


EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

December 18, 2009 Vol. 36 No. 49 www.larouche.com \$10.00

LaRouche Youth Candidates To 'Educate' Mass Strike
Shut Down Dubai's Drug and Terror Cesspool
Obama's Af-Pak Policy: A Fallacy of Composition

Copenhagen: They Tried Nazis
At Nuremberg, Didn't They?



Keep Up with 21st CENTURY SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Featured in the Summer 2009 issue

■ SCIENCE FOR LEGISLATORS

Is the Fear of Radiation Constitutional?

by Laurence Hecht

A primer to help the present majority of misinformed policymakers and citizens to learn the truth about radiation, and the wonderful power for good that it holds out for mankind.

■ Thoughts on Fusion Energy Development After a Six-Decades-Long Love Affair

by Richard F. Post

A fusion pioneer reviews 60 years of fusion history, and proposes the axisymmetric tandem mirror as a fast track to achieving ignition with magnetic confinement fusion, bypassing some of the problems with large tokamaks.

■ INTERVIEW: RICHARD F. POST

A Fusion Pioneer Talks About Fusion and How to Get There

SPECIAL REPORT

■ With DDT Spraying, Malaysia Can Show The World How to Control Dengue

by Mohd Peter Davis

A Malaysian scientist proposes a pilot project to test a program using DDT to control dengue.

■ The True Story of DDT

by Przemyslaw Mastalerz

A chemist looks at the voluminous scientific literature, and concludes that DDT is not hazardous to human health.

Also included

NUCLEAR REPORT

■ Downwinders Deluded And Waiting to Die

by Daniel Miles

Excerpts from Miles's book, *The Phantom Fallout-Induced Cancer Epidemic in Southwestern Utah*.

■ The Secret of the Supercentenarians

by Rick Sanders

■ Malaysia Is Going Nuclear!

by Mohd Peter Davis



- **GLOBAL WARMING UPDATE** Compiled by Gregory Murphy
- **Book reviews** of Krafft Ehrlicke's *Extraterrestrial Imperative* by Marsha Freeman; *Sun in a Bottle: The Strange History of Fusion and the Science of Wishful Thinking* by Charles Seife; *Sunken Realms: A Survey of Underwater Ruins from Around the World and a Complete Catalog of Underwater Ruins* by Karen Mutton; and *Uranium: War, Energy, and the Rock That Shaped the World* by Tom Zoellner



Subscribe!

Electronic subscriptions are \$25 for 6 issues, \$48 for 12 issues. Single electronic copy is \$5.

Available at www.21stcenturysciencetech.com or send check/money order to

21st Century
P.O. Box 16285, Washington, D.C. 20041

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 Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Science Editor: Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Graphics Editor: Alan Yue

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: John Hoefle, 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 Almarino

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Rubén Cota Meza

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maitra

Paris: Christine Bierre

Stockholm: Hussein Askary

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

Editor, Arabic-language edition: Hussein Askary

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: ©2009 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

As Denmark's beloved poet, Hans Christian Andersen, might observe of any and all of the world leaders, including notably, President Obama himself, gathering in Copenhagen for the Climate Change Summit this week, "The Emperor has no clothes on." In his interview with *EIR* at the Summit, Lord Christopher Monckton, the famous opponent of the global warming hoax, and self-described "loyal subject to her Majesty," observed that the British Empress Elizabeth seriously exposed herself by "speaking out of turn and against her constitutional requirement not to intevene into politics." Indeed, as all this show, the empire is tottering.

That ship of fools and evildoers, as described by Nancy Spannaus (p. 4), intends to carry out Prince Philip's nightmare scenario: to reduce the world's population by as many as 5 billion souls. This is the real agenda at Copenhagen, and the phony "climate change" mantra was invented precisely to bring it about. From the ghoulish Dennis Meadows' 1972 *Limits to Growth*, to today's U.S. Environmental Protection Agency head Lisa Jackson, who cites population growth as the cause of "global warming," the Orwellian kooks are all coming out of the woodwork, on behalf of the Empire's drive for a global dictatorship, in a mad, last-ditch attempt to save their rotting hulk of a system. Helga Zepp-LaRouche nails it in her leaflet, titled, "Climate Swindle: Do You Really Want World Dictatorship?" which is now circulating at the Summit.

John Hoefle's *Economics* report on "The LaRouche Plan" (p. 14) makes it clear that there is still time, however short, to rescue the people of Planet Earth, by carrying out those measures, elaborated by Lyndon LaRouche over decades, and honed to precision since Summer 2007: an international credit system, to replace the bankrupt British-run international monetary system, and a return to the FDR-era Glass-Steagall standard in banking, including the outlawing of derivatives. Michele Steinberg's *Investigation* of the Dubai hot-money blowout provides the counter-example (p. 16).

How, then, to force our government to join Russia, China, and India, in a Four Power agreement to create a new, just world economic order? Meet the three LaRouche Congressional candidates who are campaigning to educate the ongoing U.S. mass strike, and unseat London and Wall Street's pet lawmakers, in the 2010 election (p. 24).



Cover This Week

The LaRouche Youth Movement in Australia joined a protest rally against the climate change fraud, in the capital, Canberra, last August. Their banner is seen at the top.



CEC

- 4 Copenhagen: They Tried Nazis at Nuremberg, Didn't They?**
The real agenda of those behind the “climate change” hoax is coming out in the open at the Copenhagen Summit on Climate Change: population reduction.
- 6 Climate Swindle: Do You Really Want World Dictatorship?**
A leaflet by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, circulated at the summit.
- 8 The Queen, Copenhagen, and ‘Climate Change’**
An interview with Lord Christopher Monckton.
- 9 EPA Head Lisa Jackson Backs Climate Genocide**
- 10 Organizing in Copenhagen: Stop the Genocide! Go with LaRouche Plan!**
- 12 The Greens Are a Sinister Movement**
An interview with Martin Durkin.

Economics

14 The Only *Real* Reform Measure Is the LaRouche Plan

By addressing the economic/financial crisis from the highest standpoint, the LaRouche Plan provides both the roadmap to lead the world out of this mess, and a standard by which to judge the efficacy of the various reform proposals that others are putting forward.

Investigation

16 Shut Down Dubai's London/Saudi Drug and Terror Cesspool

The publicity given to the Dubai government's refusal to bail out its own Dubai World company, a huge real estate and tourism enterprise, has obscured the real story: Dubai is the pivot for Afghanistan-based drug trafficking, a black market beyond black markets, which is controlled by the City of London and the Saudi financier elite. Michele Steinberg reports.

National

24 **LaRouche Youth Candidates To ‘Educate’ Mass Strike**

A new era in U.S. politics was initiated on Dec. 3, when Lyndon LaRouche announced that three members of the LaRouche Youth Movement will run for Congress in Democratic Party primaries.

27 **‘The Future: Mars or the Scrap Heap’**

By LaKesha Rogers, running in Texas; the incumbent is Republican Pete Olson.

28 **Let’s Put a New Face on Congress**

By Summer Justice Shields, running in California against Nancy Pelosi.

29 **Bailout Barney: ‘You Won’t Duck Me Again!’**

By Rachel Brown, running in Massachusetts against Barney Frank.

International

30 **Obama’s Second Af-Pak Policy: A Fallacy of Composition**

While Obama’s West Point speech on his Afghanistan policy was, to a certain extent, an acknowledgment of the reality that the U.S. cannot win the war there, it nevertheless misrepresented that reality.

34 **Ghosts Behind Obama’s Afghanistan Surge**

The LaRouche Show

36 **Trash Global-Warming Genocide; Look to Indo-Pacific Frontier!**

Glen Isherwood of Australia’s Citizens Electoral Council and the LaRouche Youth Movement joins *EIR*’s Ramtanu Maitra and host Marcia Merry Baker to discuss how “the British Empire is going down.”

Interviews

8 **Lord Christopher Monckton**

Lord Monckton, a leading international spokesman against the climate change hoax, was science advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher during the 1980s.

12 **Martin Durkin**

Mr. Durkin, of the United Kingdom, is the director of such widely viewed documentaries as “The Great Global Warming Swindle” and “Against Nature.”

Editorial

48 **Obama’s 1984**

Copenhagen: They Tried Nazis At Nuremberg, Didn't They?

by Nancy Spannaus

Dec. 14—As the Copenhagen Summit on Climate Change (COP15) enters its decisive second week, the depopulation policies of Britain's Prince Philip, who, in his own words, wants to be reborn as a deadly virus in order to better assist in reducing the world's population by 80%, have now virtually been placed on the agenda in Copenhagen. One official after the other, including U.S. Environmental Protection Agency head Lisa Jackson, is putting forward the thesis that it is population growth which is causing the alleged threat of global warming—leaving one to draw the conclusion that it is by reducing population, that the problem could be resolved.

The argument itself is a fraud, just as much as that of Britain's Parson Thomas Malthus was two centuries ago, and as is the now-exposed pseudo-science behind so-called anthropogenic global warming. But the organizers behind the COP15 are determined to ram it through, by getting agreements for a de facto global dictatorship to police and reduce carbon emissions, until they reach the level of the "pre-industrial" age. At a pre-industrial level of technology, mankind's population must be reduced by *billions*—genocide!

As Lyndon LaRouche put it this week, those pushing the COP15 agreements for binding agreements (on any section of the world) to reduce and enforce carbon reduction, are advocating policies worse than Hitler's. They should be prepared to face a Nuremberg Tribunal.

Targetting Population

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), in its "State of World Population Report 2009," which was presented in Copenhagen on Nov. 18, makes the unabashed argument that global warming can only be reined in by means of a massive reduction of the world population.

On the panel presenting the report was Roger Martin, the Director of the Optimum Population Trust (OPT), a group which claims, with aid of a recent study by the London School of Economics, that the cheapest way to solve the so-called crisis of global warming, would be to reduce the world population by 500 million by the year 2050. Various projections show that by 2050, the world population would climb to over 9 billion. Thus, the proposal to reduce the world population to 6 billion (far less even than today's 6.7), means the elimination of 3 billion people!

In a March 16, 2009 press release, the OPT went further, saying that it believes the world's sustainable population to be only 5 billion! In a separate statement, the OPT demanded that population reduction be placed at the top of the Copenhagen agenda.

These numbers of persons targetted for elimination are greater, by several orders of magnitude, than those killed by the Nazis who were in the dock 60 years ago at the Nuremberg Trials.

As usual, the British Empire is using its old tricks, to try to get its agenda through. Aware that China, India,

Brazil, and many Third World countries had come to an agreement a few weeks ago, to resist any binding agreements for reduction of their own greenhouse gases, on pain of their walking out of the conference altogether, the British are seeking to break up their unity. In addition, the Empire is trying to entice financially desperate developing countries to accept a global dictatorship by use of bribes. Those who think they are smart to accept whatever monies are offered, with the delusion they can renege on their pledges after they've gotten the money, will be cutting their own populations' throats.

Global Dictatorship

While the shape of the global dictatorship being planned is also being hidden, outspoken opponents of the climate fraud such as Lord Christopher Monckton are taking the point in exposing it. After getting the UN bureaucracy (after much resistance) to release to him the 180-page draft treaty, Monckton went to the media to denounce it as an attempt to set up a world government, although not by using the name. Power to police greenhouse gas emissions, and to collect huge sums of money to "fund" measures to deal with climate change, would be given to supranational agencies, he charged.

On top of the well-known swindle called cap-and-trade, these international bureaucracies would collect taxes directly, either through an international transaction tax, or taxes on carbon emissions. In this way, the longtime Keynesian proposal for a world bankers' dictatorship could be achieved.

Trying To Save Their System

It is only by understanding that the global financial system is hopelessly bankrupt, that one can explain how all sorts of strange creatures have the audacity to come crawling out of the woodwork now to express their genocidal ideas. So, it comes as no surprise, that one of the masters of manipulation by means of rigged computer programming, namely Dennis Meadows, the infamous co-author of *The Limits to Growth*, should add his voice to the clamor. It was in this 1972 study for the Club of Rome, that Meadows and his co-authors specifically excluded the role of human creativity in defining new raw materials. Through his intentional manipulation of the public, the book became an icon of the environmentalist movement.

And what wisdom does Meadows offer us today? In an interview with the German magazine *Spiegel* of Dec. 9, 2009, he said, "We have to learn to live a life that

allows for fulfillment and development with the CO₂ emissions of Afghanistan." Asked what this means for population, Meadows replied: "Even 7 billion people is too much for this planet. . . . If everybody is allowed to have the full potential of mobility, nourishment and self-development, it's 1 or 2 billion." That's an outrageous lie—and a genocidal one at that.

Also newspapers, such as the London *Financial Times*, or the *Financial Post* of Canada, have exposed their proposals for radical family planning, and even a worldwide one-child policy. Shall the future be a world only of old people? No, thanks! The most perverse contribution was definitely that of the German-language edition of *National Geographic*, in an article on the Hadza tribe of Tanzania, a people that today live as hunters and gatherers, just as in the Stone Age. The author writes that the question of sustainability confronts us with "the ever so sober, as well as unavoidable question: Can we, indeed, must we not learn from the Hadza?" Are we supposed to go back to a population potential of around 10 million?!

The British-based depopulation lobby has not changed one whit from their murderous agenda, expressed in the 20th Century through the eugenics lobby, and its spokesman, the late Julian Huxley, who ran UNESCO. The depopulators have been consistently frustrated in getting a global regime to enforce population cuts—the last time, in Cairo in 1994. Now, they are simply using the scientific hoax called "climate change" to go for the same objective.

The Alternative

If this conference in Copenhagen has had any use at all, it is that it has brought the genocidal agenda of organizations such as the OPT and the UNFPA into the light of day. It is this agenda that must be rejected with full force.

The systemic crisis of globalization, which is escalating daily, allows for only one useful discussion: how to create a new, just world economic order, in the quickest manner possible. The only realistic proposal, is that put forward by American economist Lyndon LaRouche—that the four most powerful nations of the planet, namely Russia, China, India, and the U.S.A. of Franklin Roosevelt, replace the currently bankrupt monetary system, with a credit system.

President Roosevelt's intention for the Bretton Woods System, to end colonialism for all time, must now be realized!

Climate Swindle: Do You Really Want World Dictatorship?

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Dec. 8—This leaflet was issued by the Schiller Institute, of which Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche is the international founder and the president in Germany. It was translated, and subheads and footnotes were added by EIR.

With unprecedented audacity, a clique of climate scientists, a majority of the media, and an array of governments are trying to uphold the fairy tale of anthropogenic climate change, even though the recently published e-mails from East Anglia University have totally confirmed the suspicion of innumerable serious scientists that there is no evidence for global warming.

The reason for this is obvious: Today's monetarist system of globalization is several orders of magnitude more bankrupt than the communist system was in 1989. The British Empire is especially desperate. The crisis in Dubai and other pending state bankruptcies make clear that a second wave of insolvencies threatens to collapse the whole bankrupt system—and this time the financial oligarchy does not assume that the taxpayers in all countries are prepared to pay off the gambling debts of those who have been accumulating even more of them in grand style.

So, what is happening in Copenhagen? It is nothing less than an effort to establish a world dictatorship, to fund the gambling casino in a new way, and to give an environmentalist cover to the long-desired goal of population reduction.

Monckton: 'A Bureaucratic Coup'

Listen to what Lord Monckton¹ had to say in Berlin on Dec. 4:

"The Copenhagen Treaty says that it is going to establish a world government. This has been an ambition

1. Britain's Lord Christopher Monckton is a leading opponent of the "climate change" hoax internationally. See interview, p. 8.

of certain bureaucrats, certain political groupings, fascists, freemasons, marxists, for hundreds of years. All these different groups, all at once or one after another, wanted to achieve world domination. Previously it was thought it might happen by force, by military force. Now they found a way of doing it by what one might call a bureaucratic coup d'état in the name of saving the planet which doesn't need to be saved. There is no threat to the climate. They have decided that they can persuade even the free nations of the West to give up their democracy, give up their freedom, and transfer all ultimate economic as well as environmental power to an unelected world government.

