reported from Dubai that the Gulf sovereign funds may change the pricing of oil from the dollar to another currency, while Qatar already cut its exposure to the dollar by 40% of its foreign reserves portfolio. Although Arab OPEC members later announced that they would stay with the greenback for a while, the danger of their withdrawal remains real.

According to IMF estimates, government-managed investment funds now have \$2.5 trillion at their disposal. The investment bank Merrill Lynch forecasts that, by 2011, this total will grow to \$7.9 trillion. Thus sovereign wealth funds may become an alternative wielder of leverage in world finance and reduce the exorbitant privilege of the United States, which finances large current account deficits in its own currency.

About a dozen leaders of center-left ruling parties from around the world, brought together by British Prime Minister Gordon Brown in Watford on April 5, called for the urgent reform of global financial institutions, to prevent a recurrence of the credit crisis. There was general agreement among them on the need for new rules for disclosure and transparency of financial institutions. They also pressed for global, rather than national supervision of financial markets and development of an effective early warning system to guard against financial risks to the global economy. It can be presumed that this so-far tacit recognition of the fact that global finance must not be controlled by national interests and policies, is just a beginning of a wide debate about the necessity of a new international monetary order.

The End of Empire?

Surprising as it may seem, one more challenge to U.S. financial supremacy now comes from the U.S. multinational companies.

“Multinationals: Are They Good for America?” The answers to the question posed last February by *Business Week* were largely unenthusiastic. Unlike the U.S. economy, the weekly wrote, multinational companies have plenty of cash and soaring profits from overseas operations. They are more productive and innovative than domestic companies. And,

unlike American consumers, banks, and smaller companies, the multinationals are not constrained by the credit crunch. In short, the magazine reckons, they are the go-to guys right now for the ailing American economy. It is far from certain, however, that they are going to oblige.

Politicians can't help to reverse the trend, even if they wanted to, because powerful capitalist motives underlie this corporate exodus. Multinationals go where growth and profits are high. By official estimates, U.S. multinationals' share of domestic output shrank from 21.8% of GDP in 2000 to 18% in 2005, and continues to decline. In the same period, these multinationals cut more than 2 million jobs. While the sales of foreign subsidiaries of U.S.-based multinationals have skyrocketed, American exports in 2007 retained the same share of GDP as in 1997.

The overseas earnings of American companies in emerging markets are a lot higher than at home, not only because of the larger sales volume, but predominately thanks to the big gap in labor costs. Last year, for example, a factory worker in Mexico cost his employer \$2-3 an hour; in China, \$1.40; in India, \$1.00—whereas in America and Europe, this cost is more than \$20-\$30. The annual rate of profit growth in the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, China, India) is triple or quadruple that in the developed countries.

Multinationals enjoy profit-generating advantages in the emerging markets also thanks to their technological prowess. It is not only sales of machinery and equipment that are riding the wave of investment-driven growth. No less important is the distribution of value added between a multinational company and its counterpart in an emerging market. For example, it is estimated that only 15% of the value of China's electronics and information technology exports is added by its manufacturers. The rest—i.e., sophisticated units and components—is imported by China, both for exports and for domestic consumption. It will take years before the BRIC members upgrade their R&D capability to bridge the gap.

Even this, so-far unequal division of labor has brought radical changes to the world economy. It has become truly global and has thrown off its former dependence on U.S. economic performance and financial strength. History so disposed that the United States became the capitalist world's leader in the 20th Century by replacing the British Empire. Now, America's international position is largely being eroded as a result of the arrogant and belligerent international policy of its leadership.

The alarm bells began to toll even before U.S. troops invaded Iraq. On Sept. 23, 2002, the *Nation*, a popular political weekly, published an eye-opening article, which to this day makes die-hard neoconservatives clench their fists and curse. The article, entitled "The End of Empire," foretold all that is now happening to the American supremacy in actual fact. That the imperial ambitions of the Bush Administration are founded on quicksand, and its main vulnerability has to do

with money. That Bush's open-ended claims for U.S. power and its unilateral right to invade and occupy "failed states" to execute "regime change," offending international law, are prerogatives associated only with empire. And that Bush-led America is ignorant of the humiliating lesson of Great Britain, whose empire met its demise under the pressure of global changes.

Now, when it becomes clear that financial reckoning for the foolhardy policies may be around the corner, American political winds are blowing against President Bush and his men. As usual, the *Economist* is among the first to forecast a change of course. In an article called "After Bush," the weekly's Washington Bureau Chief, Adrian Wooldridge, describes how both Democratic contenders oppose the most disastrous foreign policy in American history, because the public has turned sharply against military assertiveness. America's foreign policy may change under the next President, the *Economist* writes, but confusion over Iraq, worries about overstretching, and divisions over the country's role in the world will remain.

A 'New' New Deal?

In 1961, President Dwight Eisenhower said that the United States had created a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions, whose influence was felt in every city, every state house, every office of government. Since those faraway times, the posture of the military business in the American establishment has only strengthened. To the extent that even Senator Obama, who makes a lot of his anti-Iraq-war stand in winning the electorate, can't afford to disregard the interests of Pentagon contractors. The *Progressive* magazine noted that Mr. Obama is forsaking the position of most African-Americans in favor of "butter" by supporting the expansion of U.S. ground forces by nearly 100,000 additional soldiers.

As we know, the Clinton family never hesitated to please the military when it had a chance: The bombing of Belgrade in 1999 is just an outstanding example. This is all the more so for Senator McCain, whose manifesto, related by the *Washington Post* on March 30, was hawkish by definition. He called for further increases in U.S. military spending, and for making clear that "the solidarity of NATO, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, is indivisible" in order to counter "Russia's nuclear blackmail or cyber attacks." So it looks as if all U.S. Presidential candidates are playing the Russophobia card to reassure the weapons industry establishment of their allegiance to the "bullets before butter" policies.

It is also becoming evident that, whoever occupies the White House next year, he or she will not be in a position to withdraw troops from Iraq overnight. In a time of recession, it would be unsafe to curtail spending on military procurement and add new factories to the list of redundant businesses, not to mention reductions in military personnel. During a critical time, however, a declaration of intent is no less important than

a deed. President Roosevelt calmed American workers by announcing his New Deal, months before it began to bear its fruit of unemployment and welfare benefits. Thus, corrections of course among Presidential contenders are possible, if the economy gets out of hand before the November elections. The more so, that more and more Americans are feeling change-hungry. A *New York Times*/CBS poll released on April 3 found that 81% of respondents felt that “things have pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track.”

Pragmatic We Can Be

Nowadays, it is not only Americans who need assurances of the good intent of America’s powers-that-be. Millions of people all over the globe expect that the U.S. recession, which is starting to spread to some parts of the globe, must be taken care of at its source. American multinationals, which in recent decades expanded their operations to new overseas markets, are also interested parties in a coherent policy of ensuring international stability instead of creating new tensions. This is a pressing demand of critical economic circumstances and of pure common sense. Global stability and economic development must not be sacrificed to the vested interests of one industry cluster of one country, no matter how politically powerful they may be.

The political rift between Washington and Moscow,


which has not abated during the last four years, is a result of artificially instigated tensions. There are a lot of heated discussions about what can be done to mend our relationship. What has been missing so far in the debate is one encouraging fact. In current U.S.-Russia economic relations, things are not business as usual, as happened even in Soviet times, but with every passing year such business is a lot better than before.

A survey of American companies carried out by Ernst & Young, a consultancy, from October 2006 to February 2007 discovered that 89% of them projected continued growth in sales, and 79% intended to make investments through 2008. The profitability of 79% of the companies surveyed in 2001-05 was on or above target. The survey also recorded that 90% of the American companies operating in Russia believe that continued commercial engagement with Russia is positive for American business. According to information released by the Association of European Businesses in Russia, CEOs of EU companies in Russia think the same. They also believe that 2007, when there was a setback in EU-Russia relations, was a year of political losses against economic gain.

There is little doubt that the thousands of American residents working and living in Russia will confirm that this country has never been and is not “America’s natural enemy,” as is claimed by some U.S. right-wing politicians. Moreover, our countries have a record of mutually advantageous trade in the time of the Great Depression, and brotherly relations against a common enemy in World War II. And, once we are no longer ideologically divided, it is foolish to settle the scores over international or domestic issues that can well be resolved without diplomatic or propaganda wrangles, as often happened in the past. The history of our two nations has known confrontations and detentes, partnership and quarrels.

What now divides American and Russian politicians is their assessment of the lessons of history. The Soviet defeat in Afghanistan became such a lesson for the Russian elite. The American defeat in Vietnam did not change belligerent U.S. strategies. It is also worth remembering the whim of history that taught Germany and Japan that a defeat in war might be a blessing. Defying such experience, the United States went on building up a superpower’s military muscle and dragged its economy into the debt trap. To the contrary, Russia’s refusal to continue the Cold War, largely motivated by economic exhaustion, may now prove to be an economic achievement. (Well, thanks to abundance of natural resources.)

In any event, despite the cooling of relations with the West and American provocative policies in Eastern Europe, Georgia, and Ukraine that raise Russians’ concern, the Kremlin is set to continue a pragmatic and conciliatory foreign policy. Now, when America is in economic distress comparable to that of 70 years ago, it may be the right time for a New Deal not only in U.S. domestic policies, but in America’s relations with the outside world, Russia included.



EIR, News Service

This English translation of the work of Russia’s authoritative economist, presents a critical analysis of the complex economic processes in Russia during the last 15 years.

Available through EIR

Order by calling 1-800-278-3135, or at the EIR online store, at www.larouche.com.

\$30 plus \$2.50 for shipping and handling

Business Briefs

China Income Gap

Beijing Addresses Severe Rural Poverty

A severe and growing income gap between China's rural and urban populations, and between the interior and coastal regions, is the target of a concerned Chinese government, said Vice Minister of Finance Ding Xuedong April 16, speaking to the 2008 Forum on Fiscal Reform in China. He said that China will "increase the volume of transfer payments to ease fiscal difficulties of grass-roots governments."

The poverty of 700 million rural Chinese is not only a serious problem itself, but is making it difficult for China to shift its economic strategy from dependence upon exports to the collapsing U.S. and other economies, to one based on internal development, *China Daily* reported. Lyndon LaRouche noted that this is also a strategic problem, as the enemies of China are trying to drive a wedge between the "two Chinas" implied by the continuing rural poverty.

Two years ago, China finally ended the 2,000-year-old agricultural tax and other taxes on farmers, which amounted to 50 billion yuan (\$8 billion) a year. However, local governments, which were dependent upon these tax revenues, were hit hard. Some Chinese economists are estimating that county and local governments accumulated about 1 trillion yuan in debts after the tax reform, according to *China Daily*.

Energy

Putin Builds Economic Ties with Libya, Italy

Russian President Vladimir Putin arrived in Sardinia, Italy April 17, for talks with Prime Minister-elect Silvio Berlusconi, after having paid a visit to Libya, the first of a Russian leader since 1985. Putin's trip is part of an effort to integrate the North African, European, and Russia economies, in the field of energy, infrastructure, and industrial projects. The British Empire, which wants

to block this land-bridge development, signalled that its pawns at the European supranational center in Brussels are "nervous" at such a partnership, especially the South-stream gas pipeline, to be built by Russia's Gazprom and Italy's ENI. In a comment on Putin's trip, the April 18 *Financial Times* wrote that, "to many in Brussels, the pipeline is seen as a dangerous move to increase the dependence of the European Union on Russian energy supplies."