"When Sir Maurice Strong first created the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in the UN, he created it not as a scientific body, but as a political entity. He said at the time that he hoped that this would become the nucleus of a world government. The whole idea of world government, according to people like Sir Maurice Strong, is not to trust the people. What they will talk of is that there has been market failure, in that the policies and freedom and successes of the free market and of capitalism have led to the poisoning of the planet with CO₂, and therefore we need to take democracy away, so that the institutions of democracy, which include the stock markets and companies which flourish best under freedom, all of those will in future be under the thumb of a tyranny.

"It won't seem brutal initially, but it will be extensive. It will stifle freedom in exactly the way that we have already begun to see with the European Union, where there is a European parliament, but it cannot propose legislation. If it decides something, it can be overruled by the commissars. If it wishes to amend legislation, only the commissars, who are unelected, can give it permission. So Europe already has a kind of regional model of what will become a world government with far greater powers even than the EU over the individual nations of the world. It will be a sad day for freedom and democracy if that treaty proceeds at Copenhagen in only a few days' time.

"The Climate-gate Affair, the revelation that all the leading scientific institutions and leading scientists around the world have been bending, inventing, fabricating, contriving, altering, hiding and destroying scientific data, will, if anything, put even more pressure on the world leaders who want a dictatorial world government, to act in haste, and push it through before too



EIRNS/James Rea

Lord Christopher Monckton interviews greenies rallying outside a conference on “climate change” in Berlin on Dec. 4. He also intervned at the Copenhagen Conference, and addressed a counter-conference of the Nongovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in the same city.

many people find out about Climate-gate. At the moment, the mainstream news media have indulged in what might be almost called a conspiracy of silence, not to admit these e-mails exist, and if they have to admit they exist, as the BBC did one month after receiving them (but only after other people had mentioned it first), the BBC and most of the news media have still not said what is in these e-mails.

“So, the world political leaders who want to create a world government will try, and try really hard, extra hard as a result of Climate-gate, to push it through before it’s too late. Once people find out what you and I know, they will not want any kind of world government, because they would realize the climate is not at risk; that’s always been a fabrication, and those who are using that fabrication to close our liberties down, must not be allowed to get away with it.

“They have certainly destroyed data that had been validly requested under the British FOIA. That is a criminal offense, for which I think the professor in charge of it, and possibly one or two other officials there, including the FOIA-official at the University of East Anglia, will be prosecuted, and they will be heavily fined. I can’t see how they can get out of it, given

the very clear content of their e-mails, one of which is Professor Jones writing to his colleagues all over the world, saying, ‘Please, destroy your data, because otherwise we will have to give it to these people.’ That is an outrage, and he must not be allowed to get away with it. I hope that he will be prosecuted, convicted, and fined.

“I think that Prof. Rahmsdorf will be there, I imagine Prof. Schellnhuber will be there. I have heard Prof. Rahmsdorf’s lecture, and I have noticed in his slides that he never used a peer-reviewed source. He always used a website called re-allocate.org; and what is that website? It is the website of this poisonous network of dishonest scientists to which Rahmsdorf and Schellnhuber belong; to

which Jones belongs, Hansen and Schmidt of NASA belong; Tom Karl, who runs the National Climatic Data Center in the United States—Kevin Trenburt, who wrote the landmark paper in 1997 on the Earth’s radiation budget—all of these people are connected by these e-mails. We have always suspected they were connected, and of course we have never been able to prove it, but now we can. . . .

“I described how at various stages in the previous evolution of the climate scare, people had bent, distorted and invented the data, used corrupt mathematical procedures, used incorrect science, deliberately pushed things only in one direction, a false direction towards greater alarm than there should be. There is nothing wrong with the climate, we are having virtually no effect on it, but they wanted to tell another story, for financial reasons because they all got rich on this. . . .”

The fact that the majority of German industry adopted environmentalist technology long ago, and obviously intends to remain “market-leaders” in this area, which is based on totally false scientific assumptions, changes nothing about the blindness of their members.

Singer: ‘Everybody Will Lose’

Listen to what (to offer an exact description) Fred Singer² had to say at the same conference in Berlin:

“The final word I have is for those of you who are concerned about Germany and the economy of Germany. I have here something which was put out by the BDI [Federation of German Industry]. They accept every bit of nonsense from the IPCC! How is it possible that people who are educated, maybe even have engineering degrees, can go along with this kind of nonsense? They think that perhaps they will benefit from it. They will not! Everybody will lose. Everyone here will lose, and it is a shame that these things can happen. I read the names of some of the people: Keitel, Löscher, and Schulz.

“First of all, it is clear that we have no climate problem, and certainly no climate problem that can be tackled by human efforts. The question is: Why all this excitement? What is going on? And if you look into it closely, you can see that it is a question of money and power. I’m not into this business, but it is useful for those of you who are in the press or in the media to find out who benefits from all of this and who loses. Well, I can tell you who loses: the population as a whole.

“Now, what is the great disappointment to us from outside of Germany is to see what has happened here in this country when the government changed. We had expected and hoped for a change similar to what has happened, let’s say, in Australia in the last week, when they turned down cap and trade, the Emissions Trading System, decisively. We would think the same thing will happen in the United States. Here we find that the Black-Yellow [Christian Democratic-Free Democratic] government is following steps that are no different from the Red-Green [Social Democratic-Green]; in fact, it’s worse. A 40% cut by 2020? That is ridiculous! It doesn’t make sense.”

This monstrous dumbing down of the population must stop. There is only one reasonable theme to be discussed in Copenhagen, namely, how the greatest systemic crisis in the history of mankind can be overcome, how the poverty which cries to heaven, in which more than half of mankind lives, can be overcome.

The only practicable concept for doing that, has been proposed by Lyndon LaRouche, with his Four-Power alliance for a new credit system.

2. An American atmospheric physicist who has held many government and academic posts, and currently heads the private Science & Environmental Policy Project.

Interview: Lord Christopher Monckton

The Queen, Copenhagen, And ‘Climate Change’

Britain’s Lord Monckton was science advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher during the 1980s. Stephan Ossenkopp interviewed him at the International Conference on Climate Change, in Berlin on Dec. 4, 2009. The conference was sponsored by the Institute for Entrepreneurial Freedom (Institut für Unternehmerische Freiheit, IUF), the European Institute for Climate and Energy (EIKE), the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), and the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT).

EIR: Environmentalism and the climate change theory have been the main obstacle to industrializing the poor regions of the world. With that obstacle gone, should we not turn towards these poor countries and make them an offer to allow them to industrialize quickly?

Monckton: Of course it is not our gift to allow them to industrialize; it is theirs to allow themselves to industrialize. What they must do is no longer be cowed and bullied by the UN and by the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change] and by these bogus scientists with their bogus theories. They must say, “No, we do not need to worry about saving the planet anymore; those days are over. Therefore, if want to build fossil-fueled power stations, we will do it for the sake of lifting our people out of poverty.”

That is the line which is being taken by China, South Africa, Brazil and India. They are taking a joint stance by saying, “We will not have any compulsory limit of our emissions. We will not have any mitigation actions at all, unless somebody else pays for them. And we will not have anyone come in and inspect what we do in mitigation unless somebody else has paid for that miti-



EIRNS/Michelle Rasmussen

gation.” And they have also said, “We will not allow the climate to be used as an excuse or a barrier to free trade.”

All of those four policies I think are very sensible policies, which all the countries of the Third World should endorse and take up and follow. They should no longer be bullied by the West.

EIR: The Queen gathered 53 heads of state in Trinidad recently and made the point that the British Commonwealth should gain a global perspective through the Copenhagen Conference. What is this all about?

Monckton: This is the first time that Her Majesty has spoken out of turn and against her constitutional requirement not to intervene into politics, since she took the throne. This is a very sad day. I am a very loyal subject to Her Majesty. She should not have said what she said. Of course, one cannot ask her to withdraw it now that it has been said, but what one can ask, is that she had better not ever say anything of that character again, in one direction or



Commonwealth Secretariat/Plc. Kenroy Ambris
Queen Elizabeth II and Prince Philip in Trinidad and Tobago, Nov. 26, 2009. Her speech there in support of the Copenhagen Conference, said Lord Monckton, made it “a very sad day.”

another. That is not her place as a constitutional monarch. And she must remember that, or she will lose our loyalty—and then she will lose the throne.

EPA Head Lisa Jackson Backs Climate Genocide

Dec. 7—In a declaration today that carbon dioxide, a harmless gas essential to life, “threatens the public health and welfare of current and future generations,” the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) claimed for the Obama regime dictatorial power to genocidally cut economic activity. In anticipation of this, Fred Singer, the first director of the U.S. Satellite Meteorology Service, had said in April that “this finding, if acted on, would be like dropping an atomic bomb on the economy.”

EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson claimed in today’s press conference that the U.S. Supreme Court had ordered the EPA to make such a finding in a 2007 decision concerning the 1970 Clean Air Act, and that, having now made the finding, the EPA is now legally obligated to issue regulations cutting down carbon dioxide emission, i.e., agriculture and industry.

In reality, the President can stop any such “findings” or regulations; that is why no such “finding” was issued for two years after that Supreme Court decision.

By issuing that lying “endangerment statement” now, the Obama Administration is trying to threaten the U.S. Senate with unilateral actions to shut down what remains of the U.S. economy, if it fails to pass the “cap-and-trade” monstrosity. The Administration is also positioning itself to force Third World nations, at Copenhagen, to commit *hara-kiri* via “emissions limits.” All this, under the orders of Obama’s British controllers, especially Prince Philip’s frankly genocidal Worldwide Wildlife Fund.

As Lyndon LaRouche said, either EPA chief Jackson has no idea what she is talking about, or she is lying wildly. To the exposure of the fraud of the global warming “science” via the leaks from East Anglia and otherwise, she could only reply with the phantasmagoria of “polar ice caps crumbling into the oceans, changing migratory patterns of animals and broader ranges for deadly diseases, historic droughts, more powerful storms and disappearing coastlines.”

Stop the Genocide! Go With LaRouche Plan!

by Michelle Rasmussen

Dec. 11—A small group of LaRouche movement organizers are having a large impact at the Copenhagen COP15 Climate Summit. We are broadcasting the call to nations to reject the summit's genocidal economic and population reduction agenda, and replace it with the LaRouche Plan for a new credit system to finance physical economic development of the world.

Our impact, a laser-like voice of sanity amidst a fog of negative-growth brainwashing, has enabled many delegates to start questioning the lies they are being fed by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and others. It is helping to create the deep fault lines that have developed at the summit, which have increased the chances of preventing an agreement on CO₂ emission reduction measures, which would literally kill nations and their people.

Our effect is the result of the combination of our mass leaflet distributions, discussions with delegates, and interviews with world media, from our organizing station, near the entrance to the conference; with the addition of our special www.copenhagenscandal.org conference website, and participation at an alternative anti-global warming conference. Since before the conference began, we have been calling and meeting with ambassadors and other diplomats.

Thousands of copies of two mass leaflets have been already been distributed: "Global Warming Hoax Spells Genocide: Adopt the LaRouche Plan for Development!" and "The Anthropogenic Climate Swindle: Do You Really Want a World Dictatorship?"

Here are just a couple of examples of the responses: One African delegate, who had read the first leaflet, said, "It's amazing, and probably true," adding that everyone is talking about the leaflets inside the conference. Many are taking extra leaflets.

A young NGO delegate from Kenya was very shaken by the revelations in the first leaflet, and wanted to meet

with us to learn about what the LaRouche movement stands for. The delegates from one African country, after several discussions, invited us to their hotel to discuss policies for development.

As of this writing, the LaRouche organizers have gotten contact information from about 90 delegates, who will be invited to attend a briefing by the chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, Tom Gillesberg, on the eve of the arrival of more than 100 heads of state. We have also had several meetings and many phone conversations with diplomats. Some have agreed to get our leaflets to their delegations, and try to arrange meetings with their delegates.

Media Interviews

In addition to denouncing the global warming hoax, the way that our organizing at the COP15 summit is intersecting the LaRouche movement's international organizing for Lyndon LaRouche's Four-Power agreement, may be seen by the media interviews, and discussions we have had with delegates. We have been interviewed by Russia Today TV, a major Chinese newspaper, ABC radio from Australia, Kenyan TV, a French weekly magazine, and web TV, particularly from the U.K., and photographed by Reuters.

Russia Today, an English-language Russian TV program which has previously interviewed LaRouche, broadcast a short clip of its interview with Sebastian Périmony, a LaRouche organizer from Paris, in a story titled "Skeptics Challenge Copenhagen Global Warming Summit" (http://rt.com/Top_News/2009-12-08/global-warming-conference-skeptics.html). After interviewing Lord Christopher Monckton (see above for *EIR*'s interview with Monckton), and before reporting on the Saudi challenge to the scientific basis for the meeting in the wake of the East Anglia University Climategate revelations, the reporter described the activities outside the conference hall:

"I spoke to Sébastien Périmony from the LaRouche Foundation [sic] who calls the Climate Change lobby a cult.

"Périmony: 'We have been discussing here with a lot of people. It's like they are in a cult, saying that the planet will disintegrate, if we are not doing anything right now, right now, right now. And I think it's just propaganda.'"

The interview with the Chinese newspaper, to be published next week, included questions about the sci-

entific evidence for stating that global warming is a hoax, and what the LaRouche Plan is. There have also been many lively discussions with delegates from China and India.

Not everyone is buying the negative-growth agenda. Three Indians, for example, wore a shirt with this slogan into the conference: “Change the System, Not the Climate.” They are working for real, physical economic development in rural areas.

Climate Challenge Conference

We have also been organizing the climate skeptics, by participating in the Copenhagen Climate Challenge Conference, held Dec. 8-9, organized by Climate-Sense (www.climate-sense.com), initiated by persons from Denmark and Great Britain, with Lord Monckton on the board of advisors; Committee for Constructive Tomorrow; and the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change. There were speeches by senior scientists and others, fully documenting the global warming fraud. (See the Climate-Sense homepage for the list of speakers, and scientists who have signed its open letter to the UN Secretary General.)

On a panel chaired by Monckton, H. Leighton Steward, a Texan who is promoting the *increase* of CO₂, food for plants, which increases food grain and other plant growth (www.plantsneedCO2.org), stated that reducing CO₂ would reduce plant growth, and therefore cause population reduction. In response, Michelle Rasmussen of the Schiller Institute and *EIR* raised the population-reduction question: “You said that policies to reduce CO₂ can lead to a reduced population,” to which he replied, “Yes.” Rasmussen continued, “I wanted to bring that up, because we are circulating this statement, by the friends of Lyndon LaRouche, the U.S. economist, that maybe the reason why the environmentalist movement is pushing for this reduction in the human activities, is purposely to have an ideology that would go along with a reduction in population. Let’s remember that Prince Philip, the founder of the World Wildlife



A LaRouche movement organizer at the Copenhagen Summit, Dec. 9, 2009.

EIRNS/Michelle Rasmussen

Fund, said that the Earth would be better off if there were only 2 billion people. What do you have to say to this?”

Steward replied: “Well, I say that a lot of people do feel that way, because I’ve read, and I’ve heard some people say that. Exactly that. . . . There are already a billion people on Earth who are severely undernourished. Associated Press said two weeks ago that a child is dying from malnutrition every six seconds. That’s their statistics, not mine, that’s Associated Press in all the major newspapers. So you can just logically go back and say, if we reduced the food supply on Earth by 12% [his figure for the effect of reducing CO₂ to the pre-industrial revolution level], a lot of those people are going to die, because they’re almost dead now. And a lot of them will die because of malnutrition, lack of nutrition.”

One individual said that he was appalled to hear a speaker say that the increase in population was bad, and especially the increase of poor people, implying getting rid of them. “That’s Nazism,” he said. A Briton, he was told that we are attacking the Royal Family for leading the campaign, as the old imperialists, allied with the City of London-based financier group whose system is dying.

With eight more organizing days to come, the LaRouche movement’s impact, during and after the summit, will surely intensify.

The Greens Are a Sinister Movement

Martin Durkin of the United Kingdom, is the director of such widely viewed documentaries as “The Great Global Warming Swindle” and “Against Nature.” He was interviewed by Stephan Ossenkopp of the LaRouche Youth Movement, in Berlin, Germany, on Dec. 11, 2009.

EIR: The Sudanese chairman of the G-77 group of developing countries said at the Copenhagen Summit that the recently leaked draft treaty was a takeover by the few at the expense of all humanity, and that the proposed aid of \$10 billion was not even enough to buy them coffins. What are your thoughts on that?

Durkin: I think I would agree with the Sudanese chap. Aid is a bad idea anyway. Giving aid to poor countries is what causes civil wars as far as I can see, causes corruption and civil war. Those poor countries need to develop. They need to grow themselves, they need to become economically successful themselves, not rely on handouts from the West, especially small handouts, but big ones, too. All handouts are bad.

But I think the green agenda, which supports global warming, has always been, that ordinary people in the West and in the poor countries are consuming too much. They always said—[former German Chancellor] Willy Brandt for example—for years and years, and lots of other Greens, too, that the Third World cannot expect a standard of living like the West, that the planet will not support it. As far as I can see, this is a kind of repulsive, reactionary neocolonialism, a horrible ugly argument, and they’ve been arguing it before global warming came along.

EIR: Have things changed with the so-called Climategate scandal? What are the implications and necessary consequences of this scandal?

Durkin: It has been very interesting. I have done a few interviews about this in the U.K., on radio programs where listeners call in, and the thing that amazes me is that so few people, as far as I can tell, really believe in man-made global warming; despite all the ef-

forts of the BBC and the rest of the global warmers, ordinary people just don’t buy it. I think ordinary people are much more sensible than they are often given credit for, and the Climategate stuff has just brought it to a head.

They have been putting out scare stories on all sorts of things for so many years, about GM [genetically modified]-food, about Mad Cow Disease, about DDT, about this, about that, and I don’t think people believe it anymore. The Climategate stuff—people who have looked closely at this issue have known all along that there is funny business behind the science. The global warming scandal goes far beyond simply a scientific scandal. It is a scientific scandal, but it is also a political scandal. Global warming is about politics; it is not about science, and the politics that supports global warming is a profoundly reactionary, wicked, snobbish politics, I believe.



They Hate Ordinary People

EIR: Renowned scientist Zbigniew Jaworowski has recently said that UN representatives like Maurice Strong have expressed, at the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit, that, in order to save the planet, modern industrialized civilization would need to be eliminated. What is your comment?

Durkin: You just have to read the works of the global warmers and the Greens. This is a form of anti-capitalism. And the strange thing is, I think, what we need to get used to is that there is a section of the middle classes, who are profoundly anti-capitalist, middle and upper classes who are anti-capitalist. We are used to thinking that—socialists taught us that it would be the workers who are anti-capitalist, but that’s not true. The ordinary working people have benefited enormously from capitalism, and the people who hate capitalism now, it appears, are the intellectuals in the middle classes and the upper classes.

I believe they hate capitalism because they hate ordinary people, they hate this thought that mass production also goes with mass consumption. They hate supermarkets, they hate IKEA, they hate all the things that ordinary people rely on for a decent standard of living. When



Creative Commons/Revolve Eco-Rally

“The monarchy has survived thanks to Elizabeth,” says Durkin, “but I think Charles will kill it.” Prince Charles is scheduled to give the keynote to the Copenhagen summit on Dec. 15, 2009. Here, he meets other deep-pocketed green gurus at an event in 2007.

Prince Charles says, “Wouldn’t it be nice if everyone were peasants again,” it’s because he wants to be an old-style king, where everyone is groveling beneath him. He doesn’t like the idea that suddenly there are state agents and plumbers who have bigger houses than professors. This is a kind of class war, which is, I think, waged by upper-class people and impoverished upper-class people in the middle classes, against ordinary people.

EIR: It seems Prince Charles’ chances of reigning are very slim, given the fact that the monarchy is losing so many followers, especially with what the Queen said in Trinidad recently. As a result of that, Lord Monckton said the Queen might lose the Lords’ loyalty, and then the throne.

Durkin: I think there is a great possibility that the Queen will be the last full monarch of England. I believe that Charles is such a reactionary. And he is quite ignorant, and he doesn’t even understand he is a reactionary. And he doesn’t understand the full implications of what he says and what he believes. I believe that he will destroy the monarchy because people do still love the Queen, even though the monarchy is an anachronism. She has been so successful in being self-effacing and obviously good, obviously dutiful, and doing the right thing. The monarchy has survived thanks to Elizabeth, but I think Charles will kill it.

A Reactionary View of the World

EIR: What about Prince Philip, who has been on the forefront in financing this anthropogenic climate change theory? He has been on the record for saying that he would like to reduce the population more rapidly than wars and epidemics have been able to do, by reincarnating as a deadly virus. What is going on in his mind?

Durkin: If you look at the history of green thinking, it is both anti-capitalist, and it’s anti-people. Population control has always been a major part of it. People think of the Nazis and eugenics, but in fact, the eugenics movement was very wide in Europe, and obviously came from Britain, but was also very big in the U.S., with sterilization programs and so on.

It is very interesting that the IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change], in their scenarios, have “good” and “bad” scenarios in their future trajectories of society—and their “good” scenario is “population control, limited migration, limited trade”: It is a very reactionary, right-wing, backward-looking view of the world. The link with population control has obviously been there in the modern Green movement, like the Sierra Club and Paul Ehrlich’s *Population Bomb*, and in the earliest books of the “Climate Crisis.” If you read Stephen Schneider, all those books go on about population. It is a very sinister movement.

Even people who disagree with the Greens often think that they are innocent and misguided, that their foolish attachment to paganism doesn’t matter. I think it’s deeply, deeply sinister. Anyone with a full understanding of the history of the Nazis should know how sinister this ideology is. I think they are absolutely wicked. When you read Rachel Carson’s book [*Silent Spring*], about how awful DDT is, it goes on about owls and eggs and such things, it doesn’t mention once in the book that thanks to DDT, literally hundreds of millions of lives had been saved at that point. Not one line does it express concern about this. And likewise, if you read Paul Ehrlich and other green writers they talk about triage where you just let people die because, you know, “The Earth cannot sustain them.” I think they are nasty, nasty people.

The Only *Real* Reform Measure Is The LaRouche Plan

by John Hoefle

Dec. 11—Never in U.S. history has financial reform been more necessary than it is today, as the global financial system enters the final phase of its disintegration. Either we dramatically change the way we operate, along the lines indicated by Lyndon LaRouche, or the world will plunge into a global new Dark Age.

However, it is also the case that every move to take down the protections put into place by President Franklin Roosevelt after the banking collapse of the early 1930s, has been done in the name of reform. The repeal of interstate banking prohibitions, the deregulation of the savings and loan sector, and the repeal of Glass-Steagall, along with a host of other measures, were all done in the name of reform.

Today, the world is full of calls for reform. Some of them are genuine attempts to restore sanity to our regulatory process, others are well-intentioned but misguided efforts that would fail to have any meaningful impact, and still others are malicious measures that would advance the British Empire's plans for a global financial dictatorship. It is imperative, therefore, that we have a standard for sorting the wheat from the crap and the Trojan Horses.

Fortunately, such a standard exists, in the LaRouche Plan. By addressing the crisis from the highest standpoint, the LaRouche Plan provides both the roadmap to lead the world out of this mess, and a standard by which to judge the efficacy of the various reform proposals.

The Whole Enchilada

The critical point, as LaRouche has repeatedly insisted, is that nothing less than the *full* plan will work. Any solution requires the writing off of the giant mountain of speculative debt currently choking the global economy, a reorganization of banking according to the Glass-Steagall standard, and the replacement of the Anglo-Venetian imperial monetary system—including that scam known as globalization—with sovereign national credit systems, complete with fixed exchange rates among national currencies.

With those measures in place, supported by the combined power of the U.S., Russia, China, India, joined by other nations, to keep the empire from making a comeback, we can begin serious work on rebuilding the physical-economic productivity of the world, through large-scale investment in infrastructure—led by building state-of-the-art nuclear power plants, a global network of high-speed, magnetically levitated trains, and water management systems to provide the water for people, agriculture, and industry.

It is not sufficient to merely repair existing facilities, or to build new facilities at existing technological levels. What we must do is to replace them with higher levels of technology, raising the productive power of human labor to new levels. This requires a science driver, the adoption of a mission which will force us to make the scientific and technological breakthroughs necessary to push mankind forward into a new Renaissance; to give ourselves problems to solve, which imbue us with a

sense of optimism, and engage our creativity.

The perfect mission in this regard is the mission to put a manned base on Mars. To get to Mars requires not only returning to the Moon, but developing the capability on the Moon to build the spacecrafts necessary to make the trip to Mars. It also means developing the propulsion systems necessary to maintain a constant acceleration, and then a deceleration, of 1 Earth gravity, and solving an incredible range of other problems.

This is not a collection of programs, from which to pick and choose. It is a coherent program which must be adopted *in its entirety* if mankind is to avoid, at this late date, a collapse of civilization as we have known it.

Society Is Crumbling

To understand why the full LaRouche Plan is required, we must understand the full extent of the problems we face. We are not facing merely a financial crisis, though we certainly have one. Neither are we facing merely a political crisis, which can be fixed by replacing one set of bums with another. What we are facing is a breakdown crisis, in which the very fabric of society itself, is crumbling.

Look around you, at the rate at which people are losing their jobs, their homes, their ability to survive. Look at the rate at which governments at all levels are going broke, unable to perform their proper functions. Look at the way that all attempts to solve these problems are failing.

Nothing works as it should anymore. *That* is the problem. Our ability to fix things has broken down, because we have become so fixated on money, that we have forgotten how to run our economy, and have allowed our political system to be taken over by the very financier interests that are sucking us dry. We have allowed our schools to devolve into intellectual deserts where children are taught *what* to think, not *how* to think. We have allowed giant insurance and pharmaceutical companies to turn medicine into a looting ground, and allowed giant corporate cartels to increasingly dominate our lives. Far too many among us allow ourselves to be distracted by the latest celebrity gossip, the local sports teams, the business news, partisan politics, and a host of other trivia. We have allowed ourselves to become stupid, and thus easily manipulated.

This is what we must correct, and the LaRouche Plan offers the way to do it.

Real Reform

The propagandists of the Anglo-Venetian empire have gone to great lengths to try to convince us that our future depends upon returning their predatory financial system to health. We are induced to focus on such relatively minor issues as bankers' bonuses and accounting issues, while the financial predators continue to steal us blind. They make us think that we need them, even as they lead us into a nightmare of fascist austerity, global government, and genocide.

Real reform means busting up the imperial monetary system, with its control over the issuance and price of money, and replacing it with sovereign credit systems. It means an end to the power of the private central banks, beginning with the Federal Reserve, and a return to the principles laid out in the U.S. Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution.

Anything that reeks of globalization, we toss. Beginning with the idea of a global transaction tax, which is really intended to be the first tax of the global financial dictatorship. Same goes with cap and trade, and all the other greenie taxes. No funding of imperial schemes, period.

Derivatives regulation is easy. We outlaw derivatives. All derivatives contracts currently outstanding are declared null and void, and all new contracts prohibited. Problem solved.

The mountain of speculative debt gets written off through the bankruptcy reorganization, and the banking system that emerges from that process will operate under the Glass-Steagall standard. We will have banks, not casinos—and we'll make sure they behave. Banking serves the economy, not the other way around.

We'll set up a new Bank of the United States, to act as the intermediary between the government and the private banking system. We'll audit the Fed, after we shut it down.

Lesser measures, such as the moves in Congress to reinstate Glass-Steagall, are useful and should be encouraged—as long as everyone understands that they are steps along the way to a larger solution, and not solutions in and of themselves. We must not fall into the trap of confusing winning a battle or two with winning the war. Civilizations have been lost to such errors.

Finally, we need to change, so that we citizens can understand what must be done, and make it happen. It is our future, after all.

johnhoeft@larouchepub.com

Shut Down Dubai's London-Saudi Drug and Terror Cesspool

by Michele Steinberg

Dec. 10—When international financial circles shuddered on Nov. 26, at the announcement that Dubai World, the sleazy, global real estate swindle that served as a facility for money laundering, was calling a “time-out” on paying billions of dollars on corporate bonds, Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates, became the center of media attention. But nowhere, save the publications associated with Lyndon LaRouche, did the gloves come off to identify Dubai as the pivot for British-controlled Afghanistan drug trafficking—a black market beyond black markets; the place where every piece of filth, including Saudi filth, can run through banks and real estate markets—detected, but undisturbed.

Dubai is the gateway to the world for terrorists, drug mafias, weapons smugglers, herders of slaves—both sex slaves and slave labor. Here is where Osama bin Laden received \$50 million in a single bank wire from wealthy Saudis in the late 1990s; here is where A.Q. Khan, Pakistan's nuclear black marketeer, operated freely; here is where arms traffickers to terrorists, including Viktor Bout, were safely ensconced; here is where the deadly attack on Mumbai, India, of November 2008, was financed through mafia-kingpin Dawood Ibrahim; here is where the Afghan narco-billions go to be disbursed to the terrorist enemy that President Barack Obama is supposedly fighting in Afghanistan.

LaRouche nailed the Dubai profile when speaking

to colleagues on Nov. 29 about the moves by Britain's Queen Elizabeth II to use the British Commonwealth and the Copenhagen Conference's climate change hoax to reassert the British Empire worldwide, at the very point that Dubai was imploding.

LaRouche said, “Now what this means ... [is] the entire monetary-financial system, in its present managed form, is now doomed. Everybody knows it, or should know it. And what they arranged was to try to create a sleight of hand around this Dubai mess.

“What's Dubai? \$60 billion? What are you, crazy? It's the international drug trafficking! The center of the international drug traffic is Afghanistan! And the southern part of Afghanistan, where the British troops are occupying and managing the territory, and running the terrorists, is the center of this operation. The drug trafficking! Every piece of filth in that entire region, of financial and related filth, and Saudi filth thrown in, is running through this Dubai pivot. People will go out of Afghanistan, and they will take their ill-gotten gains and they will cash in, in Dubai. So, Dubai is a market, for a black market beyond black markets.”

The Hong Kong Model

Thirty-one years ago, in 1978, *EIR* published the first edition of *Dope, Inc.*, a book that had two subsequent editions, in 1985 and 1992, and which remains

the paramount case study on how drug-money laundering and the investment of this dirty money drives the international narcotics trade, from planting to harvesting to smuggling to retail sales of deadly heroin and other mind-destroying drugs. Focusing on Hong Kong, then a British Colony, and the center of the worldwide, cartelized heroin trade, run as one of the largest global corporations (without “registration”), *Dope, Inc.* was the primer on money laundering in the age of electronic wire transfers



Courtesy of Nakheel

Dubai’s “tourist and real estate paradise” became the biggest repository for hot money on the planet. The bankruptcy of Dubai World in November, and the government’s refusal to bail it out, signalled that “the era of sovereign defaults has arrived,” said Lyndon LaRouche.



EIR’s “underground” best-seller warned as early as 1978 that drug trafficking and terrorism could never be stopped, unless governments shut down the banking side of the operations. Dubai today is a perfect target for investigation and action.

and British offshore banking centers. It is also the seminal book on narco-terrorism. The second edition of the book elaborated the point that the illegal narcotics trade was the backbone of global terrorism and asymmetric warfare.

Dope, Inc. explains: “The British oligarchy’s banking operations—including the Boston-New York ‘Tory’ banking establishment of the United States, have the following qualifications:

“1. They have run the drug trade for a century and a half.

“2. They dominate those banking centers closed off to law enforcement agencies.

“3. Almost all such ‘offshore’ unregulated banking centers are under the direct political control of the British monarchy and their allies.

“4. They dominate all banking at the heart of the narcotics traffic; the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, created in 1864 to finance the drug trade, is exemplary.

“5. They control world trade in gold and diamonds, a necessary aspect of ‘hard commodity’ exchange for drugs.

“6. They subsume . . . the full array of connections to organized crime, the pro-drug legislative lobby in the United States, and all other required elements of distribution, protection and legal support.”

Hong Kong left British hands in 1997, more than 110 years after control of it was consolidated by the British after the First and Second Opium Wars (1839-42 and 1856-60) against China. But the notorious Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corp.—the giant now known as HSBC—which was the global clearinghouse for heroin traffic throughout the 20th Century until the late 1990s, had global reach by 1997, and quickly came to dominate Dubai.