Putin discussed with Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi an increased role for Gazprom in building gas pipelines from North Africa to Europe, via Italy. Gazprom is already holding talks with Nigeria about participating in a \$13 billion project to build a pipeline 4,000 km across the Sahara, linking the Niger Delta to an export terminal on Algeria's Mediterranean coast. In Libya, Gazprom is interested in participating in the construction of the second stretch of the Sicily-Libya gas pipeline built by the Italian ENI consortium. ENI, the largest foreign operator in Libya, discussed, earlier this month in Moscow, a swap of a quota in the Libyan "Elephant" oil field with Gazprom.

African Development

Niger Minister Backs China, Nuclear Power

At a press conference April 18 in Paris, Mohamed Ben Omar, Niger's communications minister, addressed the country's development programs. The presence of China and others in Africa has reinforced the independence of Niger, which is now able to negotiate higher prices and better conditions for contracts with mining and oil companies. The purpose of his press conference was to outline what the country is doing with these increased revenues. He indicated to which countries the 141 exploration permits for uranium, oil, gold, copper, platinum, and other raw materials were granted, and the list includes a highly diversified group of nations, including France, China, India, Canada, Britain, and the United States. In the area of oil exploration, in particular, he mentioned CNPC from China and the Alge-

rian Sonatrach as being among the main recipients of those contracts.

Among the improvements derived from this new wealth is the fact that 15% of the proceeds from oil and uranium are returned to the development of the regions where they are exploited. Ben Omar was particularly proud to announce that never again would his country, one of the richest in terms of raw materials, allow itself to be treated as one of the poorest in Africa, begging for handouts. He also called for nuclear power to be developed in his country.

Banking

Macquarie Intensifies Assault on China

The British Empire's Macquarie Bank is spearheading an Australia-based, but British-directed financial assault on China by a complex of "Australian" banks and insurance companies. Macquarie, the world's leader in corporatist/fascist public-private partnerships (PPPs), has held talks with "key Chinese ministries, regulators and investors about establishing China's first domestic infrastructure fund," reported the April 15 *Sydney Morning Herald*. Fronting for Macquarie and other British speculators, Mandarin-speaking Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd lunched with Chinese executives and regulators in Beijing the week of April 14 to push the idea. "One of the core propositions that I am putting to the Chinese government for consideration is to expand the number of Australian funds managers who are able to operate here in the Chinese market," Rudd said.

Macquarie bought the brokerage business of the Anglo-Dutch ING Barings in 2004, and advised the China Railway Construction Corporation in a \$5.6 billion Hong Kong and Shanghai stock offering, China's largest float this year, and "the second-largest globally," according to the *Herald*. The paper also notes that Macquarie is working with Goldman Sachs and Morgan Stanley to secure a role in "future floats and acquisitions involving some of China's largest companies."

London's Man Cheney Blows Up Iraq, To Trigger War on Iran

by Jeffrey Steinberg

In the wake of the April 9-10 Capitol Hill testimony by Gen. David Petraeus and Ambassador to Baghdad Ryan Crocker, the Bush Administration, according to senior U.S. intelligence sources, has ordered American forces inside Iraq, to escalate the military campaign against Shi'ite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr and his Madhi Army. Lyndon LaRouche promptly denounced this action as totally psychotic, and guaranteed to blow up the Iraqi situation, which is already fragile, at best.

According to the sources, U.S. military forces will increasingly take the lead in battling the Shi'ite militia in Baghdad's Sadr City neighborhood, and in the southern region of Basra. This, LaRouche warned, is guaranteed to throw Iraq into further chaos. "Is President Bush actually psychotic?" he asked.

Reliable sources in Baghdad and Washington trace the provocation against al-Sadr back to Vice President Dick Cheney's recent visit to Baghdad, during his ten-day tour of the region. In his meetings with Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki, according to the sources, Cheney pressed for a military assault on the Madhi Army, even though a ceasefire between rival Shi'ite factions had been recently extended. U.S. intelligence sources report that the combined Iraqi-American-British military operations aim to crush al-Sadr's militia long before the scheduled provincial elections in October. Al-Sadr's forces are in control of Basra, and by all projections, would likely win the provincial vote, further undermining the Bush Administration-backed al-Maliki coalition, which also includes the al-Hakim SCIRI (Supreme Council of the Islamic Revolution in Iraq) group. All three Shi'ite factions—al-Maliki, al-Hakim, and al-Sadr—enjoy the backing of Iran.

Shifting Targets

The U.S. is counting on Saudi Arabia to continue pouring money into the Sunni tribes, in the Anbar and Diyala provinces, to prevent a new outbreak of anti-American insurgency in that part of the country. This was evident in the testimony of both General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker, who downplayed the threat coming from the Sunni al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), while focusing on the growing threat coming from Iran. However, this reliance on Saudi Arabia to maintain the calm in the Sunni regions of Iraq is fraught with danger. It is known, according to U.S. military and intelligence sources, that the Saudi support is not reliable, particularly as the Saudis view the U.S. support of the Shi'ite al-Maliki government as evidence that Washington will back a Shi'ite domination of Iraq.

Furthermore, as one senior U.S. intelligence official emphasized to *EIR*, the "900-pound gorilla in the room" is the role of Saudi intelligence in the 9/11 attacks, a role that the Bush Administration has gone to great lengths to hide from the public, but which is recognized among some leading American intelligence officials. They bristle at the idea that the U.S. can trust the Saudis to genuinely work for American interests, in bankrolling the Sunni tribes in Iraq. It is widely believed that, in response to continuing American support for a Shi'ite majority government in Baghdad, and a belief that a new U.S. administration will withdraw the majority of U.S. troops from Iraq, Saudi Arabia is building up a Sunni buffer state in the bordering areas of Iraq.

The sources add that, within the Pentagon, both Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, and a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, oppose the acceleration of U.S. counterinsurgency operations against al-Sadr. For one thing, they are concerned

about other threats to the stability of the larger region, including the prospects of a major escalation in fighting in Afghanistan and the bordering regions of Pakistan. In recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, two retired U.S. Army generals, Barry McCaffrey and William Odom, had strongly asserted that the Iraq situation could not be settled militarily, and called for a U.S. troop withdrawal, accompanied by a new U.S. diplomatic initiative, including direct talks with Iran and Syria.

Gates has personally promoted diplomatic contact with al-Sadr, emphasizing that the cleric represents a large number of Shi'ites in the south of the country, and in major parts of the capital city of Baghdad. Al-Sadr's family is one of the leading Shi'ite families in Iraq; his father and uncle were revered clerics, and the political movement he leads has a long history there, including during the worst periods of the Saddam Hussein regime, when many other Shi'ite factions fled the country. Crocker acknowledged this profile, during questioning from Senators.

Gates and the Joint Chiefs' opposition to the recent military provocation is part of their ongoing battle with Vice President Cheney, who is committed to bombing Iran before the administration leaves office. The clock is running out, and Cheney is escalating the drive to get President Bush to okay military strikes against targets inside Iran, according to U.S. intelligence sources.

One senior U.S. intelligence source told *EIR* that Cheney has recently scored two tactical victories over the Defense Secretary: The Vice President successfully sabotaged Gates' efforts to advance U.S.-Russian cooperation, during President Bush's recent meeting with outgoing Russian President Vladimir Putin at the Russian leader's vacation home in Sochi; and Cheney's order to al-Maliki, to attack the Madhi Army preempted Gates' push for U.S. diplomatic outreach to al-Sadr.

Made in London

LaRouche painted an even more dire strategic picture, one that is largely missed by American policymakers and intelligence officials. The entire Iraq fiasco was a "Made in London" operation, in which then-British Prime Minister Tony Blair played a dominant role in drawing the United States into the Iraq invasion and ensuing quagmire. The British, then pulled their forces out of Basra in 2007, setting the stage for the Shi'a-on-Shi'a confrontation, into which the United States has now been drawn. The psychotic policy of the Bush White House, LaRouche concluded, borders on treason—although President Bush, personally, could make a very compelling case that he is not guilty, by virtue of insanity. LaRouche suggested that medical records from the President's year-long drug rehabilitation treatment for cocaine addiction, while he was purportedly serving in the Texas Air National Guard, during the Vietnam War period, might assist in his insanity defense.

As the result of the Bush Administration walking into the

British trap, which is part of a larger British drive to orchestrate a world war between the trans-Atlantic powers versus Asia, LaRouche warned, we now have both Russia and China preparing strategic asymmetric warfare against the West. India is headed in the same direction, and even Japan will be forced, albeit reluctantly, to join with the rest of Asia. Japanese Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda has announced that he will travel to Moscow on April 25-26, to meet with Putin and his successor Dmitri Medvedev.

"We are staring at World War III," LaRouche warned, "orchestrated from London. And most so-called strategic thinkers in Washington are clueless about the British role."

Rear-Guard Efforts vs. Cheney and London

In the context of Cheney's resurgent power, and Bush's deteriorating mental condition, a number of admittedly rear-guard efforts have been initiated, from within U.S. institutional circles, to avert a preventive strike against Iran.

In recent weeks, former U.S. Undersecretary of State Thomas Pickering, one of the most senior and respected U.S. foreign service officers, co-authored a proposal to break the deadlock around Iran's nuclear program. In the March 20 issue of the *New York Review of Books*, Pickering, William Luers (president of the UN Association of the U.S.A.), and MIT nuclear scientist Jim Walsh called for Iran to participate in an international consortium for the production of nuclear fuel—under tight International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) supervision. The proposal has been favorably received in Tehran, according to official Iranian government statements; however, the Iranian government will not issue any official response, unless the proposal is formally presented by the U.S. government or the United Nations.

On April 14, Pickering gave an interview with the London daily, the *Independent*, in which he provided some details of a five-year diplomatic back-channel process between the United States and Iran, on the nuclear issue. Pickering identified the UN Association of the U.S.A. and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), headed by former UN weapons inspector in Iraq, Rolf Ekeus, as sponsors of the talks, which took place around the world, but not in the U.S.A. or Iran.

It is noteworthy that the Pickering secret diplomacy began right after Iran offered the United States a "grand bargain" of comprehensive diplomatic talks, including on the nuclear issue, in early May 2003—soon after the U.S. invasion of Iraq. At the time, Cheney and then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld rejected the Iranian initiative outright, asserting that U.S. policy was "regime change."

Rumsfeld is gone from the administration, but Cheney has eight months more to convince President Bush to order Stratcom to launch "Global Strike" against Iran. Were Cheney to succeed, all of Southwest Asia would be thrown into the kind of permanent chaos that Cheney's string-pullers in London so desperately want.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Ambassador M.J. Mapuranga: Why the British Hate Zimbabwe

Dr. Machivenyika J. Mapuranga, the Zimbabwean Ambassador to the United States, gave this interview to The LaRouche Show on April 12. The host was Lawrence Freeman, and Portia Tarumbwa Strid joined in by telephone from Berlin. She is a member of the LaRouche Youth Movement from Zimbabwe. The LaRouche Show is an Internet radio program, webcast every Saturday at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time, at www.larouche.pub.com.

Freeman: ... I'll frame the discussion a bit in terms of what the global picture looks like—and this was discussed by Mr. LaRouche this past Thursday, when he met with a group of foreign diplomats in Washington, D.C.¹ The condition now that we're seeing around the world, is the meltdown of the global financial system. And under these conditions, the British financiers, located in the City of London, are looking for control, looking to save their system. And we're seeing a series of destabilizations, potentially leading to wars, that are being instigated by the British around the globe—certainly in Africa, in their attacks on Zimbabwe; their operations to support the Dalai Lama against China; their provocations against Russia. The British policies are to try to find a way to survive in a system that is dead: This financial system cannot be brought back to life. It is finished! What's needed is a new one, which Mr. LaRouche and our friends around the world and in the United States, are working to create.