“HongShang,” as it was called in 1978, was the first foreign bank to be granted status to operate in the United States. But rather than conforming to U.S. laws, the British financial oligarchy, through manipulation of political forces, used HongShang as a beachhead to transform banking in the United States to become the criminal global casino that it is today. The U.S. banking system fully and knowingly participates in the Dope, Inc. global money laundry. If any country deserves to be labelled an outcast for harboring terrorism, it is Dubai, the second-largest of the Emirates that make up the U.A.E. But this former British protectorate, freed only in 1971, has led a charmed existence, immune from law enforcement.

That’s because, to go after Dubai, would be to go after the British financier oligarchy. Dubai is no sovereign—it is a creation of the Anglo-Saudi deals that *EIR* has exposed with the BAE bribery case, involving Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the British, and the network of Saudi intelligence agents involved in 9/11.

But since 9/11, the negligence by George W. Bush and Barack Obama in covering up for Dubai and the British-run opium trade in Afghanistan is nothing short of treason. These two U.S. Presidents have willfully protected the British operations that manage the world opium and heroin trade—from the fields of Afghanistan, under the noses of 100,000 U.S. and NATO troops that are not permitted to do anything to stop the trade that finances al-Qaeda and the Taliban, to the money-laundering capital of Southwest Asia—Dubai.

Why is it that Obama’s envoy for Afghanistan and Pakistan, Richard Holbrooke, called a halt to *all drug eradication programs* in Afghanistan, when it is *known*, and was stated, even by then-NATO Commander Gen. John Craddock, that the opium trade is financing the enemy in Afghanistan? The fact that Holbrooke has been



a business partner of George Soros, the British-created banker and international face of drug legalization, and that Soros was the sugar daddy behind Obama’s springboard to the White House, in financing his 2004 Senate campaign, must be investigated as part of the answer.

Why is it that, in 2006, the Bush Administration cleared Dubai Ports World, which is wholly owned by the Dubai government, to take over six U.S. ports that had been previously run by the British firm Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company (P&O), and even praised Dubai for its help in fighting terrorism? P&O was taken over by Dubai Ports World in February 2006. When Congress moved to block the takeover, specified in a letter from Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.) to George W. Bush, Bush threatened to veto any legislation that tried to block Dubai Ports World. “It would send a terrible signal to friends and allies not to let this transaction go through,” Bush said. Schumer had raised the issue of Dubai’s connection to 9/11 terror—already identified in the investigation of the 9/11 Commission.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld went even further in defending Dubai: “We all deal with the U.A.E. on a regular basis. It’s a country that’s been involved in the global war on terror.”

The crisis ended without a Presidential veto, when Dubai Ports World sold all the P&O port operations that it had just acquired to American International Group—



Creative Commons/John Hill

The legacy of the British Opium Wars remains today, focussed in Afghanistan but radiating worldwide. Here, an opium smoker from the Akha ethnic group, who live mostly in China and Southeast Asia.

the same AIG that would require \$168 billion in government bailouts less than three years later.

What Is Dubai?

For LaRouche, the Dubai collapse was not a shock, but a manifestation of the collapse of the global financial system, which LaRouche had identified since July 2007. On Nov. 28, LaRouche wrote: “It was Thanksgiving Day 2009, which caught the U.S.A. sleeping: the day western Europe threatened to be overtaken by an echo of Autumn 1923 Germany—from Dubai! This is a study which can not be competently concluded without reliance on my 1996-2009 treatment of what I have named as ‘The Triple Curve’ method, the method required for understanding the way in which the great global monetary crisis of the post-World War II period to date, actually developed. The special case of 1923 Weimar Germany, is the model case to be studied in preparing specialists for the way in which the post-April 1945 pattern of post-World War II developments has come to the present point of a global breakdown-crisis of the world’s presently, hopelessly bankrupt, world monetary system.”

Dubai’s ruler, Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashid al-Maktoum, oversaw the Nov. 25 announcement of Dubai World’s non-payment of its debt, from London, where he had just met Queen Elizabeth II, Prime Minister

Gordon Brown, Lord Mayor of the City of London Nicholas Anstee, and Tory Party leader David Cameron. “It was a good day,” Sheikh Mohammed twittered.

Beginning some ten years earlier, Sheikh Mohammed made Dubai available as the biggest repository for hot money on the planet. It was all to be done under the cover of the biggest tourist and real estate boom in history, complete with the world’s tallest building. Some reports say he boasted that Dubai would attract 10 million tourists a year, others that he said 15 million. The number of actual tourists is not known, but it is suspected to be far lower. In any event, the large amount of cash and commodities that would be required to service a mega-tourist trade, provides a good fairy tale to disguise

money laundering.

Now it’s over. On Nov. 29, 2009, the second shoe dropped: Dubai’s government, and its moneybags, the Abu Dhabi government, both members of the U.A.E., announced that the debts of Dubai World would *not* be bailed out by the U.A.E. Central Bank or the government. LaRouche then warned that “the era of sovereign defaults has arrived.”

Dubai is no Hong Kong, which is a bustling, centuries-old trading and population center. It is a barren strip of sand, whose limited oil and gas resources were already used up in the 1990s. The number of Dubai nationals is less than 500,000, enhanced only by hundreds of thousands of imported slave laborers, who are treated like animals. But Dubai was set up to play the same role for Afghanistan’s opium, and terrorism in Southwest and South Asia and in Africa, that Hong Kong played for heroin in Southeast Asia for the British, until 1997. As in the case of Hong Kong, the key banking institution in Dubai was HSBC—which had centuries of experience in running the opium and heroin finances.

Dubai’s existence depends on the largesse of the British financial empire, Saudi Arabia, and former British protectorate Abu Dhabi, the largest of the seven Gulf emirates, and headquarters of the U.A.E. Central Bank. Trillions of dollars of laundered criminal money have passed through Dubai, creating a real estate bubble.

The fallout continues. On Dec. 8, the Arabic press highlighted the fact that the Dubai, Abu Dhabi, and Saudi stock markets are continuing to plunge, with Dubai -6.2%, Abu Dhabi (the cash cow for Dubai) -3.4, and Saudi Arabia -3%. The previous day, Dubai was down 6.5%. This is believed to be just the beginning of the Arab and British exposure.

Things were made worse, when Abdulrahman al-Salih, chairman of the Dubai State Financial Department, told al-Arabiya TV on Dec. 7, that the government of Dubai will support the Nakheel company (Palm Island, part of Dubai World), but *will not guarantee* its debt.

This would leave British and Saudi banks out in the cold—or, more appropriately, in the heat—as the assets of Nakheel and other real estate companies in Dubai have become worthless. Al-Salih explained that Nakheel’s creditors now own “assets” in return for the money they loaned!

An example of such a comic, but real, asset-transfer, is given in the Dec. 7 Bloomberg news report: “Nakheel creditors may win the right to seize a strip of barren waterfront land the size of Manhattan if the company defaults on the \$3.5 billion bond backing the development . . . part of the Dubai Waterfront project, where Nakheel plans to build a city twice the size of Hong Kong Island. The site is empty except for a cluster of partly finished low-rise buildings, idle cranes, and a few roaming camels.”

The Terror Nexus

As the bankers’ panic continues, the Dubai World case provides the perfect opportunity for the United States, especially in context of the Four Powers (U.S., Russia, China, and India) alliance that LaRouche has recommended, to shut down international terrorism and the drug traffic that funds it. It is sovereign nation-states against the London-Saudi drug and terror nexus. And Dubai could be the key to the puzzle. There is hardly a major terrorist operation in the last decade and a half, notably 9/11, that did not involve Dubai. Some of these are summarized here:

Money Laundering and Terror Financing

“Whether it’s drug smuggling, people trafficking, or money laundering, all roads lead to Dubai,” says John A. Cassara, who served for 26 years in U.S. Treasury Department, and has written about Dubai’s dirty money

and the Afghanistan opium trade in numerous articles, and in his 2006 book, *Hide and Seek*.

After 9/11, as Afghanistan opium production got bigger and bigger, under the noses of the British military occupation in southern Afghanistan, so did the cash flow into Dubai. The “world’s biggest washing machine,” writes journalist Misha Glenny in *McMafia*, his 2008 book on the global criminal underworld. This washing machine was facilitated by the opening of the Dubai International Financial Centre (DIFC) in 2005, a zone where foreigners could own 100% of companies and properties in Dubai, and where everything is tax free, and there are few rules.

Many of the world’s largest banks operate in Dubai, especially in the DIFC: Abbey National Offshore, HSBC Offshore, ABN Amro, ANZ Grindlays, Banque Paribas, Banque de Caire, Barclays, Dresdner, and Merrill Lynch. Dubai wants more. The DIFC boasts that it is “designed to span the time zones not covered by New York, London and Hong Kong. It will complete the missing quarter [of the world] in the 24 hour, 7 day week, global financial system.”

That the DIFC was born in 2005 is even more significant, when overlaid on the rise of Afghan opium production: 2002, 3,400 metric tons; 2003, 3,416 metric tons; 2004, 4,200 metric tons; 2005, 4,100 metric tons; 2006, 6,100 metric tons; 2007, 8,200 metric tons; 2008, 7,700 metric tons.

Alliances between the Afghanistan drug warlords and the Islamic mujahideen date back to the protracted 1980s warfare against the Soviet Army. One of the two most prominent members of this drug warlord/mujahideen nexus is Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, who is now battling U.S. and NATO troops, from bases along the undemarcated Afghan-Pakistan border.

But in those early days, opium production was a mere 1,500 metric tons a year, and Hekmatyar and others carefully confined their interaction to local drug traffickers who would pay them cash and carry the stuff away. In the late 1990s, when Taliban supremo Mullah Mohammad Omar took control of Afghanistan and brought in the al-Qaeda group, Saudi millionaire and Islamic fundamentalist Osama bin Laden, exploiting his extensive contacts in the Gulf Emirates, developed a powerful link with the international drug cartel, gun traffickers, and underground money-laundering network—in Dubai. *Vanity Fair* author Nick Tosches pointed out in 2006 that visitors arriving in Dubai are immediately hit with signs announcing “Bin Laden Construction.”



FEMA

Dubai was a hub for wiring money from Osama bin Laden and others to the accused 9/11 hijackers. Shown: search and rescue operations at New York's World Trade Center.

The 9/11 Terrorist Connection

Dubai's role in the Osama bin Laden apparatus, and the Saudi-linked 9/11 terrorist attacks is too extensive to describe here, and the documentation can be seen, in part, in the report of the 9/11 Commission, which was released in July 2004. (There are 28 pages redacted from the 9/11 report, that deal extensively with Saudi Arabia, and possibly also with al-Qaeda financial transactions in Dubai.) However, a few examples suffice to show that the case against Dubai is indisputable.

Two reports indicate that in 1999, the U.S. State Department, CIA, and National Security Council were in Dubai investigating a transfer of \$50 million to Osama bin Laden through the Dubai Islamic Bank; the money came from wealthy Saudis in a single transfer. On July 8, 1999, the *New York Times* reported that the CIA had information about this transfer of funds, and that bin Laden's accounts had been given the approval of the officials who control that bank. U.S. law enforcement and intelligence officers were able to pin down hundreds of thousands of dollars wired from Dubai and the U.A.E. to the accused 9/11 hijackers, including Mohammed Atta, Marwan Alshehhi, Nawaf Alhazmi and Khalid Almihdhar. Most of these transfers are attributed, in the report of the 9/11 Commission, to Ali Abdul Aziz Ali (a.k.a. Ammar al-Baluchi), a nephew of accused 9/11

mastermind Khalid Sheikh Mohammed.

Eleven of the 19 hijackers of the 9/11 attacks came to the United States either from, or through, Dubai. The 9/11 Commission report indicates that several of the 9/11 hijackers were working for Afghanistan's Ariana Airlines in Kandahar in Summer 2000, where they may have been trained in airline operations. By that time, reported the 9/11 Commission, Ariana Airlines was the vital link for al-Qaeda's logistics, and the Kandahar Airport was under the control of al-Qaeda and of the aircraft companies controlled by Russian mafioso Viktor Bout.

Victor Bout: The Russian Mafia Connection

When the al-Qaeda/Dubai connection developed in the 1990s, one of the first moves that Osama bin Laden made to link up his jihadi group with the sleazy international underground was to take control of the Afghan national airline, Ariana. As a former U.S. National Security Council official told a reporter, Ariana became a key node in al-Qaeda's infrastructure. The network used Ariana to move everything that was useful—money, personnel, and matériel.

Soon enough, Ariana changed from being a passenger to a cargo airline. The planes would return from the U.A.E. loaded with weapons, said Julie Sirrs, an Afghanistan specialist at the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency during the Clinton Administration. It was mostly Soviet weapons, small arms—Kalashnikov rifles and RPG-7s (shoulder-fired antitank rocket launchers). While the weapons would come in from Dubai, and later from Sharjah, the planes carried tons of opium back to Dubai. Agents of al-Qaeda in Dubai would take control of the drugs, contact the drug-trafficking network, and purchase weapons using some of that money.

Ariana's schedule became something of a deliberate hit-or-miss proposition. That gave them the flexibility they needed to move illicit cargo.

A frequent stop was Sharjah, one of the Emirates, 20 miles outside of Dubai. There, al-Qaeda's benefactor was Russian mafioso and gun-runner Victor Bout, who set up the hub of his international weapons-trafficking and smuggling operations there in 1993.

Bout, who was arrested earlier this year in Thailand, developed contacts with the Taliban in August 1995, when the Taliban was in opposition to then-President Burhanuddin Rabbani's government in Kabul. One of Bout's planes, flying under the banner of the Trans Aviation Network (TAN) from Albania via Sharjah, and transporting small arms and military equipment to Rabbani, was intercepted by a MiG-21 and forced to land in Taliban-controlled territory, according to the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ). Soon thereafter, Bout became the arms supplier for the Taliban and any other narco-terrorist army—from South Asia, to Africa, to South America. In fact, Bout was arrested in a deal in which he was selling arms to an undercover U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration agent he thought to be with the narco-terrorist Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC).

In addition to Bout, who would supply arms for cash, the Taliban and al-Qaeda needed an underground kingpin to sell the drugs and launder the receipts. Enter Dawood Ibrahim.

Dawood Ibrahim and Terror in India

Mafia don Ibrahim, in Mumbai in the 1980s and early 1990s, was always a gold and drug trafficker. He fled India for Dubai following the March 12, 1993 bombings of the Bombay Stock Exchange, which killed hundreds of Indians and injured over a thousand more. It is said that Dawood's syndicate, under control of the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), has consistently aimed to destabilize the Indian government by inciting riots, terrorism, and civil disobedience.

Dawood, who has been designated a terrorist by the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) in the U.S.



Worldwide news coverage of the Mumbai bombings of November 2008. Mafioso Dawood Ibrahim's connections in Dubai helped finance and support the terrorist assault that killed 207 people.

Treasury and by many other governments, is a pioneer in the criminal-terrorist-jihadi nexus. For many years, he has provided the criminal links that al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Pakistani terrorist groups needed to move money, personnel, and equipment. Despite how well known his activities are, he has never been apprehended.

The U.S. Treasury Department's description of Ibrahim says, in part, that his criminal syndicate is involved in large-scale shipments of narcotics in the U.K. and western continental Europe. The syndicate's smuggling routes from South Asia, the Middle East, and Africa are shared with Osama bin Laden and his terrorist network. Successful routes established over recent years by Ibrahim's syndicate have been subsequently utilized by bin Laden. A financial deal was reportedly brokered to facilitate that arrangement. In the late 1990s, Ibrahim travelled in Afghanistan under the protection of the Taliban. Information, from as recently as Fall 2002, indicates that Ibrahim has financially supported Islamic militant groups working against India, such as Lashkar-e-Tayyiba (LeT).

It is evident that Dawood Ibrahim provided his support network in Mumbai, and elsewhere in India, to the



U.S. Air Force/Cpl. Sean K. Harp

Afghan police officers and U.S. troops discover 600 pounds of opium earlier this year, in Helmand Province. Dubai has become a smuggling capital for drugs from Afghanistan that are headed for the West.

terrorists who attacked two posh Mumbai hotels, an Orthodox Jewish community's office *cum* residence, and the main Mumbai railroad station, in November 2008. The Indian investigation showed that the LeT—which the U.S. Treasury had identified as one of Dawood's beneficiary terrorist groups, operating within, and from, Pakistan—was among the leaders in the Mumbai assault.

But Dawood's usefulness to the terrorists does not end with his ability, or willingness, to finance them directly. More importantly, his network brings a lot of drugs to Dubai by means of his "mules," protected by the intelligence agencies and his beneficiaries. It is said that the containers that carry large equipment sent to Dubai from Kandahar and elsewhere in southern Afghanistan for repair, also contain drugs. The drugs are converted to cash in Dubai, where Dawood maintains a palatial residence, similar to the one he enjoys in Karachi, Pakistan.

Dawood Ibrahim is a killer, and one who is protected by London, the mother of the Saudi/ISI/Dubai nexus. His crimes include running the 1993 Bombay Stock Market bombing that killed 250; the 1999 Air India hijacking, where hundreds of hostages were exchanged for British terrorist Ahmed Omar Sheikh, who later murdered journalist Daniel Pearl in Pakistan; the 2006 Mumbai train attack in which 207 were killed and 600 injured; and the spectacular 2008 sea-launched com-

mando attack in Mumbai that killed over 100 people and injured over 200 in more than ten coordinated shooting incidents.

There are many other crimes of Dubai that cannot be detailed in this article: how the *hawala* money-transfer system has become a multibillion-dollar transfer capability, used to launder and hide funds. There is also the intricate network of Pakistani nuclear proliferator A.Q. Khan, who used Dubai for a number of front companies, and there is Dubai's organized traffic in human slaves.

Dawood Ibrahim is still at large, as are Osama bin Laden and other al-Qaeda leaders. The opium-fed insurgency in Afghanistan has grown far larger than it was in October 2001, when the Taliban and al-Qaeda fled

from the U.S. attack into Pakistan, after only a few weeks.

John Cassara writes, in an article titled "Afghanistan's Drug Menace: Why Can't We Follow the Money" (July 31, 2007, www.johncassara.com): "A South Asian businessman with ties to the underworld finance in the region told me, 'Don't you know that the terrorists are moving money and value right under your noses? But the West doesn't see it. Your enemies are laughing at you.'"

Not only is Dubai key for money, Cassara explains, but as the largest port facility in Southwest Asia, it is a smuggling capital for goods and gold, as well as the drugs that are sometimes used for currency.

"Understanding and following these culturally opaque money and value trails will hurt terrorists more than any tactical battlefield victory," writes Cassara. "We will never win the War on Terrorism or the War on Drugs if we continue to go after the endless supply of terrorists and narcotics. It is time to fight smart and, by doing so, we will stop the profit—and the laughter—of our enemies."

In 1978, LaRouche and the authors of *Dope, Inc.* already warned that drug trafficking and terrorism could never be stopped unless the banking side—especially the offshore banking side—were gone after. In *EIR's* view, the War on Drugs has not been "lost"; it has never been fought.

The Dubai case could win that war.

LaRouche Youth Candidates To ‘Educate’ Mass Strike

by Harley Schlanger

Dec. 11—A new era in U.S. politics was initiated on Dec. 3, when Lyndon LaRouche announced, at his webcast, that three members of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) will run for Congress in Democratic Party primaries (LaRouche’s speech was published in *EIR*, Dec. 11, 2009; the video is archived at <http://larouchepac.com/webcasts/20091203.html>). The three candidates, who were introduced later in the webcast, will provide a programmatic focal point for the millions of Americans who are angry, and want a real change in the direction of the nation, but are unclear as to what to do.

The three are:

Rachel Brown, who will run in the 4th Congressional District in Massachusetts against blowhard and bailout maven, Barney Frank, who is an incumbent Democrat;

Kesha Rogers, intends to unseat the incumbent Republican, Pete Olson, in the 22nd Congressional District in Texas, which includes NASA’s Johnson Space Center; and

Summer Shields, who will take on House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, in the 8th Congressional District in San Francisco, Calif.

(See below for their campaign statements.)

According to LaRouche, the function of their campaigns “is to coordinate and create a national campaign ... in order to create a pivot around which to begin to mobilize the population now, for what it must do now.”

This will be something new, he added, saying “We’re not going to wait until November of next year, for new candidates to be elected, or for January (2011), for these candidates to enter office. We’re going to organize now, to get people ready to clean the mess out in Washington, to replace a lot of key people. But the campaign is now, is essentially creating the three points of reference, for creating a national organization to straighten out the Democratic Party, by setting forth and defining a policy, a national policy.”

Nation in Crisis, Party in Disarray

These campaigns are necessary given the devastating economic and political crisis facing the nation, and the failure of the Democratic Party to bring about a real transformation, following its re-emergence as the dominant party in 2008, after the disastrous two terms of President George W. Bush and Dick Cheney. As LaRouche detailed during his webcast, the policies being pushed by President Barack Obama and the Democratic Party leadership represent no change, despite his campaign slogan, but are, in reality, a continuation of the worst of the Bush regime, and threaten to plunge the world into a New Dark Age.

In particular, Obama’s slavish adherence to the bailout of bankrupt financial institutions, and his open promotion of fascist austerity, allegedly to “cut the deficit,” which has grown enormously due to the hyperinflationary bailout, is already destroying what remains of the

HEALTH CARE in AMERICA

Barney Frank goes toe to toe at health care town hall

updated 1:50 p.m. EDT, Wed August 19, 2009

STORY HIGHLIGHT

- Rep. Frank's town hall
- "On what planet do
- "I have no interest"
- Frank also notes ill

Next Article in Politics

READ

VIDEO



Frank spars with constituents 2:50

Rachel Brown, shown here in a videotape that went viral last Summer, confronting "Bailout" Barney Frank, during a town meeting in Boston, one of hundreds of such meetings that put members of Congress on notice: Their days in Congress are numbered. Her campaign will make sure Barney is not allowed again to duck the question: Why did you bail out Wall Street, when millions of Americans are suffering?

once-productive industrial and agricultural sectors of the U.S. economy. To reverse the 40-year collapse of production in the U.S. economy, LaRouche presented a coherent set of solutions, incorporated in the "LaRouche Plan." LaRouche's proposal includes an end to the bailouts, and the return, through seizure if necessary, of the bailout funds from the banks, financial institutions, and insurance companies; a return to the Glass-Steagal banking standards, putting the financial system through bankruptcy reorganization, freezing the trillions of dollars of worthless derivative and related obligations, rather than attempting a bailout; and the utterance, by the Congress, of credit, which would be directed to investments in large-scale, necessary infrastructure projects, such as building new power plants—

especially nuclear; high-speed rail; water management; and a science driver; which would be centered around upgrading the space program, through a mission to colonize the Moon and Mars.

Instead of adopting the LaRouche Plan, which has been gaining support among Americans, who are losing jobs, homes, and general security at an accelerating rate, the President has chosen to go along with policies authored by the financial oligarchs of the City of London, which threaten to reduce the planet to a depopulated rubbish heap. Obama's foolish cheerleading for a policy of drastic population reduction, through a top-down fascist, global, anti-technology dictatorship, as pushed by the Copenhagen "Climate Change" conference, and promoted directly by the British royal family, combined with his insistence on a "health care" plan modeled on the T-4 genocide policies of Hitler's Nazi regime, makes it evident that representatives within the Institution of the Presidency must move to either place him under supervision of responsible officials, or remove him from office.

Despite growing anxiety among Democratic Members of Congress, who have seen an eruption of anger among their constituents, both against themselves, and the President, there has been no serious, concerted effort, to follow LaRouche's counsel, and place the President under "adult supervision."

The Mass Strike

The anger, which was highly visible, especially during the August recess, when thousands of constituents attended Congressional town meetings and confronted their elected officials, leaving many members of Congress visibly shaken, has not only *not* subsided, but has deepened, in the ensuing months. Although House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid have kept lawmakers in Washington, thus allowing them to avoid their angry constituents, those who have ventured out to recent town hall meetings have found it is not safe to appear in their districts. Their constituents are aroused, and are demanding answers to questions, such as, why are there trillions of dollars from the Federal Reserve and the Treasury to bail out bankrupt banks, but not a penny to

create jobs, keep people in their homes, or provide health care?

Polls show that respect for Congress is continuing in a near-free fall, and that all incumbents, in both parties, are in trouble. Election results in November 2009 produced major defeats for Democrats in two gubernatorial races, including the defeat of an incumbent Democrat, Jon Corzine, in New Jersey; and the loss of Virginia, by a wide margin, even though Obama won the state handily in November 2008. Obama personally campaigned aggressively for the Democratic Party candidates in those states, and that was a factor in their defeat.

Fueling the anger is the recognition, among many citizens, that the health-care “reform” pushed by the President and his supporters will not expand and improve health care; and a growing awareness that so-called climate change is not only based on a scientific fraud, but that the “green” policies adopted by leading Democrats will mean the end of scientific and technological growth in the U.S., to be replaced by low-wage, non-productive “green” jobs—provided the bankrupt government can scrape together any money to subsidize them!

LaRouche organizers in the field have encountered not just increased skepticism about these policies, but an increasing minority of people who are asking what can be done, to address this crisis, as they are running out of patience with the present course of the nation.

Enter the LYM Campaigns

It is this reality—of a deepening crisis, a failure of leaders in both parties to offer solutions, and a heightened awareness among the population that “something must be done”—that is the driver behind the decision to launch the three campaigns of LYM members for Congress. Each of the candidates is a veteran organizer, with experience in the recruitment of members to the LYM. That recruitment process involved their intense engagement in the rigorous intellectual curriculum that Lyndon LaRouche has developed for the LYM, giving each organizer a depth of understanding of history, through study of key scientific discoveries and cultural breakthroughs.

Through this work, they are prepared to bring into U.S. politics a new generation of leadership.

It has never been more clear that such a new generation must step onto the stage of history. The Baby Boomer generation, typified by the bellowing and often

incoherent grunting of Rep. Barney Frank, has proven itself dangerously incompetent in positions of leadership. Frank, through his chairmanship of the House Financial Services Committee, personally served as a bully, under Pelosi’s direction, against LaRouche’s Homeowners and Bank Protection Act, in 2007-08. As many officials in local and state governments urged passage of this legislation, to provide a moratorium on home foreclosures, while putting banks through a Franklin Roosevelt-style bankruptcy reorganization, Frank publicly, and repeatedly insisted that LaRouche is wrong, that the crisis is “not systemic.” Instead, he worked with Treasury Secretaries Henry Paulson and Timothy Geithner, and with Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, to provide trillions of dollars in bailout funds to the banks, knowing full well that this bailout would not save a single homeowner, nor create a single job.

Or, if he did not know this, and believed that his plans would work, he has proven to be incompetent. Either way, whether he is ignorant or a liar, he should no longer represent his district in Congress. While he ducked Rachel Brown before, at a town meeting, during which he did an infamous impersonation of Elmer Fudd, ranting about debating a dining room table, he will not be able to duck her during the coming primary campaign.

Nor will Speaker Pelosi be able to ignore Summer Shields, who will challenge her as the leader who deployed the thuggish Frank, to do the dirty work of the Wall Streeters who gave Pelosi the backing to become House Speaker. Recent polls show that Pelosi’s popularity as Speaker has collapsed, and organizers are finding her San Francisco constituents unhappy with her leadership of the House.

And the Rogers campaign in Texas will offer the best opportunity for young people to fight for a future, as she will emphasize the potential of space exploration to shape the scientific and technological challenges for the next two generations. She has called for removing troops from Afghanistan, and putting them into space!

Her opponent in the general election, Rep. Pete Olson, is a hard-core neocon. In addition to his support for privatizing NASA, he played a leading role, as a Congressional staffer, in the repeal of Glass-Steagall in 1999. The 22nd district was once the home of House Minority leader Tom DeLay, whose brutal style of leadership earned him the contempt of the nation. Rogers played a role in his ouster. She also ran a strong cam-

paing, in 2006, for chairman of the Democratic Party of Texas.

As Lyndon LaRouche identified at the outset of his webcast, these three campaigns, in three very different parts of the nation, will provide a unifying direction for all those others running for Congress in 2010—as well as those endangered incumbents looking for solutions, if they wish to be re-elected—and will serve as a rallying point, for those Americans who now know that they can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines, while their nation, and the world, is threatened by a crazed and endangered financial oligarchy, and its foolish narcissistic puppet in the White House.

LaKesha Rogers

‘The Future: Mars Or the Scrap Heap’

Dec. 4—LaRouche PAC activist LaKesha Rogers today announced her candidacy for the Democratic nomination to U.S. Congress in the 22nd Congressional District of Texas, which houses one of the most important scientific and technological research centers in the country, NASA’s Johnson Space Center of NASA. She is seeking the nomination of the Democratic Party, in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon LaRouche. Rogers is challenging Republican incumbent Pete Olson, a key player in trying to save the bankrupt world financial system, as shown by his role in the 1999 repeal of the Glass-Steagall law.

“As we enter a period of breakdown crisis of the entire global monetary system, no so-called practical solutions to economic recovery will work,” Rogers said. “Instead, my campaign will emphasize the urgent

need to adopt the immediate solutions of bankruptcy reorganization, to reimpose Glass-Steagall standards between commercial and investment banks, and to issue masses of directed Federal credit for economic recovery—the plan put forth by economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche.

“The current leadership in Congress and the Obama Presidency has proven themselves to be completely incompetent,” Rogers charged, “as they continue to push for the bailout of a bankrupt monetary system, a fascist policy in health care, and putting our troops into the danger zone of Afghanistan. Any political leader or candidate who is not addressing the collapse of the financial system is not in the real world.

“The only sane solution for dealing with the present bankrupt monetary system,” Rogers continued, “is a reinstatement of the 1933 constitutional banking policies of Glass-Steagall, to provide needed protection for commercial and savings banking, against predatory investment banking practices. My campaign will orient around the need for programmatic economic solutions, with policies for long-term infrastructure projects for high-speed rail, nuclear power, and desalination, and

human space flight for interplanetary space travel and habitation of the Moon and Mars.

“We must give our youth a mission for the future,” Rogers said. “Let’s get our troops out of the war zones and put them into space. We will fund this mission by a return to a Constitutional credit system, which must be implemented if we are to address the immediate crisis as well. No system of free trade or monetarism will be acceptable. The space program provided the last major boost in productivity to our economy—and it’s indispensable for providing the next.”

Rogers said her Congressional campaign will lead the way for a national economic science-driver initiative. “The space pro-

gram cannot be thrown onto the scrap heap, as is happening today. We need a 50-year mission orientation for Mars. The future of mankind will be determined by what we do today,” the candidate concluded.



EIRNS/Chris Jadatz

LaKesha Rogers is running for Congress in the 22nd CD in Texas, against Republican Pete Olson.

Let's Put a New Face on Congress

Dec. 8—LaRouche Political Action Committee activist Summer Justice Shields today announced his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for Congress in the 8th Congressional District of California. Shields is challenging incumbent Nancy Pelosi, who blocked Lyndon LaRouche's Homeowners and Bank Protection Act of 2007, thus ushering in the age of the bailout, and blocked impeachment of Vice President Dick Cheney.

"The United States and the countries of the world are in the throes of an unprecedented economic breakdown crisis," said Shields. There is a completely understandable rage building within the American population since Pelosi bailed out Wall Street, first under Bush and Paulson, and now, under Obama and Geithner. It is time to take this anger and turn it into a productive force for the good. We have a chance to return to a science policy orientation and put our people back to work—not work



EIRNS/Chris Jadatz

Summer Shields promises a "tight" race against Speaker Nancy Pelosi, in the Democratic Primary, for California's 8th C.D.

for work's sake, but employing our citizens in the necessary industrially productive jobs required to pull our country out of crisis that has been covered up for too long. It is time to rouse our citizens to take our country back through the power of the Constitution.