Today, we will focus on the situation in Africa and in Zimbabwe. We're very fortunate to have the Ambassador here.

I'd like to start off with some very preliminary questions, Mr. Ambassador. Today is two weeks since the Zimbabwe elections for President and for Parliament. Could you bring us up to date, in terms of where we are in this process?

Zimbabwe's Election: Truth vs. Lies

Mapuranga: Thank you, Larry. You know, these elections are actually the culmination of a process that started last year in March, when the heads of state and government of the Southern African Development Community (SADC) met, and they issued a communiqué in which, among other things,

they requested the President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, to play the part of facilitator—some say even mediator—in talks between the ruling party, ZANU-PF, and the opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC). Many meetings were held, both in Zimbabwe and in South Africa, through Thabo Mbeki's mediation, and it bore fruit. These talks resulted in Amendment 18 to the Zimbabwean Constitution—because all along, we have been operating under the Lancaster House Constitution that was given to us by the British, at the end of the protracted war of liberation—it lasted 14 years. And then we proceeded to Lancaster House for the peace conference that resulted in a constitution that we are operating under to this day.

Now, Amendment 18, agreed upon by the parties involved, cuts the Presidential term from six years to five, and it also stipulated that there would be a maximum of two terms. Because previously, we were following the British practice, that there is no term limit for the chief executive officer. The prime minister of Britain has no term limits. In the United States, you operated for a long, long time, since your Declaration of Independence, without term limits—until 1959, I think. The great Franklin Roosevelt, when he died, was in his fourth term.

The other provision of Amendment 18 that is germane to your question, has to do with the conduct of elections. Previously, there were three or four bodies that were involved in preparations for elections: You had the Registrar General's office, you had a Delimitation Commission, and an Electoral Council. All their functions were now concentrated in one body that was created, known as the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission. This commission has both members nominated by the opposition party, and members nominated by the ruling party, on a 50-50 basis.

Freeman: I think there are two for each.

Mapuranga: Yes. Then, there is a chairman, who is appointed in accordance with the procedure governing the appointment of judges: that is, on the recommendation of the Judiciary Services Commission.

So really, this malicious talk about how this commission is biased, or something like that, is not true, because the composition was made on a bipartisan basis.

1. See *EIR*, April 18, 2008.

Previously, we used to have our Presidential elections and our parliamentary elections separately. One of the agreements in the Mbeki talks, was that these elections have to be harmonized; they should be held simultaneously. There are four elections in one: the local government elections, for the councils; the Presidential election; the election for the Senate; and the election for the House of Assembly. Four in one. This is something that is unprecedented in our history. Previously, when we held our elections, we would get the full results within two or three days. But this time around, it has taken a bit longer. After four or five days, we got all the results of the House of Assembly. And after two more days we got the results of the Senate. We are getting the results now of the local government elections. But we still do not have the full results in the Presidential election, because there are two processes involved here.

First, the results of the election were posted at the polling station, for everybody to see. Then, they were transmitted to the National Collation Center, to be centralized, collated. We're talking about results from 9,000 polling stations. And then, the second process is that of verification. Now, in the other three elections, the Senate, the House, and the local government, these processes have been concluded. In the Presidential election, they are still in the process of verification. Your listeners may have noted that the ruling party had some complaints to make, because in several areas, the results posted at the polling station did not tally with the results that were received by the National Collation Center. These anomalies have to be addressed.

So, this is where we are now. But because the process has taken more than a week, to get the full results, the British and their surrogates, that is the opposition MDC, are claiming that their Presidential candidate had won, even though the Electoral Commission, the ZEC, has not yet concluded its task. We think that this is a recipe for disorder. People should not declare themselves winners before the authorized body does that.

Freeman: The votes have not been officially released for the President, and yet there are people in the MDC and others around the world, who are claiming that Morgan Tsvangirai, the Presidential candidate of the Movement for Democratic Change, won the election. How can anyone claim that, if the votes aren't counted yet?

Mapuranga: For one to win the Presidential election, he has to get 51% of the vote. And when the secretary general of the MDC addressed a press conference, he said, we have done our own collation of the votes from all the constituencies, from the polling stations, and we reckon that our candidate has won 50.3% of the vote. And they said that President Mugabe had won maybe 44% of the vote. But the important thing to notice here, is that *even by their own reckoning*, their candidate has not attained the 51% that the Constitution stipulates as the threshold.

Freeman: Right. So if people who are always talking about the rule of law being followed, well, the rule of law in Zimbabwe is, the candidate has to get 51%. If that does not occur, then there would be a runoff. So this is where we stand on the Presidential election. Now, while we are speaking here today, an emergency meeting of the SADC has been called in Zambia, to deal with this. Maybe you could give us some background on why this meeting was called, and what you expect to happen at it.

Mapuranga: Right. You probably would have noticed that when President Thabo Mbeki was on his way to a summit, the Africa-India summit, I think, he passed through London and he had discussions with Prime Minister Gordon Brown. And when he came out of those discussions, he was asked a question on Zimbabwe, and the election there. And he said: "We have to be patient, because the the ZEC has to do its job thoroughly." He could not understand why there was so much, almost panic, or whatever, impatience. You probably have noticed that only yesterday, he was having a meeting with President Mugabe in Harare, and he was saying to news reporters that there is *no crisis* in Zimbabwe. We have the results of three elections, and we are awaiting the final result of the fourth election, which is the Presidential. And the ZEC has made it clear, and the chairman of the ZEC has said on several occasions, that his body wants to make a meticulous collation of the results, so that we do not have a situation where the results are gainsaid and second-guessed, or, even worse, we have a Kenyan-type situation of post-election violence. So, this is what they are trying to avert.

But the British Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, and I think Department of State here also, in the United States, have been leaning on the leaders of the SADC to say that they must put pressure on the ZEC to release the results. And the ZEC is saying, we cannot release incomplete results. We are still in the process of verification.

For Britain: 'White Man's Country'

Freeman: When you say that they are putting pressure on them, I think that is diplomatically well put. There is a lot of intimidation going on, I believe, at this point, because of Prime Minister Gordon Brown's attitude toward Zimbabwe.

I think, additionally, we should look at this situation in Zimbabwe, from a larger historical standpoint. And I think that most people, especially Americans, refuse to look at history, as if history has any relevance to what's going on today. Of course, the Baby Boomers think history began in the 1950s, when they were born. But even other people don't think that history is actually a force that acts on the present. I think it would be important to realize that the people of Zimbabwe and President Mugabe fought a very tough, long, war—a 14-year war—of liberation, against one of the most racist, imperialist regimes that the British Empire has ever seen, in Southern Rhodesia. And I don't think that they have ever forgiven President Mugabe or the Zimbabwe people for becoming in-

dependent, in fact, today I don't think they think they *are* independent, they still think they're under the British Empire.

Mapuranga: Well, if you listen to some of the debates that go on in the House of Lords, when from time to time they debate Zimbabwe, you would in fact get convinced that as far as they're concerned, Zimbabwe is not yet an independent, sovereign state.

To understand this, as you said, you have to go back slightly into history. If you peruse the Colonial Office documents that are kept in the Public Record Office in London, in Kew Gardens, you will see that Southern Rhodesia, which is Zimbabwe now, and South Africa, along with Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, these five, are referred to as "white man's country." That is the phrase that is used consistently by the great administrators, Lord Salisbury, Lord Milner, Sir Harry Johnston—they all refer to these five as "white man's country." It's a policy that was predicated on two subpolicies, or rested on two pillars: First, the British settlers who went to these countries, were supposed to eventually outnumber the natives, because these five were earmarked for permanent white settlement. Of course this policy succeeded completely in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and it was well on its way to success in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe now), because in the course of years, they radically changed the ratio between the natives and the incoming settlers. As we speak now, in South Africa, the ratio is 1:10, whereas three centuries ago, it was 1:19,000.

In Zimbabwe, when the British South Africa Company colonized the country in 1890, four years later we have figures which showed that in 1894, in their estimation, there was one white man to 17,000 natives. But at the height of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which lasted from 1953 to 1963, in 1961, the ratio had been changed to 1:13. So, that is one aspect of this policy.

The other aspect has to do with land alienation. In all the five countries, the natives were removed from their land, and herded into native areas. In Zimbabwe, these were called "native reserves." I grew up in a native reserve myself, which comprised not more than 25% of the land. The other 75-85% was now in British hands. We had been totally removed.

Freeman: Same as with Kenya.

Mapuranga: Yes, that happened also in Kenya, but not to that extent. In Kenya, it was only what they called the White Highlands: The highlands which were cool and regarded as good for white settlement.

So this explains why, while the rest of British Africa was being given independence on a silver platter, or maybe after a few demonstrations or some strike action, in Zimbabwe we had to fight a liberation war for 14 years, because they said, "This is not black man's territory."

Freeman: From 1965 to 1979?

Mapuranga: From 1966 to 1979.

Freeman: It was a very brutal battle.

Mapuranga: Yes, and you know, at the Lancaster House conference, the peace conference, these talks almost broke down on the question of land. The liberation movements were packing their bags to go back to the bush, to resume the war, when Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said, "I have a compromise proposal. We will not insist that you buy the land."

Because they were insisting that a new government of independent Zimbabwe would have to buy the land from the British settlers. And we were saying, no, this land was not bought from *our* ancestors; it was an act of booty that was taken from us. And we have fought a liberation war: We must get back this land. We cannot pay for this land! It's ours! But we can pay for the development on the land. Say, if the British farmer had built a farm, or has tobacco barns, or whatever development has gone on on the farm, a court will assess the value of that development, and then the government will have to pay compensation for that—but not buying the land. This was the compromise agreement.

Freeman: The compromise was that the British and the Americans would buy the land.

Mapuranga: Yes, because President Jimmy Carter—this was conveyed to us by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance—said that they also would step in and make a contribution to a land reform program. And indeed, Margaret Thatcher did pay money for what they called the Inception Phase of the land reform program. But when her party was defeated in elections in 1989, by the Labour Party of Tony Blair, the new party said that they were not beholden to promises made by the Conservative Party of Margaret Thatcher. And so this was conveyed to us by a letter from Clare Short, the Secretary of the Foreign Office. She said that this is a new government, and we cannot honor the promises made by the old government. And so, the government of Zimbabwe was constrained to amend the Constitution, in order to make it legal for the government to appropriate land, for redistribution.

Freeman: I think the point that is clear, then, is that Tony Blair said, we're not going to participate in this any more, and therefore what the current government did, was give the land to the 15 million Zimbabweans who were living on reserves. This is, I think, what drove the British over the deep end in 2000, to escalate their campaign against President Mugabe.

Mapuranga: Right. So, when we launched the land reform program, we were not actually saying, we don't want the British here. We were saying, let us share this land equitably.

Even as we speak now, we have British farmers in Zimbabwe. It's not like they've all been expelled. But before the land reform program, we used to have the second-largest number of white farmers in Africa, after South Africa. But because we have insisted on a "one man, one farm" policy, the

number of white farmers has gone down, and now we are number three in the whole of Africa. Number one is South Africa; number two is Namibia; we are number three; and Kenya is number four, in terms of the numbers of white farmers.

British Imperial Policy

Freeman: Portia, would you like to jump in, with some questions for the Ambassador?

Tarumbwa Strid: Well, I have a comment. In the organizing here in Europe, what I've noticed around these issues, is that the reason why people do *not* understand what is going on in Zimbabwe, or do not understand the key historical issue of this land question, is that they really do not know who the enemy is. That leads to the fact that they don't know what they should be fighting for.