"Globalization has ruined our country and every other country on Earth. I have travelled to Africa twice in my capacity as an organizer with the LaRouche PAC and I have seen this first hand. Nations are no longer self-sufficient in food production and other important industries. It is pertinent that we reach out across the Pacific Ocean to China, Russia, and India, to sign immediate agreements," Shields continued, "to create an international credit system to rebuild our countries for the benefit of the many. This has been the policy orientation of Lyndon LaRouche and I continue that with my campaign today.

"Within his first 100 days, President Franklin Roosevelt had restrained Wall Street and begun a re-industrialization process for the United States. Contrast this to the ongoing Obama Administration policy of health-care cost reduction, and the recent decision to send 30,000 more troops into an endless quagmire in Afghanistan—a continuation of the Cheney/



"Bailout" Barney Frank, has proven himself dangerously incompetent as chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, and served as Speaker Pelosi's personal hitman against LaRouche's Homeowners and Bank Protection Act, in 2007-08. LPAC candidates intend to unseat both.

Bush permanent war policy. Real Democrats choose Franklin Roosevelt.

“Let’s put a new face on Congress,” Shields concluded.

Rachel Brown

Bailout Barney: ‘You Won’t Duck Me Again!’

Dec. 10—LaRouche Youth Movement activist Rachel Brown announced Nov. 14 that she is a candidate for the Democratic nomination to Congress in the 4th District in Massachusetts, for the seat presently occupied by Rep. “Bailout” Barney Frank. Brown told an Internet audience on The LaRouche Show that Frank is one of the key Congressional figures promoting fascist policies, which are destroying our nation’s physical economy, and which threaten the lives of millions of Americans. She singled out his role in supporting the bailout of bankrupt banks and financial institutions—in particular, his attack on Lyndon LaRouche’s 2007 Homeowners and Bank Protection Act—and his rabid support of the Obama health-care bill, which is modeled on Hitler’s Nazi T-4 euthanasia policy, as evidence that he is unfit to remain in the U.S. Congress.

Frank, she said, “has no problem supporting a bailout of financial institutions, run by swindlers and thieves, at the expense of jobs and industries in the U.S. While millions are losing their jobs and their homes, he repeatedly has sided with those, such as former Goldman Sachs CEO and Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson,

Federal Reserve chairman Ben Bernanke, and current Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, who have provided more than \$23.7 trillion in bailouts to bankrupt institutions, while ignoring the needs of our citizens. While a mass strike has emerged, of people who feel betrayed by their government, who are demanding that the government act in their interests, Bailout Barney worked to sabotage moves to establish a Pecora Commission to investigate financial fraud, and is currently involved in efforts to prevent a return to the Glass-Steagall regulatory standards in banking.

“And when I asked him at a town meeting,” she added, “how he can defend President Obama’s so-called health-care policy, which will kill the sick and elderly, through provisions taken from Hitler’s 1939 ‘useless eaters’ policy, he tried to duck the question, instead, ranting incoherently.

“His actions,” she said, “are nothing less than a betrayal of the oath of office he took, to uphold the Constitution. The anger directed at him during town meetings has been richly deserved, as his constituents’ lives are endangered by what he has done in the Congress, and what he will continue to do if re-elected.

“Therefore,” she concluded, “I am running for Congress, to defeat him in the Democratic Party primary.

To those who have lost your homes, or are in danger of losing them, because of Bailout Barney’s actions, join with me, to send him packing. To those who have lost your jobs, or fear you will lose them, join me in getting The LaRouche Plan passed by the U.S. Congress, to revive our tradition of a credit system, to revive our productive economy, while shutting down the bailouts of speculators. For those whose lives, and those of your family members, are threatened, due to his promotion of the Obama Nazi health-care bill, join me in defeating this legislation.

“Bailout Barney, you ducked my questions once before—you will not be able to duck me again.”



EIRNS/Chris Jadatz

Rachel Brown will take on “Bailout” Barney Frank in the Democratic Primary in Massachusetts’ 4th C.D.

Obama's Af-Pak Policy: A Fallacy of Composition

by Ramtanu Maitra

Dec. 9—At West Point on Dec. 1, President Barack Obama presented his latest Afghanistan-Pakistan policy—the result of an extensive review, and one that would lead to the “end of the Afghanistan war,” he promised. Although not as dramatic as President George W. Bush’s landing on the *USS Abraham Lincoln* on May 1, 2003, with a banner behind him declaring “Mission Accomplished,” in Iraq, Obama chose West Point for obvious effect. But, what he delivered as his new policy was riddled with misrepresentations, and could not but have made the grim-faced cadets even grimmer.

Obama said the United States will shortly add another 30,000 troops, and a drawdown of U.S. troops will begin in the Summer of 2011. The next day, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates moved partially away from that commitment in response to a question from Ranking Member John McCain (R-Ariz.), pointing out that a further evaluation of the situation would be made in December 2010, before the drawdown date is fixed. Gates emphasized that the President has the authority to change his plans.

In his West Point speech, Obama said: “Our overarching goal remains the same: to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat al-Qaeda in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and to prevent its capacity to threaten America and our allies in the future. To meet that goal, we will pursue the following objectives within Afghanistan. We must deny al-Qaeda a safe haven. We must reverse the Taliban’s momentum and deny it the ability to overthrow

the government. And we must strengthen the capacity of Afghanistan’s security forces and government so that they can take lead responsibility for Afghanistan’s future. We will meet these objectives in three ways. First, we will pursue a military strategy that will break the Taliban’s momentum and increase Afghanistan’s capacity over the next 18 months.”

Citing the economic burden that the Afghan War has become, Obama said: “We must rebuild our strength here at home. Our prosperity provides a foundation for our power. It pays for our military. It underwrites our diplomacy. It taps the potential of our people, and allows investment in new industry. And it will allow us to compete in this century as successfully as we did in the last. That’s why our troop commitment in Afghanistan cannot be open-ended—because the nation that I’m most interested in building is our own.”

By Comparison

Compare this speech to the one President Obama delivered on March 27, the first iteration of his Af-Pak policy, and also to his speech on Aug. 17 to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. On March 17, Obama said: “We are in Afghanistan to confront a common enemy that threatens the United States, our friends and our allies, and the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan who have suffered the most at the hands of violent extremists. So I want the American people to understand that we have a clear and focused goal: to disrupt, dismantle and defeat al-Qaeda in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and to prevent their return to either country in the future. That’s the goal that



U.S. Army/Tommy Gilligan

President Obama's Afghanistan speech at West Point Dec. 1, while not as preposterous as George W. Bush's "Mission Accomplished" blunder in 2003, in Iraq, nonetheless egregiously fudged the facts about what the U.S. faces in the Af-Pak theater.

must be achieved. That is a cause that could not be more just. And to the terrorists who oppose us, my message is the same: *We will defeat you.*"

To achieve those goals, Obama recommended "a stronger, smarter and comprehensive strategy," adding that "to focus on the greatest threat to our people, America must no longer deny resources to Afghanistan because of the war in Iraq. To enhance the military, governance and economic capacity of Afghanistan and Pakistan, we have to marshal international support."

On Aug. 17, Obama told the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "This is not a war of choice. This is a war of necessity. Those who attacked America on 9/11 are plotting to do so again. If left unchecked, the Taliban insurgency will mean an even larger safe haven from which al-Qaeda would plot to kill more Americans."

The President's Dec. 1 speech was devoid of the "We will defeat you" statement, and similar emphatic rhetoric such as, "This is not a war of choice; this is a war of necessity." One may wonder what accounts for the change in tone. One thing is certain: The situation on the ground in Afghanistan—or in Pakistan, for that matter—has not changed for the better. On the contrary. The insurgents, despite being hit again and again, appear to be resilient enough and determined enough to weaken the foreign troops in Afghanistan; and Islamabad's ability to subdue the home-grown insurgents within its own borders has grown more doubtful.

And one can reasonably conclude from the goings-

on in Washington, before and after the speech, that the United States has realized that the Afghan War cannot be won. If Washington chooses to stay in Afghanistan with the motto "We will defeat you," American troops will remain there for decades—if not forever.

Bravado aside, it has perhaps also been understood that Pakistan cannot be stabilized just because Washington would like it to be stable. What needs to be done in Pakistan to halt the trend toward non-governability, is beyond Washington's ability or means. Therefore, the only policy options Washington has toward Pakistan are strong-arming of the pro-U.S. faction in the Pakistani military; pumping in more money to ease Pakistan's collapsed

economy; and sweet-talking Islamabad to stay "on course."

In fact, the real worry in Washington is not the Afghan Taliban or al-Qaeda; it is the prospect of Pakistani nuclear weapons falling into the hands of the "nasty" elements within Pakistan's military and intelligence, and from there, finding their way into the hands of Saudi-funded, viciously anti-U.S., opponents of sovereign nation-states.

Fudging the Facts

But while Obama's West Point policy speech was, to a certain extent, an acknowledgment of reality, it nevertheless misrepresented that reality. This is not simply the President's doing; to be fair, the way Afghan War was conceived and fought was all wrong from the outset. Here are some of the salient points:

- When the U.S. went into Afghanistan in the Winter of 2001 to unseat the Taliban, a Pushtun-led organization, and to capture the al-Qaeda leaders, it was with the help of the Tajik-Uzbek-dominated Afghan political grouping known as the Northern Alliance. Hamid Karzai, himself a Pushtun and, therefore, representative of the majority community in Afghanistan, was set up as President in Kabul; but no effort was made to organize the non-Taliban or anti-Taliban Pushtuns to support the government. For the sake of exigency, the top Uzbek warlord, Abdur Rashid Dostum, and many top Tajik warlords, of whom Mohammad Fahim stands out as the most

powerful, were attached to President Karzai. Dostum and most, if not all, of the Tajik warlords were beneficiaries of huge drug-trafficking operations begun in a big way after the Red Army left in 1989. Under the circumstances, Karzai's complete dependence on the Uzbek and Tajik drug warlords made the Kabul government—by necessity, not by choice—a corrupt administration. Some Pushtun warlords, particularly in eastern and southeastern Afghanistan, who continue to support Karzai, had to be given access to drug and other illicit money, further widening the corruption ring.

- By the time the U.S. Special Forces had begun their operation in Afghanistan, the Afghan Taliban was a spent force. Less than 5% of Pushtuns, and none of the minority communities (the Tajik, Uzbek, and Hazaras, among others) had anything to do with the Wahhabi-influenced Taliban. This weakened state of the Afghan Taliban was the reason that the U.S. Special Forces and the Northern Alliance, despite having to also battle Pakistani army personnel and Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), won a quick victory. Acting like the proverbial blind men of Hindoostan, however, Washington refused to acknowledge that, while all Afghan Taliban were Pushtuns, all Pushtuns were not Afghan Taliban. Of course, many Afghan Taliban hid among the non-Taliban Pushtuns; but instead of pursuing a policy that could build a Pushtun majority unsympathetic to the Afghan Taliban, the U.S. chose to depend on air strikes on Pushtun villages to eliminate the insurgents. The result was to turn the Pushtuns against the United States en masse and push them into active assistance to the Afghan Taliban—a known devil. The process also further weakened President Karzai. Pushtuns saw him as an “American stooge” who could not defend the innocents of his own community.

- As a way of getting out of Afghanistan and cutting losses in money and manpower, Washington began building the Afghan National Army (ANA). While the idea was not wrong, its implementation has been skewed by Washington's pervasive misunderstanding of Afghan realities. First, the composition of this army is predominantly non-Pushtun; it is dominated by the Tajiks and some Uzbeks. Out of a total of 92,000 members on a sunny day, more than 80,000 are Tajiks. What has not been comprehended is that, while



DOD/Tech. Sgt. Francisco V. Govea II, USAF

Only if the United States joins the emerging alliance among the three great Eurasian powers, India, Russia, and China, will the Afghanistan-Pakistan quagmire be resolved. Here, U.S. Army soldiers on patrol in Chabar, Afghanistan, Dec. 3.

the Tajiks and Uzbeks are, historically, hostile to the Pushtuns, they never “worked” for foreign forces to fight the Pushtun majority among whom they have always lived. That is why U.S. commander Gen. Stanley McChrystal could corral no more than 600 ANA personnel when he sent 4,000 U.S. Marines to Helmand province, which is dominated wholly by the Pushtuns. Even these 600 did not fight; and some of them dropped their guns and told the Pushtuns that they were just visiting Helmand.

When Obama talked on Dec. 1 about training the ANA in a jiffy (18 months) to take over Afghanistan's security, it was almost laughable.

- At the time the U.S. came into Afghanistan, the Afghan Taliban had brought down annual opium production, from the year 2000 high of 4,400 tons, to 600 tons. During the eight years since, opium production has soared to 8,200 tons annually. In fact, a total of 44,000 tons of opium, which is then converted into heroin, has been produced under the U.S. and British watch. After years of double-talking by the Bush Administration, aided by U.S. think-tank experts, it was finally acknowledged that drugs translate into weapons, and that the Afghan Taliban and al-Qaeda, among others, were beneficiaries of this booty. In his speech to the Military Academy, Obama showed that he has no policy to curb the drugs that are flowing out of Afghanistan, and are helping the insurgents and terrorists everywhere, including Russia. Although Obama repeatedly utters his resolve to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat

the insurgents, one key element—the production of drugs—is given the usual go-by.

- In his Dec. 1 speech, as well in his earlier speeches, Obama failed to acknowledge the fact that U.S. and NATO troops are presently fighting (that is, when they are forced to fight by the insurgents) not the Afghan Taliban, but the entire Pushtun community, which is now joined by some Tajik and Uzbek commanders as well. This is really not a secret. This fact was pointed out by the former Afghan Taliban ambassador to Pakistan, Mullah Abdul Salam Zaeef, a conduit between Taliban supremo Mullah Omar and the Afghan government. Zaeef recently told an Associated Press correspondent that the militant leadership now refers to its forces not as Taliban, but as “mujahideen,” a throwback to the Afghan “holy warriors” who ousted the Soviet Union at the end of the 1980s. The reason is that only one out of ten militant fighters is a true “Taliban.” The rest are ordinary Afghans, Zaeef said.

The reality is that Taliban leader Mullah Omar has now emerged as the Pushtun warrior who has fought the foreign troops with a great deal of success. When the foreign troops choose to leave Afghanistan, President Karzai will have to abandon his post to a “better Pushtun,” Mullah Omar that is, who fought for the Pushtun community and kept Afghanistan free of foreign “occupiers.”

Additional Truths

There are additional truths that have become clear to students of Afghanistan by now. For instance, it is evident that the Afghan Taliban were never involved in any anti-U.S. activities outside of Afghanistan. Not a single Afghan Taliban was ever found involved in Iraq or in Palestine. Afghans like to stay home—unless they are driven out. Then they seek refuge in Pakistan with the hope of returning home some day.

One example of the monumental incompetence exhibited by the White House since the Bush days, has been its unwillingness to reconcile Kabul with Islamabad. These two are the main ingredients in Obama’s Af-Pak broth, and yet they have remained extremely hostile to each other since 2001. Karzai’s father, Abdul Ahad Karzai, who fled to Quetta, Balochistan, after the Taliban took over Afghanistan, was Deputy Speaker of Parliament during King Zahir Shah’s days. Washington knew, and deliberately ignored, that according to President Karzai, his father was assassinated in Quetta by the Pakistani ISI/al-Qaeda in 1999. Washington also knew that weeks before the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, Karzai, who was residing in Pakistan, claimed the ISI had told him his

visa would not be renewed and he must leave by Sept. 30.

Yet, with so much bad blood between Karzai and Islamabad, Washington did nothing. Pakistani President Musharraf continued trashing Karzai for years, and Karzai made clear that he was convinced that the Pakistani establishment was continuing to interfere with his administration, and was shoring up the terrorists working against him, and the United States and NATO. One wonders in what place Washington had its head up!

Further, from what we know about Khalid Sheikh Mohammad, the alleged mastermind of 9/11, he had brought his family from Saudi Arabia and settled them in Karachi as far back as 1997, and was using it as his operational base. It should be noted that Karachi is located in Pakistan, not Afghanistan. It is a foregone conclusion that al-Qaeda supremo Osama bin Laden would not have moved into Afghanistan without being facilitated by either Pakistan or Saudi Arabia. It is one of those open “secrets”—like the airlifts of Pakistani army personnel, ISI operatives, and Afghan Taliban commanders from Kunduz, Afghanistan, in 2002, when they were about to be captured by U.S. troops and Northern Alliance warlords. On that occasion, Musharraf got the deal through with the help of President Bush and Vice President Cheney.

Finally, it is not clear what President Obama meant when, on Dec. 1, he said: “We’ll have to use diplomacy, because no one nation can meet the challenges of an interconnected world acting alone. I’ve spent this year renewing our alliances and forging new partnerships. And we have forged a new beginning between America and the Muslim world—one that recognizes our mutual interest in breaking a cycle of conflict, and that promises a future in which those who kill innocents are isolated by those who stand up for peace and prosperity and human dignity.” A similar statement was embedded in his March 27 speech: “But this is not simply an American problem—far from it. It is, instead, an international security challenge of the highest order. . . .”

Yet, when Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov sent a proposal to Washington, following his meeting with the Indian and Chinese foreign ministers in Bangalore last October, suggesting a regional effort would include Russia, China, India, Iran, Pakistan, and the Central Asian “stan” countries, to contain Afghanistan, it was ignored. Obama talks about a “new beginning between America and the Muslim world,” but he seems unaware that the Muslim world, beyond Afghanistan and Pakistan, also contains Iran and the “stan” countries, as well as parts of Russia, India, and China.

Ghosts Behind Obama's Afghanistan Surge

by Carl Osgood

Dec. 11—When President Obama announced his troop buildup in Afghanistan, at the U.S. Military Academy on Dec. 1, the cadets were not the only ones present in the room. There were also the ghosts of history, going back to the Vietnam War and Britain's Malayan Emergency.¹ When Secretary of Defense Robert Gates or U.S.-NATO Commander in Afghanistan Gen. Stanley McChrystal speak, the only memory they evoke is the U.S. abandonment of the Afghan mujahideen after the withdrawal of the Red Army from Afghanistan in 1989. However, the history of the U.S. war in that country does not begin there.

The Obama policy is wrapped around what the military calls "population-centric counter-insurgency." This doctrine emphasizes "protection of the population" from the insurgents, opening the opportunity to provide basic services and good governance. Or, as McChrystal put it in Congressional testimony on Dec. 8: "To pursue our core goal of defeating al-Qaeda and preventing their return to Afghanistan, we must disrupt and degrade the Taliban's capacity, deny their access to the Afghan population, and strengthen the Afghan security forces. This means we must reverse the Taliban's current momentum, and create time and space to develop Afghan security and governance capacity." In many respects, it's a clone of the Iraq surge in 2007, and the cast of characters behind the two surges overlaps, particularly with respect to the neocons.

In 2008, the Institute for the Study of War was formed in Washington. Headed by Kimberly Kagan, wife of the American Enterprise Institute's Fred Kagan, it has become the "go to" place for the latest military analysis. Fred Kagan was one of the architects of the Iraq surge, and he and his wife were members of the team of outside advisors that McChrystal invited to Kabul, last Summer, to help him design a campaign plan. Other members included Anthony Cordesman of the Center for Strategic

and International Studies, Stephen Biddle of the Council on Foreign Relations, and Andrew Exum of Center for a New American Security. The Kagans also brought along Lt. Gen. James Dubik (ret.), who headed the training mission in Iraq during the 2007 surge. By his own account, Dubik sold McChrystal on the idea of running the training operation in Afghanistan, the same way it had been done in Iraq.

To the neocons and their military fellow travelers, the Iraq surge is deemed a clear success. However, as pointed out by former *Washington Post* reporter Tom Ricks, one of the foremost chroniclers of the surge, while it did reduce the violence from what it had been in 2006, the political problems remain. "It worked tactically, but it didn't work strategically," he told National Public Radio on Dec. 7. "All the basic problems you had in Iraq before the surge are still there."

'Screwing Down the People'

At the same time that the Obama national security team was arriving at the decision in favor of the "winning hearts and minds" approach, a new argument appeared to be gaining ascendancy. It was signaled in Britain by the June 2009 issue of the *Journal of Strategic Studies*, and it starts from the premise that the British counter-insurgency campaign in Malaya was actually far more coercive than the currently accepted narrative describes.

The British methods in Malaya included behavior modification of the targeted population, through resettlement and food control. More than 500,000 people were forcibly resettled from the jungle into "new villages," and the supply of food was tightly controlled to deny it to the Communist insurgents. Residents of the new villages could only buy food if they had the requisite ID cards, and since food control was unpopular, the need for it was blamed on the insurgents. Such methods had been perfected after World War II by occupation authorities in Europe, to exert control over refugee populations.

Paul Dixon, of Kingston University in Surrey, England, writes in the *Journal of Strategic Studies*, "Initially, the British strategy was massive control and intimidation, with the key to the campaign lying more in 'screwing down the people,' than in winning 'hearts and minds.'" He adds that the back of the insurgency "was broken by a 'law and order' and resettlement approach, with 'hearts and minds' tactics playing an important but auxiliary role." The insurgency was largely defeated by 1952, prior to the arrival of Sir Gerald Tem-

1. A 1948-60 war between the British colonial power and the Malayan National Liberation Army, the military arm of the Malayan Communist Party. The MNLA called it the Anti-British National Liberation War.

pler, Sir Winston Churchill's chosen man to pacify Malaya. Templer's mission was to apply the psychological warfare methods of the British Tavistock Institute,² though Dixon does not say so.

The British strategy against the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya (1952-60), in that the insurgency was limited to the Kikuyu tribes, which could be isolated from the rest of the population. The British counterinsurgency campaign featured the "gang-counter-gang" operations of Sir Frank Kitson, which penetrated the Mau Mau tribe so deeply that some units were actually led by Kitson's men.

Lt. Col. Wade Markel, a U.S. Army officer then assigned to the Army Training and Doctrine Command's Futures Center, argued, in an article in the Spring 2006 issue of *Parameters*, the quarterly of the U.S. Army War College, that the main lesson to be drawn from the British experiences in both Kenya and Malaya, "is that control of the contested segment of the population is essential," and that control "is greatly facilitated when the insurgency's support is concentrated among a small and relatively unpopular minority of the population." In Kenya, that control was much more brutal than in Malaya. The population was much larger, the resources were much more sparse, and the colonial authorities relied heavily on the white settler population, which Markel describes as "fairly racist and highly self-interested." All of this made the campaign "especially and unnecessarily cruel." But nonetheless, "these tactics broke the Mau Mau."

Markel was writing in the context of the increasingly ferocious Sunni insurgency against the U.S. occupation in Iraq, and he did not advocate the tactics of Kenya in that conflict. "Now is not the time to implement such a strategy, however, and we should refrain from doing so as long as current methods continue to show signs of progress," he wrote. Markel recommended, instead, that it remain an option, should events dictate a change in strategy.

The Ghosts of Vietnam

The neocons, however, are motivated by their interpretation of what happened in the last five years of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. That narrative, promoted by such as historian Lewis Sorley in his *A Better War*, and which dates back to at least former CIA director William Colby's 1987 memoir *Lost Victory*, is that the CIA-

run rural pacification program instituted in 1967 was actually successful against the Viet Cong in the long term, in contrast to the Army's search-and-destroy operations. If only the U.S. had continued to support the government in Saigon after 1973, the war would have ended in victory for the anti-Communist forces.

This ignores, among many other things, President Harry Truman's strategic blunder of 1945, when he went along with Churchill and supported the return of Southeast Asia to European colonial control, upon the surrender of Japanese forces. It also ignores that Ho Chi Minh's movement was as much nationalist as it was Communist, a fact recognized by Americans in the OSS who deployed into Vietnam during World War II.

Among more sober thinkers, Obama's decision invokes a different parallel with Vietnam: Lyndon Johnson's 1965 decision to give Gen. William Westmoreland the massive troop increase he was asking for. Harry Middleton, an historian and former Johnson aide, told the Dec. 6 *Dallas Morning News*, "We can hear echoes of conversations from our past... I am quite fearful about it, as I do have the feeling we've been down this path before." Like Obama, Johnson held a series of meetings with his top advisors, some of whom warned him against further involvement in Vietnam, before granting Westmoreland's request.

"We're headed down the same road," said former Sen. George McGovern. "And Obama is not going to get out of there with only sending 30,000, and we are not going to come out in 2011. Two years from now, he's going to look up and say 'Gosh, we have lost 5,000 troops over there, we can't pull out now.' It's a no-win proposition. And in Afghanistan, nobody has ever been able to prevail in that deserted and mountainous country."

Obama's narcissism makes him think he can avoid the Vietnam parallel altogether. Unlike John F. Kennedy with Douglas MacArthur, Obama did not turn to a great military mind when he had to make the decision on Afghanistan. Instead, according to the Dec. 6 *New York Times*, he turned to White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel, who, in turn, got advice at a dinner party from a Deputy National Security Advisor, Tom Donilon, who pointed Emanuel to the book *Lessons in Disaster* by Gordon M. Goldstein, about McGeorge Bundy's role in the Vietnam war.

When McChrystal's strategy of "winning hearts and minds" fails, in addition to asking for even more troops, will Obama also adopt a more brutal strategy, informed by British psychological warfare methods?

2. See L. Wolfe, "Tavistock's Imperial Brainwashing Project," *EIR*, May 24, 1996.

Trash Global-Warming Genocide; Look to Indo-Pacific Frontier!

Here is a transcript of the Dec. 5, 2009 LaRouche Show, an Internet radio program (www.larouchepub.com/radio), this week, hosted by Marcia Merry Baker, and featuring Glen Isherwood of Australia's Citizens Electoral Council and the LaRouche Youth Movement; and EIR's New Delhi Intelligence Director Ramtanu Maitra.

Marcia Merry Baker: Welcome everyone. Our topic for discussion today, is “Trash the British Global-Warming Genocide and Look to the Indo-Pacific Frontier.” I might subtitle this: “The British Empire Is Going Down.”

I'm very glad to have, discussing this with me, live in the studio today, Ramtanu Maitra, who is our *EIR* New Delhi desk, and often goes back and forth between India and the United States. Welcome Tanu.

Ramtanu Maitra: Thank you, Marcia. I'm glad to be here.

Baker: And, from Down Under, Australia, we have Glen Isherwood, in Melbourne, from the Citizens Electoral Council and the LaRouche Youth Movement there. Glen, welcome.

Glen Isherwood: Thank you, Marcia.

Baker: Let me begin by saying, events are very hot and heavy right now in the world, which you can see with the degree of complete collapse being manifest, as

it was some days ago, in the so-called Dubai crisis. It's really like the crisis in Hong Kong during the Opium Wars—the dirty-money drug center. And we have many other examples of complete collapse of the monetarist imperial system.

So, the issue is, are we looking ahead to a new course, and pathway of development and hope, or, if our forces for humanity don't prevail, doom and a dark age? The good news is, there are strategic shifts in a positive direction.


I want to refer people to the LaRouche PAC website (www.larouchepac.com), where they will find Lyndon LaRouche's Dec. 3 webcast, titled, “The Real change Is Coming.” And Mr. LaRouche looked ahead to what must be done in the United States, in particular, but what we want to do in the world to forge a joint initiative by the major powers, the Four Powers—Russia, India, China, and the United States—toward initiating the credit system, the kinds of measures and major infrastructure projects that can make, literally, all the difference on this planet.

And, look on the LPAC website for LaRouche's participation, and also his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, from Germany, in a Moscow-based conference Dec. 3-4, where each of them participated by pre-taped video. And the conference was against globalization. It was held by an association that's focused on that, and also, I think, the Academy of Geopolitics, in Russia.



CEC

Glenn Isherwood, a leader of the LaRouche Youth Movement in Australia: "We've seen a massive shift coming from the population, in response to this push for a Copenhagen treaty, and the policies associated with that."



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Ramtanu Maitra, EIR Intelligence Director, New Delhi: "The large nations, like India and China... have taken the decision that they have to provide for the population, and they only way they can do it, is by adoption of nuclear..."

So, when LaRouche taped something for this Moscow conference in November, his words were, literally, that the world has shifted, from former domination—think of the globe—by the Atlantic Ocean, as far as what goes on in the world; and now, it's shifted across into the Pacific, into the Indian Ocean, with the nations of Asia, touching Africa, and certainly including Australia: that this is a new period we are looking at, where we can look to developing the vast resources of countries, of eastern Russia, Siberia, Mongolia. And we can look for generations ahead.

Let's talk now, open the discussion, in a kind of parallel, two-track way, where I'd like to have Glen start off, and describe a singular event in Australia, that took place *against* the British Empire and Commonwealth. And then, right after that, Tanu, maybe speak of the orientation towards future development by China.

So, Glen: What happened this week, tell us, in Canberra [the capital of Australia]?

Ironic Upheavals

Isherwood: Well, down here, there have been many ironic upheavals, this last week especially; but leading into last week, we've seen a massive shift coming from

the population, in response to this push for a Copenhagen treaty, and the policies associated with that.

This past week, the Liberal Party of Australia, which is, traditionally, if you look back in history, the pro-monarchy, Anglophile party, which was actually established by the financial establishment very close to London—these guys actually went through an upheaval, where they dumped their leader, Malcolm Turnbull, in a very close vote, 42-41, because he was pro-global warming; he was for this policy of putting a tax on carbon; he was for going to Copenhagen; a policy for Australia to commit to carbon dioxide reduction, and all these types of things. And, what occurred was, the population absolutely rejected this, and they pretty much burned the phone lines, sent the e-mail in-boxes into meltdown, to their political representatives, because they did not want this.

And, in a sense, what you saw was, what Lyndon LaRouche has described in the United States as a mass strike: You had, down here, such a pressure from the population not to support what these policies were for Copenhagen, and a tax on carbons, that it forced a massive upheaval in the Liberal Party.

And, to look at what happened this past week: They dumped Turnbull, a leader of the Liberal Party; he's a former Goldman Sachs banker; he went to London, earlier this year—I think in July or August—and he came back supporting the policy of our Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, to ram through, in the shortest possible time, targets and a treaty and policies to take to Copenhagen. On the basis of that issue, he was dumped, and they brought in a pretty conservative guy called Tony Abbott, who is a Liberal protégé of [former Prime Minister] John Howard.

So, what you see is, there was a mass strike reaction, and the Liberal Party realized that if they did not dump their support for the Queen's policy, and the British policy of carbon reduction and genocide that that includes; if they did not dump that, then the party would disintegrate, because the population would revolt.

And so, you had this real irony, because this is supposed to be the party loyal to the Queen's intention.

In 2007, the CEC launched a nationwide campaign to defeat the genocide agenda behind global warming: “We put out half a million copies of our newspaper, *The New Citizen*, with the headline, ‘Global Warming Is a Fraud.’ We said, we have to educate the population; we have to show the population why this is completely a fraud.”



CEC



policies of our fight to defeat the genocide agenda that lies behind global warming and this fraud of carbon dioxide production. And we on mobilized that. We put out half a million—500,000—copies of our regular newspaper, called *The New Citizen*, with the headline, “Global Warming Is a Fraud.” And, the way we approached this, is we

said, we have to educate the population; we have to show the population why this is completely a fraud. And, act on the population, because that’s what is really going to make the difference in getting rid of this tax, and getting rid of this policy altogether.

From there, we managed then to force the national TV station to screen “The Great Global Warming Swindle,” and then, through a process of continuing mass e-mailing and mass organizing around the country, we were able to shift the population to reject this policy. And so, yes, you see the developments in the recent few days as a consequence of really taking the fight to the population, and telling the truth on this whole policy, and on what the outcome is intended to be.

So, that’s the short version.

The Queen Outed in Trinidad

Baker: Right. Well, before we get to Tanu, we could draw out what kind of shift in strategic terms this is, because, speaking of the Queen, and the way the Liberal Party was loyal to her bidding, she was here in the American Hemisphere, at Trinidad & Tobago, just ten days ago, at a 53-nation Commonwealth gathering, saying that there must be global warming agreements and forced pacts. So this goes directly against it—this Senate vote in Canberra—

Isherwood: Yes, absolutely.

Baker: Could you just add on that?