And I'm talking now on an international scale—because as we speak, what's also making the headlines, especially here in Europe, is the food crisis, and the massive inflation of food prices, which is causing riots and unrest all across the globe. And people have been killed as a result. People are already dying on an enormous scale; but the fact that you see food riots in over 33 countries—this is the breakdown of civilization! And it is only the beginning. And anybody who has a sense of what LaRouche is talking about, when he says that the international financial and monetary system is dead, and that the central banks are now just pumping money, in a hopeless attempt to deal with this—then you know where all this is coming from. They've created a huge inflation of food, because the speculators said, "People are always going to have to eat something, so we can make a profit." And they don't really care very much about the suffering that this produces. They're for globalization and the free-market economy.

What has happened, is that the countries that *were* the leading exporters of grain and wheat, have just said, no, we're not going to go to market, because our people have to eat too. So the market for food has totally run dry! And this has to do with Al Gore's fascist biofuel policy: that suddenly everybody has to stop climate change and drive a car that uses ethanol. (I heard that most cars cannot even use these biofuels anyway!) Food production was diverted to this piece of nonsense, and then the food that was produced was not eaten by people. And the other side to this, is that the farmers who thought they were going to make a killing on this (they did, literally), ended up paying inflated prices for animal feed. So in the end, it just did not tally; they didn't gain anything. This is really a crime against humanity.

So if you can understand *this*, if you can see the face of the enemy in this whole question, then you also see why the media are so hyped up about Zimbabwe. Because any government that tries to go against globalization, or against the IMF, or against the British Empire—it's all one thing—they'll get crushed. And it's part of an operation, really to perpetrate genocide. You have these horrible quotes from Prince Philip, the Royal Consort, or the Royal Pervert—he wrote in a book



EIRNS/Helene Möller

LaRouche Youth Movement organizer Portia Tarumbwa Strid: The reason people don't understand what is going on in Zimbabwe, is that "they really do not know who the enemy is."

from 1988, called *Down to Earth*, how you have to reduce the population by starvation, wars, disease. This is really disgusting stuff. And so you get to a situation, where what the Zimbabwean government is trying to address, or *redress*, in this land reform issue, is this British policy.

I was wondering if Dr. Mapuranga could also go into that a little bit, this whole question of the British Empire.

Mapuranga: In the case of Zimbabwe, you have to understand that the economy that we inherited was an integral part of the Anglo-American economy, and so, very vulnerable to sanctions. When we launched the land reform program, the British prevailed on their allies in the European Union and the Bush Administration, to impose sanctions on Zimbabwe. If you talk about sanctions with people from the British government or the State Department here, they say, "Oh, we have *targeted* sanctions!" Which is not true. They're only referring, in the case of the U.S.A. here, to the Executive Order that is made by the President every year, in which he lists the Zimbabwe leadership that is forbidden to come to the United States, and whose properties may have been nationalized or frozen, or whatever. But they will not talk about the *real*



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Dr. Mapuranga in the studio with *The LaRouche Show* host Lawrence Freeman.

sanctions, which were imposed by Congress in 2001. Because Congress passed a law, called ZDERA (that is, the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act), by which the Secretary of the Treasury instructed all the directors who are U.S. citizens, wherever they are—in the Bretton Woods institutions, in the international finance houses, etc.—to block Zimbabwe’s access to loans, to credits, to debt forgiveness, and so forth. So, they really put the squeeze on the economy. And that also happened in Europe. That explains why Zimbabwe cannot even raise loans on the global market, because of these sanctions.

These sanctions were part of what Tony Blair, the British Prime Minister, when he was addressing the House of Commons in 1994 and also in 2004, was saying: that our policy toward Zimbabwe is “regime change.” In other words, they are funding the opposition—and this is not a secret. You can visit the website of the Westminster Foundation: The three parties in the British Parliament, the Liberals, the Labour Party, and the Tories, or the Conservative Party—they vie with each other to make contributions to the MDC, and what they call “civil society,” the nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in Zimbabwe that are opposed to the government. Here in the United States, you need to read the 2007 reports of the Department of State. They give a global report on human rights. Now, if you go to the section on Zimbabwe, they say the U.S. government spent money on the opposition and the civil society organizations that are opposed to the government. So, they are coordinating their efforts for what they call regime change. And maybe this explains why the British, more than anybody else, have been very much interested in the outcome of the Zimbabwe elections: because they wanted the party which they are sponsoring to win the elections.

A ‘Treasure Trove’ of Raw Materials

Tarumbwa Strid: Absolutely. I can only add to that, that in the *International Herald Tribune*, there was an article yesterday discussing another issue which is very telling, especially right now, that they’re coming out with this: They talk about Zimbabwe as a “treasure trove” for miners. It’s a pedagogical example that I like to use, to get people to understand the land issue in Zimbabwe. If you have the image of two maps (**Figures 1 and 2**), you can imagine a great belt of mineral deposits running through the center of Zimbabwe, diagonally across, over 500 kilometers, with just about everything you can think of—gold, silver, platinum, nickel, tin—

Mapuranga: Diamonds.


Tarumbwa Strid: Right. They were saying, we would love to come in and start mining again, because this for us is an absolute dream!

And then, you think of the land distribution in Rhodesia since about the 1930s, until we gained independence. You have another map, were the white Europeans had their farms, as Dr. Mapuranga was saying. They had the richest soil. If you superimpose these two maps—where you have most of the mineral deposits, and where they had the land that they gave to the white Rhodesians—this is exactly the same, one thing on top of the other.

This is also why the land reform is very contentious, because this is not only in Zimbabwe. Also in Francophone countries in Africa, they realize that if the British are successful in recolonizing Zimbabwe, through their puppet opposition leader, Morgan Tsvangirai, then the rest of Africa is even *more* vulnerable. And that’s why the African leaders actually supported President Mugabe being at the Lisbon summit, the EU-Africa summit last December. They insisted he actually be there, because he represents a *principle*, now more than ever, of the resistance to imperialism, especially British imperialism. And no country that has had a taste of what freedom is like, wants to go back to that. This is another reason that the British hate Zimbabwe so much.

A Campaign of Vilification

Mapuranga: I could add here, they have led a campaign of vilification. When they gave us the Lancaster House Constitution, the first elections in Zimbabwe were organized and supervised by the last governor of the British, Lord Soames. They said these elections were free and fair, and Mr. Robert Mugabe and your party, you have won. Please form the first government of an independent Zimbabwe. And they placed Prime Minister Robert Mugabe on a pedestal, saying this is a paragon of democracy of a statesman. Even Her Majesty the Queen gave him a knighthood, and Zimbabwe was held up as the paragon of democracy. But once the land reform program was launched, they embarked on a campaign of vilification, to say, “There is no democracy in Zimbabwe! This is a dictatorship, this is a tyranny.”



U.S. Air Force/Tech Sgt. Jeremy Lock

Zimbabwe President Robert Mugabe was praised to the skies by the British—even knighted by the Queen—until he began his program of land reform.

break Zimbabwe, is in preparation to do the same thing in South Africa, over the period of 2008, leading up to their election in 2009.

Mapuranga: Yes, I think that is a valid point. You know, the principle that was agreed upon at the Lancaster House conference, and that was implemented for 20 years, was called the “willing seller/willing buyer” principle. It did not succeed in making a substantial redress to the imbalance in land ownership. And this is the same principle that was adopted by democratic South Africa, and also by Namibia, when it gained independence in 1990. In both countries, Namibia and South Africa, the government has declared that the principle is not working. There has to be a conscious and proactive policy to redress the colonial imbalance. And in both countries, the government has started appropriating some land for redistribution. So they actually are following in the footsteps of the Zimbabwe experience.

This is the reason why these countries have been giving solidarity to the people of Zimbabwe, because as Portia was saying, remember the EU-AU summit in Lisbon, the British were saying, we are not going there if Zimbabwe is coming. They were trying to persuade all their colleagues, don’t go to this summit if Zimbabwe is going. But the whole of Africa said, if Zimbabwe is excluded, *we’re not coming to that summit*. And the summit was held in Lisbon, and lo and behold, who was not there? Only Britain! The whole of Europe was there, the whole of Africa was there; only Britain was absent. So, this bilateral quarrel that we have with the British, they have tried to internationalize it, by soliciting the support of their allies in the EU and North America. But so far, Africa has shown tremendous solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe.

Freeman: What do you think will come out of the SADC

conference this weekend? Because obviously, there’s an attempt to pressure the SADC countries, which are the neighbors of Zimbabwe; but on the other hand, this is a sovereign question for the people of Zimbabwe to settle, the outcome of their election.

Mapuranga: I think what is going to happen, is that there is going to be a debriefing session. By this I mean, that at the Dar es Salaam summit last year in March, the heads of state and government gave a mandate to President Thabo Mbeki; now he has to report to them, to say, this is what I’ve done, the process culminated in elections, and this is where we are now. And on the basis of the report by President Thabo Mbeki, they will have to make a determination on what the SADC region has to do.

Freeman: When do you think that report will come out?

Mapuranga: The meeting is today, Saturday. We hope that by Monday we should know what the outcome is.² Incidentally, on Monday we are awaiting the pronouncement by Justice Uchena, who handled the case of the opposition MDC. They appealed to the court to say that they want an *immediate* release of the election results. The ZEC was saying: But we cannot release results which we do not have; we are still *working* on the results. And in any case, we believe that you do not have the competence to make a determination on this matter, because there is an Electoral Court, and the Electoral Court, which is in the Constitution, is the court that was agreed upon in the Mbeki-mediated talks. It is an electoral court where those who are aggrieved, in any election, make their appeals. But Justice Uchena, who belongs to the High Court, said that the High Court even has jurisdiction on these matters. So he seized on the issue; he has already made that pronouncement, that the High Court has jurisdiction of these matters; and second, he has already made the determination that the matter is now urgent, and the ZEC will be told on Monday that it should release the results forthwith, or they have to make a case to say that their work has not been completed.

Freeman: Now the other thing is, that Morgan Tsvangirai has called for a general strike for Tuesday [April 15]. I wanted to get your evaluation of what the purpose of that is, and what will be accomplished.

Mapuranga: Yes. Traditionally—and this is entrenched

2. The SADC summit was a defeat for the British. The communiqué only called for the results of the March 29 election to be released expeditiously, and that the run-off election be held “in a secure environment.” Before leaving for the summit, President Mbeki stated that there was not a “crisis” in Zimbabwe, but a normal electoral procedure.—ed.

in our Constitution and our labor laws—workers have the right to strike. And over the years, they’ve been striking on labor issues: They want more salaries, or the conditions of service are not good. There is collective bargaining, that involves workers, employers, and the government. But what has been happening, is that the opposition party has been using the instrument of workers’ strikes for political purposes. This is the latest example of a strike being called for political purposes, not for labor purposes. In the past, such strikes have not succeeded. The workers did not heed the call for strikes. In fact, they wanted to have, at one stage, the strategy they called “the last push.” They wanted there to be a nationwide strike, to make the country ungovernable, so that there is a revolution from the streets, like what happened in Eastern Europe, where you had the Orange Revolution—these “colored” revolutions. They were calling for that in Zimbabwe. And they did not succeed.

Freeman: I could also add that last week, a member of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, which is a big think-tank here in the United States, which works with the British—a so-called expert on Zimbabwe—said that the opposition party has no leverage *except* to make the country ungovernable. That’s their leverage.³ Of course, that’s what Raila Odinga did in Kenya, which destroyed the country. Kenya is now in a qualitatively worse state than it has ever been, since British rule. And that, I think, is one of the plans they have for Zimbabwe: to make the country ungovernable.

Mapuranga: Yes. That would suit very well the British policy of regime change.

But now that you mention Kenya, I need to say that there is a difference here. As far as the British are concerned—and Kenya was a British colony—it doesn’t really matter if it is Raila Odinga in power, or Mwai Kibaki—both of them are very close allies of the British. In Zimbabwe it is different. We are talking of two different paradigms of development. On the one hand, you have a puppet party, which takes instructions from London, the MDC, which is funded by London; and on the other, you have the party of nationalists, that spearheaded the liberation war, and is saying that the indigenous people should also have a say in the ownership of land, and the mineral resources. They cannot just continue to be laborers in the mines of the British, or on British farms.

These are two diametrically opposed paradigms of development.

A Development Perspective for Africa

Freeman: Portia, did you want to join in?

Tarumbwa Strid: I can just say that what really gets me worked up, is the underlying tenor in the propaganda against Zimbabwe—for example, they insinuate the all-too-racist as-

sumption that Africans cannot really deal with competitive commercial farming. Because today, there is a situation where many countries are not even self-subsisting food producers in Africa. But then, if you would just take the crazy situation with the global food crisis: Really there is no alternative but to develop Africa with massive investments in infrastructure, and advanced technology.

I just want to bring attention to this India-African Union summit that just took place. Africans have always been farmers, and they know how to farm! The huge plantations that were owned by the whites in Rhodesia: They were run, and staffed, by Africans. So you can’t say that Africans cannot farm. But the whole globalization policy of “cash cropping” completely ruined most African countries. In the last couple of decades, you had to plant things like tobacco or cotton, which you can’t eat, and which ruin the soil. So, one of the main points that Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche outlined, in her article that will appear in the next issue of the *EIR* [April 18]—she is the leader of the European movement—she talks about how the world really has to *double* its food production, as soon as possible. And that means that this whole biofuel issue has to be stopped. And it also means, as was discussed in India, that more developed countries should go into agreements with African states, and start building great projects in infrastructure, exactly what Russia and China are doing.

So, instead of the EU, or the U.S. government, grumbling about human rights and so on, I see no reason why they should not do this as well. I mean, we’re going to need highways, railways, canal systems to integrate all the land that’s to be made available for agricultural production. Similar to what Nehru did in the Green Revolution in India.

And here’s a key issue, that’s very important for Africa, because most of the farming is dependent on rainfall. And if there’s no rain, then that’s it! And to alleviate the situation, we need nuclear power—especially the fourth generation, the Pebble Bed reactor that’s being built in South Africa right now. Because it’s safe, it’s perfectly safe, and it’s also perfect for the desalination of water. And we need water management systems, power systems—we have serious energy shortages, especially in Zimbabwe, but in all of Africa. And as Mrs. LaRouche also points out in her article, the best way, and the cheapest way, to safeguard crops, is nuclear irradiation. It keeps away pests and diseases—like environmentalists!—and things like that.

At this point I can hear what most people are thinking who are listening right now: “Oh, it’s very nice what you’re saying, but it will take forever, and it’s a total fantasy.” But I don’t think so. Because in a maneuver, the German defense forces, the Bundeswehr, can build a bridge across the River Rhine in 45 minutes. And if you could have something like an Army Corps of Engineers come in with the consent of the African government, with a crash program, you would train the people to do it on their own.

And I think there’s a new determination of African coun-

3. Michelle Gavin of the CFR made this statement at a forum at the Woodrow Wilson Center for International Studies in Washington on April 9.

tries to take their destiny into their own hands. This impulse is very strong. The problem is, they're not getting any help from the West. And this is something that is a question of political will. We are blessed in Africa with the richest soils you can ever imagine: We could have four harvests in a year! One example is Sudan. In Zimbabwe, it's the same. So, what we need are these projects that the LaRouches have been discussing for a very long time.

As a young African, a young Zimbabwean, what I would wish, is to turn these barren and arid areas in Africa, into blooming gardens. And in that sense, I do admit that I'm a real greenie, as they are called here! Because I know the only way to do it is with nuclear power. That is going to be the issue that should be brought up. I'd be interested to know what Dr. Mapuranga has to say about that.

Freeman: Dr. Mapuranga?

Mapuranga: I think I agree entirely with what she has said. But then you have a situation where the Bush Administration arrogates to itself the power to say who should have access to nuclear technology, and who should not. That's a big problem. And she mentioned the question of agriculture being dependent on rain, and that is true in most of Africa. In Zimbabwe, we now have a Ministry of Water Development, which is concerned with building dams and sinking bore-holes for irrigation purposes. So, I agree entirely with her analysis.

Freeman: I think we've had a very educational show. I want to thank you, Mr. Ambassador, for coming to our studios. Thanks to Portia from Berlin. People can find out more information, at larouchepub.com and larouchepac.com, on our campaigns against the British and the defense of the African nations. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador, it's been a pleasure talking to you.

Zimbabwe: We Are Not a British Colony

In response to the April 16 charge by the rattled British Prime Minister Gordon Brown to the UN Security Council, that President Robert Mugabe has stolen the Zimbabwe election, Patrick Chinamasa, chairman of the Zanu-PF media sub-committee, formerly the Justice Minister) pointed out the absurdity of the charge, saying that the ruling party has never claimed that Mugabe won the election. He said the unofficial results point toward a runoff, since no candidate has enough votes to be a first-round winner, as even the opposition admits.

Chinamasa singled out the British as the source of the problem in Zimbabwe, still today. He charged that Brown continues to treat Zimbabwe as a colonial appendage of the British Empire: "We will tell him clearly and without any ambiguity that we are not a colony of the British. We are not a member of the Commonwealth. Brown has no legal standing to speak authoritatively on the results of the Zimbabwe elections. In speaking in the manner he has done at the Security Council is in order to promote nefarious British interests undermining Zimbabwe's due processes and misleading the international community."

Chinamasa added that false victory claims that the opposition party MDC has been peddling, were nothing but machinations of the British intelligence services to destabilize Zimbabwe. He said that Zanu-PF is calling on the Zim-

babwe Election Commission to "bring to justice and without fail all those that ZEC employed to run the elections who were corruptly paid British pounds to tamper with the electoral process."

Chinamasa also charged that opposition leader Morgan Tsvangirai, along with Brown, are seeking regime change in Zimbabwe, and said that on the part of Tsvangirai, this is "treasonous."

Zimbabwe Minister of Information and Publicity Sikhanyiso Ndlovu said on April 16, "Brown lied about the situation in Zimbabwe," specifying that Brown's efforts to smuggle the Zimbabwean issue onto the UN Security Council agenda was a sign of his desperation to ensure that the MDC ascends to power via the back door: "Brown's theatrics at the UN show that he has forgotten that Zimbabwe is no longer a British colony and he should be reminded that Zimbabwe is aware of his efforts to reverse the gains of the hard-won independence."

Zimbabwe is taking the point in Africa in the fight against the British and City of London financial empire. It has been strongly defended by South African President Thabo Mbeki, in its fight for national sovereignty. Mbeki snubbed Brown before the UN Security Council meeting, because Mbeki understands that the British intention is to undo the sovereignty created by the independence struggles in Zimbabwe and South Africa (as documented by Dr. Mapuranga, in the interview published here), and re-establish colonial-style control over all of Africa. South Africa is the next British target, and Mbeki is now being hit very hard for the role he has played in holding the British gameplan at bay in Zimbabwe.

—Douglas DeGroot

Africa's Geography: Vast Food Potential

by Marcia Merry Baker

This article is excerpted from "Develop Africa's Vast Food Potential with Great Projects," EIR, Jan. 1, 1999.

The maps show selected features of the physical geography of Africa, giving an idea of the vast agricultural potential. There is a notable absence of rugged mountain chains; most of the continent is an upland plateau, with an elevation of 660-3,000 feet in the north, and 3,000-6,000 feet in the south, edged all round by a coastal strip, and no piedmont.

There is extensive arable land. Out of a total land area of 2.13 billion hectares, an estimated 970.2 million is potentially useful for agriculture—172.3 million hectares of arable and permanent cropland, and 797.9 million hectares of permanent pasture. For comparison, South America's total land area is 1.753 billion hectares, with 116.2 million hectares of arable and permanent cropland, and 447.3 million hectares of permanent pasture.

Figure 1 shows the relative amounts of rainfall. The Sahara and the Somali-Ogaden Deserts stand out prominently in the north for "almost no" precipitation, along with the Namib Desert in the far southwest. However, under much of the Egyptian and Libyan deserts, and also in the western Sahara, are water deposits of significant quantities, some dating back to riverbeds of 5,000 years ago. Remote sensing from satellite overflights has located many such potential aquifers. Though much of the water is "fossil water," and not being replenished by rainfall, still the natural underground reservoirs could have a role in a transition period, probably 50 years or less.


A broad band of moderate rainfall of 20 to 60 inches sweeps across west Africa, to central Africa and southward. Depending on the terrain and seasonal distribution of the precipitation, these amounts are favorable to a wide variety of rainfed crops.

Finally, this moderate rainfall zone is banded by lighter rainfall along the north, northeast, and southwestern edges, and in the center, shades into the heavy rainfall belt in the heart of Africa—the huge Zaire (Congo) River basin.

Figure 2 shows the dominant natural vegetation types and gives a profile of agriculture in each region.

Lookin at the rivers and lakes of the continent we see that, in volume, the Zaire River ranks second only to the Amazon River. Africa has 4,184 cubic meters of total run-off, of which only about 3% is "withdrawn" for various uses, for an average

FIGURE 1
Relative Rainfall in Africa



Source: George F. Deasy, et al., *The World's Nations*, New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1958.

per capita utilization rate of 244 cubic meters annually. In contrast, North America has a total run-off of 6,945 cubic meters, with about 10% withdrawn for utilization, giving an average per capita use rate of 1,692 cubic meters. Except for the lower Nile River, very little of the other African river systems have been developed to their potential for productive use.

Four Agricultural Powerhouses

Reflecting these geographic features, there are four main economic regions on the continent: the rain forest in the west, extending to Kenya in the east; the African shield, rich in rainfed farm potential as well as mineral wealth; the northern coastal regions, bordered by the Sahara on the south; and the Sudan-Sahelian region, extending into the Horn of Africa.


With state-of-the-art infrastructure, these regions are each world powerhouses. The following are just some of the agricultural aspects of the development potential.

- *The west-central, heavy rainfall area.* This area could boast one of the world's richest rice bowls, with water management and soil enrichment. In the past, the region was looted for cash crops like cocoa, bananas, palm oil, coconuts, and rubber.

- *The African shield.* Much of this grass and brushland area is known as the southern African corn belt, and with added inputs per hectare, the region is a natural for grain production.

FIGURE 2

Types of Dominant Natural Vegetation in Africa



Source: George F. Deasy, et al., *The World's Nations*, New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1958.

Berlusconi Wins in Italy

Do Not Put New Wine Into Old Bottles

by Claudio Celani

Italy has a new Parliament and a new Prime Minister, Silvio Berlusconi. The coalition led by the media magnate and former premier (2001-06) won the April 13-14 general elections by a 9% margin over his rival, Walter Veltroni, leader of the Democratic Party.

Only four or five factions will be represented in the new Parliament, a revolutionary change, compared with the 29 factions represented in the old one. Remarkably, the “Left-Rainbow” coalition could not get over the 4% barrier for the Chamber of Deputies (8% for the Senate) and will not be represented in the Parliament. The good news is that the Green Party will not be there; the bad news is that several members of the leftist party PRC, who had supported LaRouche’s proposal for a New Bretton Woods, such as Sen. Lidia Menapace and Hon. Gennaro Migliore, are also out. Another major development is that the regional-populist Northern League doubled its votes, becoming the third-largest force.

Constitutional procedures require that the list of ministers be presented to President Giorgio Napolitano, for his approval. But Berlusconi had long since announced that Giulio Tremonti, who supports Lyndon LaRouche’s proposal for a new Bretton Woods system, will be Economics Minister (Treasury, Finance, and Budget). The day after the vote, Berlusconi gave another signal, announcing that European Union commissioner Franco Frattini will become Foreign Minister. Although Tremonti represents a discontinuity in economic policy, Frattini represents continuity in foreign policy.

Tremonti has started a debate on the “end of globalization” and the necessity of a “New Bretton Woods” (see *EIR*, March 28, 2008). In his first TV appearance after the vote, he promised that he will continue the dialogue on such issues with the Left, despite the fact that the Left is no longer represented in the Parliament. *EIR* readers know that Tremonti started that dialogue together with Lyndon LaRouche and PRC representative Alfonso Gianni, in June 2007 in Rome. This led London’s *Financial Times* to attack Tremonti (see box), who answered those threats coming from London on April 16, pointing out that central banks, and not Tremonti, have thrown free-market principles overboard through their ongoing bailout of the system.

Many people have asked Tremonti how it is that an outstanding intellectual such as himself is teaming up with Berlusconi. Tremonti praises Berlusconi’s qualities, but the para-

- *Northern coastal regions.* The Mediterranean littoral is already famous for its output of citrus, dates, olives, winter vegetables, and similar crops, with wheat and small grains in the drier inland regions toward the desert. With additional water, the region can develop as one continuous garden.

In 1992, Libya “turned on the tap” of its national water project, the “Great Man-Made River,” to bring water pumped from under the Sahara, via a giant underground pipeline, to the coast, to relieve the water crisis where saltwater is invading the coastal aquifers.

However, even cheaper and more plentiful water supplies can come from nuclear-powered seawater desalination plants along the Mediterranean. The cost per 1,000 gallons from such a plant, producing a million gallons a day, is less than \$2. These nuclear-desalting plants will never run dry!

- *Sudan-Sahelian region.* This extensive area, characterized by grasslands, has the potential of being the foremost grain and grazing belt of the world. What is required is infrastructure for reliable water, transport, and mechanization. The area is the perfect locale for “man-made” rivers and lakes from a combination of geographic engineering and nuclear-powered desalination, as recommended in the “Oasis Plan” approach outlined by Lyndon LaRouche, for development of the Mideast.

dox remains, and should be explained.

Generally, Italy's governments are an expression of compromises between national interests and foreign dominance, namely the British-steered EU imperial project. The visible representatives of the latter are called in Italy "I Poteri Forti" (Strong Powers), and include a gallery of personalities from the world of finance, media, academia, and others.

The Poteri Forti control factions in every political party, either directly on their payroll, or through ideology. Sometimes, the dividing line even passes through single individuals, who express such a compromise also in terms of culture.

In the case of Tremonti: He is a professor of finance who started his political career as a socialist, and then joined Berlusconi's party, as many socialists did, after the London-ordered destruction of Italy's constitutional parties in 1992-93.

Berlusconi's case presents a different picture. The *Cavaliere* was selected by an oligarchical faction in 1994, to gather the voters who supported the very same parties the oligarchy had destroyed. The basic impulse behind his Forza Italia party was anti-constitutional and pro-free market. The main influence to that effect has been Berlusconi's buddy Marcello Dell'Utri, his partner in the Publitalia firm, and holder of many secrets about Berlusconi's career.

Dell'Utri, who has been sentenced, acquitted, and sentenced and acquitted again, for Mafia connections, has promoted the career of Alessandra Mussolini, Il Duce's granddaughter, and of fascist editor Giuseppe Ciarrapico, both of whom have now been elected in Berlusconi's party.

Sicilian-born Dell'Utri is also a staunch admirer of Mussolini himself. In 2007, Dell'Utri claimed that he had found Il Duce's lost diaries, and he read passages from the alleged diaries in public events, suggesting that Mussolini deserved the Nobel Peace Prize. Dell'Utri represents the typical British fiction that there was a "good" Mussolini, who became corrupted through his alliance with Hitler.

Another key figure in Berlusconi's system of power and connections is Gianni Letta, Berlusconi's former chief of staff (2001-06), who is currently at Goldman Sachs. Letta is going to play a central role in the next government as well.

The Tremonti Challenge for Berlusconi

Despite his oligarchical connections—and despite his personal character—Berlusconi has to adapt to reality and come to terms with institutional and constituency impulses which are anti-oligarchical: for instance, the pro-development impulses coming from industrial interests, represented by Tremonti.

Tremonti's breakthrough during the election campaign, when he brought out the issues of the New Bretton Woods, protecting trade, and the collapse of globalization, has set the stage for a bipartisan dialogue to address issues of national interest. The government will urgently address several of them: the near-bankruptcy of the national airline Alitalia, the waste-disposal emergency in Naples and, foremost, the re-

construction of purchasing power of Italian families. Berlusconi has listed these issues as the priorities of his government; however, he also said that he will be forced to make "unpopular" choices because of the seriousness of the crisis.

The oligarchy will try to prevent such a bipartisan dialogue: Former President Francesco Cossiga, a British asset, warned that if there is a policy of *larghe intese*—policy agreements among the largest number of parties—this will provoke a backlash among the other parties, and a resurrection of terrorism, similar to the Red Brigades terrorism that was unleashed against Aldo Moro's policy of "large entente" in 1978. Cossiga indicated that the "extraparliamentarization" of the radical Left is a potential for that.

Berlusconi can escape his fate, by learning the lessons of Schiller's "Wallenstein." In foreign policy, a promising sign is that the first foreign head of state who met Berlusconi was Russian President Vladimir Putin. Putin visited Berlusconi's private villa in Sardinia on April 17, on his way back from Libya. This is an important signal against the NATO-British strategy for a Great Eurasian War.

Most important, Berlusconi should support Tremonti's intention to promote a New Bretton Woods, announced in the election campaign and endorsed by a large array of forces.

Financial Times Issues Tremonti Death Threat

Tony Barber, writing in the *Financial Times* online edition April 8, issued a not-so-subtle death threat against Italian economist Giulio Tremonti, under the title "Tremonti and the Serpent's Egg."

Quoting Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar." Barber urges free-trade advocates to look at Act II Scene I, where "Brutus, when looking for a reason to justify Caesar's assassination, said that the point wasn't Caesar's actions so far, but the future danger Caesar represented. And therefore, 'think him as a serpents egg/ Which, hatch'd, would as his kind grow mischievous,/ And kill him in the shell.'"

Barber begins by noting that when they first met in 2003, Tremonti was wearing braces (suspenders), smoking a cigar, and looking the part of a finance minister. He lambastes Tremonti's recent book, *Fear and Hope*, which "lashes out at globalisation and condemns the dictatorship of the market," and calls for "a new Bretton Woods." And then Barber ends, "So the message to Tremonti must be: Giulio, wear those braces if you must, but we can't let the serpent's egg of protectionism grow to full size."

Al Gore: Britain's Malthusian Agent

by Scott Thompson and Nancy Spannaus

Has former U.S. Vice President Al Gore properly registered with the U.S. Department of Justice as an agent of a foreign government, under the U.S. Foreign Agents Registration Act? That was the question raised by *Executive Intelligence Review* in its March 16, 2007 issue, and it has yet to be answered. In the face of Gore's current role in the U.S. political and economic policy-making process, including the mooted by London sources, in particular, that he "break the stalemate" in the U.S. Presidential elections, the import of that question looms even larger today.

In the years since he left the White House, Al Gore has taken two major steps toward declaring himself a *de facto* British agent. In November 2004, Gore joined with Goldman Sachs veteran David Blood in founding a London-based investment fund, Generation Investment Management, which insiders affectionately, but accurately, refer to as "Blood and Gore." Gore is chairman of Generation Investment Management, a hedge fund which is devoted to making its mega-profits by denying economic development and sustenance to billions of people in the developing world—through brokering and speculating on so-called carbon swaps. Through the carbon swap system, countries that are being starved to death by lack of electricity, are supposed to trade away their futures for a few shekels—the so-called magic of the marketplace.

Second, on Oct. 30, 2006, at a high-profile press conference, then-British Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown announced that he had hired Gore to "advise the British government on climate change." This declaration has been followed by a mass-brainwashing campaign for a genocidal takedown of industry and agriculture by Gore, not only in the British Isles, but throughout the world.

But, traitorous as these activities are, because of their impact in destroying the economic basis for survival of the Unit-


ed States and rest of the the planet, the core of Gore's anti-American, British agency lies elsewhere. For, as we will document below, Gore's total philosophical commitment lies with the evil, Malthusian, genocidal ideology of British Prince Consort Prince Philip and Crown Prince Charles. It is this anti-human devotion to reducing the world's population by famine, disease, and war, which makes Gore himself a big, fat pestilence, who must be ridiculed off the world stage.

The Princes of Genocide: Philip...

"In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation."

That statement, reported by Deutsche Press Agentur in August 1988, presents in the most concise manner, the commitment of the Duke of Edinburgh, Prince Philip, to genocide against the world's population. In expressing this view—which he also put in writing in the foreword to the book *People as Animals* in 1986—Philip places himself in the tradition of that Fabian genocidalist Lord Bertrand Russell, who had defined alleged overpopulation as the greatest threat to the oligarchical way of life.

It was in 1961 that the World Wildlife Fund (WWF, now the World Wide Fund for Nature) was founded for one stated purpose: to raise money to expand the operations of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The IUCN was a Swiss-based organization, founded in 1948, with the aid of the British Foreign Office. Under the cover of "conserving nature," the IUCN dedicated itself to (1) reduce the world's population, particularly in the developing sector; and (2) ensure that control of the world's raw materials remains in the hands of a tiny handful of large Anglo-Dutch multinationals. To accomplish this, IUCN spokesmen have repeatedly in-



*Did you hear that Al Gore is on the South Beach Diet?
No, really?
Yeah. He just ate South Beach.*

sisted that there must be a world government.

Prince Philip became head of the WWF-UK from the outset. Among his closest collaborators was Sir Julian Huxley, president of the Eugenics Society, and a founder of the IUCN as well. Since Hitler had given eugenics a bad name, Huxley tried to sell his anti-human ideology through “conservation,” as expressed in his statement, “the spread of man must take second place to the conservation of other species.” He brought this same conviction to his role as the first head of the United Nations Education, Social, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

Philip also recruited a card-carrying Nazi into the leadership of the WWF, notably Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands. Bernhard had returned his Nazi Party membership card in a letter to Hitler when he was given the opportunity to marry the Dutch Queen Wilhemina, but betrayed his ongoing senti-

ments by signing the letter “Heil Hitler.” Bernhard was the first head of the WWF-International, while Philip presided over the U.K. branch. After Bernhard was hit by the Lockheed scandals of the mid-1970s, he was replaced first by John Loudon, the former head of Royal Dutch Shell, and then, in 1981, by Philip himself.

As head of the WWF, Philip openly called for population control, calling human population growth “the single most long-term threat to survival.” Treating human beings like animals, he claimed in a 1981 article in *People* magazine: “The more people there are, the more resources they’ll consume, the more pollution they’ll create, the more fighting they will do. We have no option. If it isn’t controlled voluntarily, it will be controlled involuntarily by an increase in disease, starvation and war.”

Philip has also endorsed the long-discredited Malthusian claim that population must outstrip food supply. While his official statements pay obeisance to the idea of merely reducing the rate of growth of population, Philip’s activities—which involve setting up “ecological reserves” that are used to preserve animals and serve as sanctuaries for terrorist insurgencies, campaigning against life-saving major infrastructure projects, and opposing the most fundamental life-saving measures, such as draining swamps—give the genocidal game away.

As time went on, however, clearly the Prince thought he had to find new covers for his genocide policy, including that of religion. In 1986, Prince Philip sponsored a conference in Assisi, Italy, which kicked off a discussion process among all the world’s major religions. By 1996, it had become the Alliance of Religion and Conservation, a grouping still active in inserting the anti-human Gaia cult into the world’s religious communities.

The Prince, now reported to be ailing, officially stepped down as head of the WWF in 1996, but he remains president emeritus of the WWF’s board, according to the website. Unfortunately, he has bequeathed the world a son with the same insane genocidal instincts as his own.

...and Charles

Much has been made of Prince Philip’s sadism toward his older son, Charles, but, despite this, this nut (Charles) did not fall far from the tree. Charles’s views on Malthusianism, environmentalism, and mysticism are very much the same as his father’s, and he has used his royal wealth and prominence to promote this genocidal ideology.

Philip has not been the only influence in turning Charles into an anti-human fruitcake. Crucial in this regard was one Laurens Van der Post, a South Africa-born racist and Jungian, who promoted the idea of the African Bush-man as primeval man, and provided the intellectual cover for turning the nation of Botswana into a series of game preserves. The denial of de-



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

This picture of Britain's Prince Philip, speaking at the Corcoran Gallery of Art in 1996, captures his ghoulish spirit. The profoundly anti-human Philip has created the networks which relate to and sponsor Al Gore.

Below: Philip's son Prince Charles, has been ridiculed as a fruitcake, but his lifework, including nearly 20 years of collaboration with Al Gore, has had a deadly serious impact, by attacking economic development.



velopment to Botswana—now primarily a home to diamond mines and eco-tourism—has been a recipe for outright genocide; life expectancy there has fallen from 65 years in 1990-95, to less than 40 years in 2000-05.

Van der Post took Charles under his wing in the period of 1975 to 1996, putting him through Jungian analysis, and taking him on trips to Africa, specifically the Kalihari Desert of Botswana, where the Prince could absorb the mystical qualities of the desert, the lions, the zebras, and the like (the hyenas?). The effect was clearly lasting, as shown by the Prince's very public and continuous advocacy of environmental frauds such as sustainable development, global warming, and population control. Charles has been called the "green" prince, and has given special attention to combatting high technology in the area of farming—a surefire policy for ensuring mass death.

Enter Al Gore

Gore comes into this picture, at the latest, in 1990. The Tennessee Senator had already been a close colleague of Maurice Strong, a cofounder with Prince Philip of the secretive 1001 Club, the main "piggybank" of the World Wildlife Fund. Strong was the Undersecretary General of the UN Earth Council, and a vice president of the WWF.

Although not a prince by blood, the Canadian Strong is a bona fide oligarch. Born in 1929, he is a member of Queen Elizabeth's Privy Council for Canada, of several international environmental organizations, and on the board of directors of several top-ranking corporations. He has played a leading role in setting up international conferences which have pushed genocidal population control, starting with the Stockholm Conference of 1972, a launching pad for the green fascist agenda. When the LaRouche movement challenged this program at the time, Strong became one of the first oligarchs to publicly attack LaRouche as a danger to the Malthusian plot.

Gore worked closely with Strong on various projects, including the establishment of the Association of Global Parliamentarians, done when Gore was a U.S. Senator. Strong also worked closely with Gore's staff on his first book.

In 1990, however, Gore met the real article, the anti-human Prince Philip. Philip had brought his "religion and conservation" show to the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C. The networks which Philip brought together at that time, overlapped those which Gore consulted in producing his first book, published in 1992, *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*.

In April 1991, Gore had the occasion to meet Prince Charles. Charles held a meeting on his yacht, the *Britannia*,

prior to the United Nations Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The purpose of the meeting was to pull together a strategy for winning agreement at the Earth Summit for a program of anti-development measures, in the name of saving the Earth. The meeting was attended by key international figures and is said to have played a significant role in shaping the biological diversity plank and other elements of the Earth Summit agenda.

The so-called Rio Summit, held in June 1992, promoted the climate change hoax, which is now being used to promote global deindustrialization. Not so coincidentally, this anti-nation-state event occurred at the same time that the British oligarchy was deploying Maggie Thatcher, with her French poodle François Mitterrand, to push European unification through Maastricht—another deliberate plan for deindustrialization and fascism, which laid the basis for today’s Lisbon Treaty. The Summit sponsors, like Strong, were totally committed to destroying the sovereign nation-state. Gore headed the U.S. Congressional delegation, and came back to promote the anti-scientific, anti-development agenda of the meeting.

The content of Gore’s book mirrored the ideas of the Earth Summit, and the population fanatics, who blame the population growth of poor people, rather than the denial of scientific progress, for destroying the Earth. According to Prince Charles’s own testimony, at an event in 2007, Gore’s title *Earth in the Balance* was a very close copy of the Prince’s BBC film, produced slightly earlier, called *Earth in Balance*.

In the foreword to the second edition, issued right before his run for the Presidency in 2000, Gore was more candid than he was in 1992, stating: “None of our measures will fully succeed unless we achieve population stabilization—one of the most important environmental challenges of all. An overcrowded world is inevitably a polluted one. . . .”

Once he was elected Vice President, his activities were a bit more circumscribed, and we know little about his activities at that time with his royal co-conspirators against the human race. We do know that Gore continued to be obsessed by what he considered “overpopulation,” and therefore called for population-control measures when he headed the U.S. delegation to the 1994 UN Conference on Population and Development in Cairo. Gore also played the pivotal role in the 1997 Kyoto Summit, which was aimed at ramming through mandatory “greenhouse gas” controls, and other genocidal measures.

Going After the Green

After he lost the Presidency in 2000, however, Gore began to take a very prominent role in championing his genocidal environmental program. After all its investment in him, the international genocide lobby decided to bring him into the millionaire/billionaire club, where he could profit royally from his love of the green. Like Strong and other corrupt green moguls, Gore was given the opportunity to become

even richer, through scams ranging from the Ponzi scheme called carbon swaps, to “green” industries.

In this period, Gore prepared his fraudulent film and accompanying book, “The Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It,” released in 2006. In October of that year, he got his appointment from Gordon Brown, as “Special Advisor to the Government on Climate Change.” Then came the Nobel Prize, itself a ticket for a \$750,000 chunk of change.

Then, in December 2006, Prince Charles, according to the *Telegraph*, invited Gore to a private meeting at his Highgrove country home, in order to strategize about their shared passion for the environment. The specific subject was preparations for an event which the Prince was soon to sponsor at his St. James Palace, to launch an Accounting for Sustainability project. This project was intended to encourage big business to become more “green,” according to press reports.

Gore could not attend the event in person, but addressed the nearly 200 politicians, businessmen, and others by video, showing them his slideshow, “An Inconvenient Truth.”

Then, during January 2007, the Prince of Wales and his wife toured the United States. On Jan. 28, the Harvard Medical School’s Center for Health and the Global Environment presented the 10th Annual Global Environmental Citizen’s Award to Prince Charles, at the Harvard Club in New York City. Gore, according to press reports, “praised the Prince of Wales’s knowledge and passion, [and] said he and the prince have had conversations about global environment for 20 years.”

Conversations are one thing, but the fact is, that the Prince and the swamp creature have done more than talk. They have shaped the political environment, in a concerted attempt to destroy the legacy of Franklin Roosevelt, a legacy which the United States and world so crucially need today. They have forced through actions which now bring the human race into a crisis which threatens everyone’s future. We can let the British take care of their monarchy—but Americans have a responsibility for that fat hypocrite Al Gore. Ridicule this British agent until he’s out of the limelight!

Richard Freeman contributed research for this article.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Canadian oligarch Maurice Strong, shown here at a Washington, D.C. event in 1997, has been a model for Gore, especially in the art of making millions from corrupt “green” scams.

Mass Death Is Not Inevitable!

Speaking in Monterrey, Mexico on April 18, economist Lyndon LaRouche called on the Mexican population to join the international fight against London, the British agent named Al Gore, and the Prince Philip-sponsored World Wildlife Fund. The battle against the catastrophic food shortage, which has been *created* by the British imperial free-trade system, is the leading edge of the battle for humanity today, LaRouche said. Now that the crisis has broken out, however, nations are already breaking with the British-style World Trade Organization which has fostered this disaster, and the way is open to solving the crisis.

Specifically in Mexico, LaRouche said, there must also be a fight to implement water projects, that have long been on the drawing board, in Northern Mexico, that will create the basis for a rapid expansion of agricultural production. Such great projects are doubly necessary because the global financial breakdown, as it hits the United States, is leading to the repatriation of millions of Mexicans, who will need jobs. The defense of Mexico's agriculture can lead to a huge increase in jobs for those returning workers.

LaRouche also identified the leading opponent of these water projects as the World Wildlife Fund, whose goal is to "preserve the Earth" for its oligarchical sponsors, by ensuring that population is "controlled," and economic development curtailed. Such a program, as we have pointed out for decades, and many of the higher-level spokesmen for these entities admit, will lead to mass death—by famine and war.

How appropriate, then, that the WWF has recently launched a program to "adopt a vampire bat," which can be found on its website's Gift Center page. As its name indicates, the vampire bat sucks the blood of its victim, while secreting an anti-coagulant to ensure that the victim's blood keeps flowing. A perfect description of the Brutish free-trade and anti-human policy which the WWF propounds.

In our next issue, we will report extensively on LaRouche's discussions in Mexico, precisely because the strategic and economic perspective he put forward there, should provide the guidelines for the

global battle to save the world's people from mass death.

We have precious little time to reverse the globalization policies which have led us to the current crisis. Over the past decades, British imperial influences, working through private and government institutions, have succeeded in tearing down virtually all the protections for the world's populations that were put in place during the Franklin Delano Roosevelt period. In their place have come the shock troops demanding depopulation and rule by the "market," supposedly in the interests of helping those most in need. As you can see, just the opposite is the case—and predictably so.

On April 14, LaRouche issued the following preliminary policy guidelines for action:

- Every nation must have the right to self-defense against famine, contrary to the genocidal free trade dictates which have been imposed by the IMF and World Bank. This means the right to carry out export controls, nation-to-nation agreements, and whatever price-fixing measures may be required to guarantee food security to its people.

- A coalition of nations must come together to immediately put measures into effect that will increase food production, and make it available to countries in dire need.

- The biofuel policy pushed by British agent Al Gore must immediately be reversed. This policy is currently wresting food from the mouths of the poor, by using up to 12% of the world's corn harvest, and a large portion of oilseeds, and even wheat, as fodder for wasteful, inherently uneconomical biofuels.

Put these three steps in the context of LaRouche's March 17 three-step program, and we're on our way to durable survival. Those measures are: 1) enact the Homeowners and Bank Protection Act; 2) implement a two-tier credit system to permit long-term development at low interest rates; and 3) establish a new monetary system in collaboration with Russia, China, and India.

Mass death need not be inevitable.

See LaRouche on Cable TV

INTERNET

- LAROCHEPUB.COM Click *LaRouche's Writings*. (Avail. 24/7)
- MNN.ORG Click *Watch Ch.57* Fri: 2:30 a.m.
- RAVITELVISION.COM Click *Live Stream*. Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- SCAN-TV.ORG Click *Scan on the Web*. Sat 2 pm Pac
- WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*. Last Mon 4:30-5 pm (Eastern)

ALABAMA

- BIRMINGHAM BH Ch.4: Wed 11 pm
- UNIONTOWN GY Ch.2: Mon-Fri every 4 hours; Sun Afternoons

ALASKA

- ANCHORAGE GCI Ch.9: Thu 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

- BEVERLY HILLS TW Ch.43: Wed 4 pm
- CLAYTON/CONCORD CO Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm; AS Ch.31: Tue 7:30 pm
- CONTRA COSTA CC Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm
- COSTA MESA TW Ch.35: Thu 5:30 pm
- HOLLYWOOD TW Ch.24: Tue 4:30-5 pm
- LANCASTER/PALMDALE TW Ch.36: Sun 1 pm
- LONG BEACH CH Analog Ch.65/69 & Digital Ch.95: 4th Tue 1-1:30 pm
- LOS ANGELES TW Ch.98: Wed 3-3:30 pm
- LOS ANGELES (East) TW Ch.98: Mon 2 pm
- MARINA DEL REY TW Ch.98: Wed 3 pm; Thu/Fri 4 pm
- MIDWILSHIRE TW Ch.24: Tue 4:30-5 pm
- ORANGE COUNTY (N) TW Ch.95/97/98: Fri 4 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (East) TW Ch.25: Sun 5:30 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (NE) CC Ch.20: Wed 4 pm
- SAN FDO. VALLEY (West) TW Ch.34: Wed 5:30 pm
- SANTA MONICA TW Ch.77: Wed 3-3:30 pm
- WALNUT CREEK CO Ch.6: 2nd Tue 7 pm; AS Ch.31: Tue 7:30 pm
- VAN NUYS TW Ch.25: Sun 5:30 pm

COLORADO

- DENVER CC Ch.56 Sun 10 am

CONNECTICUT

- GROTON CC Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- NEW HAVEN CC Ch. 23: Sat 6 pm

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- WASHINGTON CC Ch.95 & RCN Ch.10: Irregular Days/Times

FLORIDA

- ESCAMBIA COUNTY CX Ch.4: Last Sat 4:30 pm

ILLINOIS

- CHICAGO CC./RCN/WOW Ch.21: Irregular
- PEORIA COUNTY IN Ch.22: Sun 7:30 pm

- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm
- ROCKFORD CC Ch.17 Wed 9 pm

IOWA

- QUAD CITIES MC Ch.19: Thu 11 pm

KENTUCKY

- BOONE/KENTON COUNTIES IN Ch.21: Sun 1 am; Fri Midnight
- JEFFERSON COUNTY IN Ch.98: Fri 2-2:30 pm

LOUISIANA

- ORLEANS PARISH CX Ch.78: Tue 4 am & 4 pm

MAINE

- PORTLAND TW Ch.2: Mon 1 & 11 am; 5 pm

MARYLAND

- ANN ARUNDEL Annapolis Ch.76 & Milleneum Ch.99: Sat/Sun 12:30 am; Tue 6:30 pm
- P.G. COUNTY CC Ch.76 & FIOS Ch.38: Tue/Thu 11:30 am
- MONTGOMERY COUNTY CC Ch.21: Tue 2 pm & Fri 11 pm

MASSACHUSETTS

- BRAINTREE CC Ch.31 & BD Ch.16: Tue 8 pm
- BROOKLINE CV & RCN Ch.3: Mon 3:30 pm; Tue 3:30 am; Wed 9 am & 9 pm;
- CAMBRIDGE CC Ch.10: Tue 2:30 pm; Fri 10:30 am
- FRANKLIN COUNTY (NE) CC Ch.17: Sun 8 pm; Wed 9 pm; Sat 4 pm
- QUINCY CC Ch.8: Pop-ins.
- WALPOLE CC Ch.8: Tue 1 pm

MICHIGAN

- BYRON CENTER CC Ch.25: Mon 2 & 7 pm
- DETROIT CC Ch.68: Irregular
- GRAND RAPIDS CC Ch.25: Irreg.
- KALAMAZOO CH Ch.20: Tue 11 pm; Sat 10 am
- KENT COUNTY (North) CH Ch.22: Wed 3:30 & 11 pm
- KENT COUNTY (South) CC Ch.25: Wed 9:30 am
- LAKE ORION CC Ch.10: Mon/Tue 2 & 9 pm
- LANSING CC Ch.16: Fri Noon.
- LIVONIA BH Ch.12: Thu 3 pm
- MT. PLEASANT CH Ch.3: Tue 5:30 pm; Wed 7 am
- PORTAGE CH Ch.20 Tue/Wed 8:30 am; Thu 1:30 pm
- SHELBY TOWNSHIP CC Ch.20 & WOW Ch.18: Mon/Wed 6:30 pm
- WAYNE COUNTY CC Ch.16/18: Mon 6-8 pm

MINNESOTA

- CAMBRIDGE US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLD SPRING US Ch. 10: Wed 6 pm
- COLUMBIA HEIGHTS CC Ch.15: Wed 8 pm
- DULUTH CH Ch.20: Mon 9 pm; Wed 12 pm, Fri 1 pm
- MARSHALL Prairie Wave & CH Ch.35/8: Sat. 9 am
- MINNEAPOLIS TW Ch.16: Tue 11 pm
- MINNEAPOLIS (N. Burbs) CC Ch.15: Thu 3 & 9 pm

- NEW ULM TW Ch. 14: Fri 5 pm
- PROCTOR MC Ch. 12: Tue 5 pm to 1 am
- ST. CLOUD AREA CH Ch.12: Mon 9:30 pm
- ST. CROIX VALLEY CC Ch.14: Thu 1 & 7 pm; Fri 9 am
- ST. LOUIS PARK CC Ch.15: Sat/Sun/M/T Midnite, 8 am, 4 pm
- ST. PAUL CC Ch.15: Mon 10 pm
- ST. PAUL (S&W Burbs) CC Ch.15: Wed 10:30 am; Fri 7:30 pm
- SAULK CENTRE SCTV Ch.19: Sat 5 pm
- WASHINGTON COUNTY (South) CC Ch.14: Thu 8 pm

NEVADA

- WASHOE COUNTY CH Ch.16: Thu 2 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- MANCHESTER CC Ch.23: Thu 4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

- BERGEN CTY TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- HADDON TWP CC Ch.9: Sun 10 am
- MERCER COUNTY CC Trenton Ch.26: 3rd & 4th Fri 6 pm Windsors Ch.27: Mon 5:30 pm
- MONTVALE/MAHWAH CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm
- PISCATAWAY CV Ch.22: Thu 11:30 pm
- UNION CC Ch.26: Irregular

NEW MEXICO

- ALBUQUERQUE CC Ch.27: Thu 4 pm
- LOS ALAMOS CC Ch.8: Wed 10 pm
- SANTA FE CC Ch.8: Thu 9 pm; Sat 6:30 pm
- SILVER CITY CC Ch.17: Daily 8-10 pm

NEW YORK

- ALBANY TW Ch.18: Wed 5 pm. TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- BETHLEHEM TW Ch.18: Thu 9:30 pm
- BRONX CV Ch.70: Wed 7:30 am
- BROOKLYN CV Ch.68: Mon 10 am TW Ch.35: Mon 10 am TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- CHEMUNG TW Ch.1/99: Tue 7:30 pm
- ERIE COUNTY TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm
- IRONDEQUOIT TW Ch.15: Mon/Thu 7 pm
- JEFFERSON/LEWIS COUNTIES TW Ch.99: Irregular
- MANHATTAN TW & RCN Ch.57/85 Fri 2:30 am
- ONEIDA COUNTY TW Ch.99: Thu 8 or 9 pm
- PENFIELD TW Ch.15: Irregular
- QUEENS TW Ch.35: Tue 10:30 am; TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- QUEENSBURY TW Ch.71: Mon 7 pm
- ROCHESTER TW Ch.15: Sun 9 pm; Thu 8 pm
- ROCKLAND CV Ch.76: Mon 5 pm

- SCHENECTADY TW Ch.16: Fri 1 pm; Sat 1:30 am
- STATEN ISLAND TW Ch.35: Thu Midnite. Ch.34: Sat 8 am. Ch 572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- TOMPKINS COUNTY TW Ch.13: Sun 12:30 pm; Sat 6 pm
- TRI-LAKES TW Ch.2: Sun 7 am, 1 pm, 8 pm
- WEBSTER TW Ch.12: Wed 9 pm

NORTH CAROLINA

- HICKORY CH Ch.3: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Sat/Sun 11 pm

OHIO

- AMHERST TW Ch.95: Daily 12 Noon & 10 pm
- CUYAHOGA COUNTY TW Ch.21: Wed 3:30 pm
- OBERLIN Cable Co-Op Ch.9: Thu 8 pm

OKLAHOMA

- NORMAN CX Ch.20: Wed 9 pm

OREGON

- LINN/BENTON COUNTIES CC Ch.29: Tue 1 pm; Thu 9 pm
- PORTLAND CC Ch.22: Tue 6 pm. Ch.23: Thu 3 pm

RHODE ISLAND

- E. PROVIDENCE CX Ch.18: Tue 6:30 pm
- STATEWIDE RI I CX Ch.13 Tue 10 pm

TEXAS

- HOUSTON CC Ch.17 & TV Max Ch.95: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am
- KINGWOOD CB Ch.98: Wed 5:30 pm; Sat 9 am

VERMONT

- GREATER FALLS CC Ch.10: Mon/Wed/Fri 1 pm
- MONTPELIER CC Ch.15: Tue 9 pm; Wed 3 pm

VIRGINIA

- ALBEMARLE COUNTY CC Ch.13: Sun 4 am; Fri 3 pm
- ARLINGTON CC Ch.33 & FIOS Ch.38: Mon 1 pm; Tue 9 am
- CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CC Ch.6: Tue 5 pm
- FAIRFAX CX Ch.10 & FIOS Ch.10: 1st & 2nd Wed 1 pm; Sun 4 am. FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- LOUDOUN COUNTY CC Ch.98 & FIOS Ch.41: Wed 6 pm
- ROANOKE COUNTY CX Ch.78: Tue 7 pm; Thu 2 pm

WASHINGTON

- KING COUNTY CC Ch.29/77: Tue 10 am
- TRI CITIES CH Ch. 13/99: Mon 7 pm; Thu 9 pm
- WENATCHEE CH Ch.98: Thu 1 pm

WISCONSIN

- MARATHON CH Ch.10: Thu 9:30 pm; Fri 12 Noon
- MUSKEGO TW Ch.14: Sat 4 pm; Sun 7 am

WYOMING

- GILLETTE BR Ch.31: Tue 7


M50 Codes: AS=Astound; BD=Beld; BR=Bresnan; BH=BrightHouse; CV=Cablevision; CB=Cebridge; CH=Charter; CC=Comcast; CX=Cox; GY=Galaxy; IN=Insight; MC=MediaCom; TW=TimeWarner; US=US Cable. FIOS=Verizon FIOS-TV.

To get The LaRouche Connection on your local cable TV system, call Charles Notley at 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. For more information, visit our Website at <http://www.larouchepub.com/tv>.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Youth Movement, we are changing politics in Washington, day by day.

EIR Online

Issued every Tuesday, EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



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

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360** for one year
 - \$180** for six months
 - \$120** for four months
 - \$90** for three months
 - \$60** for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

Name _____
Company _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____
Phone (_____) _____
E-mail address _____

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 _____