Isherwood: Well, yes. The Queen came out, and pretty much, in Trinidad there, gave this speech, saying that the British Empire, or what they call the British Commonwealth, today, has been at the center of policy

And, for a bit of extra spice in there: Tony Abbott, who is an arch-monarchist, takes over the party from Turnbull, who is supposed to be, ostensibly, a republican.

So, what we’ve seen is a complete irony; however, to add to this, I think it’s important: the overhaul of the leadership of the Liberal Party meant that Kevin Rudd and the Labor Party’s push for a carbon tax and the Copenhagen treaty was defeated in the Senate, which means it was off the agenda. Rudd could not take any policy to Copenhagen, and this is a consequence. And this is absolutely the case, that our role—the Citizens Electoral Council’s role, and the LaRouche movement’s role in Australia—has brought this about.

If you go back, and you look at the beginning of 2007, more than two years ago, we made it one of the frontline

of the world for the last several decades. And the Queen basically said, we must make sure we not only continue to have such a strong influence on world affairs in the future, but we must expand our influence. We must make the issue of the empire global warming, and we must push for policies of genocide, at Copenhagen—reductions of emissions, and this type of thing.

So this issue is the policy of the British Empire, of the Queen. She had to personally come out and say the Commonwealth *must* take the lead on pushing for the whole policy on global warming: on reduction in industry, reduction in development. And, if you throw in there this clown called Prince Philip, who said that if he were to be born again, or reincarnated, that he wants to come back to the Earth as a virus, to wipe out *people*, I mean, that captures the mindset of the British Empire. And the fact that she had to come out and say this publicly, means that she's really desperate. And you can see the desperation among these guys. And when you have, inside the Commonwealth, well, inside the Empire, so to speak, Australia and other nations sticking up their middle fingers at the Queen—that's what we're seeing, and it's really quite exciting!

Baker: Right, congratulations.

Maitra: Yes. Good job!

The Shift to Asia and the Pacific

Baker: And we want to come back to this. But Tanu, you have made the point, frequently, that the orientation—there's an intrinsic necessity about also going for just the opposite of genocide—going for increased population potential support, by high-technology, in China and elsewhere. Could you develop this now?

Maitra: Yes, absolutely. I think that the reason that the Copenhagen summit is going to fail, is because of the fact that the major nations, as Mr. LaRouche has pointed out, have made their shift toward the Asia-Pacific at this point in time. They are making the shift; the shift is not complete.

But there is a general understanding developing,




dae.gov

Nuclear power, explained Maitra, is capable of providing not only urgently needed electric power, but also, desalination of seawater. India's nuclear desalination plant at Kalpakkam, in Tamil Nadu (shown here), is scheduled to go operative in 2011.

pretty deep-rooted, between Russia, China, India, in particular, as of now, that the population location is the Asia-Pacific, the requirements are very high, and there is an enormous amount of capabilities that this area has developed over the years, vis-à-vis science and technology, skilled manpower, and all that, such that now they have to make certain decisions that cannot depend on these kinds of global monetary operations, which have led to non-development and the deaths of many people.

So, basically, the Indian nuclear program goes back to the 1950s, so that was long before “climate change” became an issue. Nobody was talking about that in the '50s, because India realized, at that point in time, that, because of its large population and limited resources, that they would have to develop the capability for power generation, capability through a medium that does not require an enormous amount of resources. So, that is one side of it.

The second side of it is that, that source itself brings in a very high level of technology; this technology is not only power generation technology, high energy-flux density, and all that, but also, it brings in a lot of materials, which otherwise you would never develop. And these materials, and the machine-tool industry that comes with it, provide the population with an enormous tool with which to develop in many other areas. And, as we have found out, we have not done as well [as we could have].



Hong Kong Nuclear Investment Co.

Much to the chagrin of the climate mafia, by the early 1990s, the Chinese had already decided to develop nuclear power in the long-term, while using coal and other sources in the short-term, to provide their people with power, food, and jobs. Shown: Guangdong Nuclear Power Plant, Guangdong Province, China.

But we have developed the capability to use nuclear power, not only for power generation, but for developing potable water. Because, when you have a large population, the first thing that is required is to get food security. And, in order to have food security, you have to adopt modern agricultural technology, which requires not only a large amount of fertilizer, but a lot of water. So you have to have an enormous amount of capability to have water, and the water—you can't depend on rain-fed agriculture—it is impossible because a billion people's lives depend on it. So you have to think about how to utilize the seawater, how to get the saline water converted into, semi-, or, I would say, to minimally saline water, which can be used for agricultural purposes. And then, also, potable water for domestic and other commercial and industrial uses.

So, nuclear energy comes in, providing all these options, and there is no other single technology that exists which provides all these options, simultaneously, and also raises the skill level of the population. So, anybody who has a little bit of insight, and a little bit of foresight, will immediately know that this is the only way a nation can survive.

China, which, of course, is a civilizational nation, and although it did not adopt a development policy until, I would say, 1979-1980, it had already, for its own

military security, started looking at the nuclear technology, particularly its military strength. But when you do that, you also have to do an enormous amount of neutral science, neutral technology, and various other areas of power generation, which then can be fitted into any future program for nuclear power development.

And they went, in 1979-1980, and they made it very clear—I still remember: It was around 1993, '94, it was the Clinton Administration—that in Delhi, an international conference took place, and this thing was brought up; the global warming was not discussed, but carbon emissions, carbon dioxide generation, greenhouse gases, all that stuff. And a whole bunch of the young scientists from other states, sort of herded in by a

Clinton Administration guy, who was connected with the scientific advisory board of the President, went in there with an international conference. The Indians were there, the Chinese were there, and many other nations were represented.

And the Chinese went up and—I still remember—and this Chinese scientist said, I agree with you; this greenhouse gas emissions, and all these other things, could be pretty dangerous and could be difficult for us to remove, and which will cost a lot of money to remove those pollutions, and all that. So we decided that we will go for nuclear. The moment he said that, I still remember, the Clinton Administration fellow—I don't remember his name exactly—he just put his hand on his forehead, and said, "Oh, for God's sake!"

But, the Chinese, at that time, had already made up their mind that they would develop the power generation capability, long-term. Short-term, in order to provide people with food and jobs and things like that, they went for coal, and they will continue with coal and whatever else, gas, and whatever else they can get their hands on, in order to provide at least a living standard and skill standard of the population.

But, for the long term, they have made up their mind, that—and I have seen it very clearly—there is no other option for them, but to go for nuclear technology. And

it is coming together: The recent caucus that India, China, Brazil, South Africa—Sudan also joined that caucus—that took place at the end of last month at Beijing, at which they decided that, at the Copenhagen conference, they will go in—basically, they are not going to disrupt anything, but if any binding solution is proposed, by the developed nations, or any other nations, then they will jointly walk out.

Now this strength, the basic understanding of this thing, comes from the fact that they realize that the only way that their countries will develop is with nuclear. And the nuclear capability they will have to develop by themselves; they're going to have to develop the engineers; they have to develop the science; they have to develop the industry. And once they do that, then, they really don't care what this international mafia, this climate mafia, and all these people say.

But, at the same time, the decision to go for nuclear was not based upon the fact that they are doing it in order to reduce greenhouse gases, or global warming. It is a decision that this is the only way. And this is always—as Mr. LaRouche has pointed out a long time before anybody thought about climate change and global warming—that any nation which wants to be an economically powerful nation, and that wants to provide the population with the necessary capabilities, has no choice but to go nuclear. That's the only way they can go.

And so, that is what is basically the driving force behind these decisions that were made in China and India respecting nuclear. And I believe that there are a lot of other countries that are looking at it; Japan had already done it a long time back; South Korea has already done it; but also, in Southeast Asia, you're seeing some countries coming in.

The Necessity for Going Nuclear

Baker: Right, and you wanted to say something on this, Glen?

Isherwood: Oh yeah. It's interesting that Ramtanu mentioned this push, the response from China and India, naturally, to this attempt to force a reduction in CO₂, which, obviously, for the British, means shutting down industry and “going green” with these terrible technologies, like solar power and windmills and these ludicrous ideas, is, they saw the necessity of going for nuclear. And it's interesting: In Australia, the recent break that's occurred has also forced the nuclear question back into the discussion. Because if you're not going to support the Queen's plan, what kind of policy

are you going to have in terms of long-term development? And what we've seen is, a few guys out of this upheaval have begun to say: Well, look, the world is moving in a different direction than the types of ideas coming out of Copenhagen. We have to look at this question of nuclear, and see where Australia can move in that direction.

Now, that's just a natural consequence of rejecting British policy, is the nuclear science and this thinking is the alternative. This is the answer. And we're seeing that, also, in Australia as a consequence of this.

Maitra: Right.

Baker: Right. I'm just pointing out here, we were just looking at an interactive map, of the 400 nuclear power plants in the world—big, small, research or not. And of course, Australia stands out so vividly as empty.

Maitra: So does Ibero-America.

Baker: Yes, with very little. And Africa. By the way, I'll point out one thing here, and Tanu may add to this, that among the announcements, [Russian] Prime Minister Putin, when he was giving the annual speech and a question-and-answer—I think they get something like 2 million e-mail questions. But it was announced that Russia is going to commit to 32 nuclear plants—by when, Tanu?

Maitra: In ten years.


Baker: That is a mobilization.

Maitra: That's a mobilization, yes.

Baker: Or, the beginning of a mobilization, rather than an indefinite, somewhat of a commitment.

Maitra: Russia, of course, has 100% capability to develop every aspect of nuclear reactor and nuclear power. The most important thing for Russia at this point in time—and they're not a power-short nation—the most important thing for Russia will be what goes in, in the developmental policy. Because 32 nuclear reactors, you can say approximately, there'll be about 32,000 MW of power, in ten years, coming in, and that consumption of that power has to be connected with large-scale development of either industries, you know, manufacturing industries, or opening up new areas like Siberia and places like that.

So it will be very interesting to note what their developmental policy vis-à-vis usage of this nuclear



NASA

The Southern Hemisphere—South America, Africa, Australia, plus Russia's Far East, stand out in this NASA satellite map of the Earth at night, as lacking sufficient power to generate the economic development desperately needed to support their growing populations. Only nuclear power can provide that.

power is. Because nuclear power by itself in Russia is not a novelty, which to many parts of the world it is. But for Russia, it is more important at this point in time, to develop its industrial capabilities' strength; and then, because Russia is one of the Four Power nations. And so, Russia—that entire, huge Siberian area, development will bring about a sea-change in the Eurasian land-mass, and will also involve an enormous amount of population involvement. Because Russia by itself cannot develop Siberia: Russia doesn't have the population; Russia has a negative population growth. So they have to involve the Chinese, and the Indians, and others, to develop this area.

But to do that, the utilization of the power, the nuclear power that they'll be generating, it has to be seen how well it is being channeled and directed. If it is done in the right way, then basically, what they will be going for is what Mr. LaRouche and the Schiller Institute had proposed on the Eurasian land-mass development. It will be a very important part of the Eurasian land-mass development. I think that it will be a very interesting thing to watch what comes up next, in Russia's developmental program. Power generation is fine, but they are not a power-short nation, so really, they don't need, and their population is not growing, so definitely, these 32,000 MW will be utilized for very high power-

density-required economic development, and that is one thing I am very interested in.

Thorium Reactors for India...

Baker: I'd like to ask both of you, two follow-up questions on that. One thing is, you, Tanu, over the decades, sketched in for India what the landscape would look like, if you were going for—which we are—smaller, modern, fourth-generation nuclear plants—what the geography of development would look like on the Indian Subcontinent. And for you, Glen, I know your Citizens Electoral Council has put out what kind of big projects in Australia would be part of the Pacific Basin development. But, Tanu, on the Indian Subcontinent?

Maitra: I am very hopeful, and of course this will come about with the help of the Russian cooperation, for the thorium breeder reactors. India has developed the very basics of the thorium reactors, and Indian design is basically—thorium is not a fissile material; it's a fissionable material. That means that thorium can be converted into fissile material, and thorium-232, when it gets hit by a neutron, it absorbs the neutron and becomes uranium-233, which is a fissile material. Now, to generate this uranium-233 from thorium-232, the old U.S. design, which was used in Shippingport, Pa., in the 1960s [in operation 1957-82—ed.], was basically, use a

particle accelerator to hit the thorium, and to make it into uranium-233. But in order to do a large number of reactors, you cannot depend on the particle accelerator, so you have to develop a breeder reactor, where thorium can be converted into uranium-233, while at the same time, that breeder reactor is generating power.

So, India has developed that, and the demo reactor probably will go into action next year, or in 2011.

Baker: Where is it?

Maitra: It is in a place called Kalpakkam, which is in Tamil Nadu, in the southern part of India.

And the Russians, on the other hand, also are quietly doing this thorium breeding process. And exactly at what level they are, we do not know, but with India, in 2001, they signed a memorandum of understanding, to broaden this area of cooperation in the thorium breeder reactor.

Now, what I'm looking at, and what I think is of particular importance—thorium is, for all practical purposes, the best nuclear power generation fuel, because thorium is not fissile, but it's a thirsty fissionable material: That means that it absorbs a neutron very quickly. The problem with U-238 or U-235, is that their cross-section is so small, that it doesn't really absorb neutrons, so you need quite a bit of effort, quite a bit of design, in order to get into a geometry in which the neutron will be absorbed and a chain-reaction will start.

Secondly, it produces U-233, which has a very short half-life, which means it's highly radioactive, which means it can not be taken out by terrorists. There doesn't exist any protective material, protective stuff with which you can handle U-233, and you can transport it or anything like that. So, from the non-proliferation point of view, thorium is a natural product.

And thirdly, thorium is the second-largest, naturally abundant mineral resource on this Earth—number one is bauxite. So therefore, thorium is a natural choice. But uranium-235 is an easy thing to do, and we did that.

Now we have to go into this doing a little more difficult engineering, a difficult neutron science, to get this thorium thing done. The initial requirement was for the developed nations, that nuclear power was mostly for the developed nations—this is decades ago—and the developed nations have a good grid system. That means, you can hook into the grid system, a very large nuclear reactor, like 1,000 MW.

Now, the development, the design of these grid systems, is very complicated: It's like designing a water pipe distribution system. If you put in too much power,

it gets clogged; if that large input point suddenly goes bust, then the whole system becomes unstable. So therefore, the grid system is very, very complicated. But if you have a very strong grid system, through which thousands and thousands of megawatts of power are passing on a regular basis, and you put in a large reactor, it has less possibility of creating any instability.

But, in a developing nation, these grids are weak, and often the grids are not nationwide, and therefore if you put in a large reactor, then the problem comes in. Then it's like having your main water pipe distribution system as a one-inch pipe system, and you try to put a four-inch pipe full of water into that main pipe distribution, so it will not go. It will just black out.

So therefore, one of the requirements for developing nations was to—there are two—one is, that you have to develop a grid system, which is big enough to absorb a large input of power, and since the grid system of a country like India or China, these are nations with grid systems, but they're weak, the development of a grid system needs a lot of money, but it doesn't create any new power. Therefore, the tendency is basically to generate power, and do the grid system bit by bit, by doing the grid system regionally, and then strengthening the grid regionally, and then connecting them up.

But the point is, that, in a developing nation like India, or in Africa, or even China, there is no requirement to develop this kind of huge grid. You can develop small reactors and the small reactors are very useful, in the sense, that your grid will not be disturbed; you can locally consume that thing. For example, in the villages you can put in a small 50 MW reactor, and that 50 MW reactor serves the village. And then the heat that it creates can be used for flash desalination of water. And then, when the village becomes a little wealthier, you put in or two of these 50s and make a cluster—you can keep on making these clusters, and you can put in as many as you want. And the good thing about it, is that when you put in the first one, that is, a 50 MW reactor, you need a very small infrastructure to make it work, and very little capital expense. So you are introducing a very high technology with little capital expense and which doesn't need a huge infrastructure. So the whole thing can be put up in one or two years. In my book, it's a very wonderful option that you have.

...And for Africa

And when I look at Africa, there is no way, other than probably in South Africa, that any other part of

Africa can absorb these large reactors. So among other things that the thorium reactors, since it is being developed in India, and with Russian collaboration, India must go for these small reactors. These small reactors will not only help India, but will help a huge section of China, and probably the entirety of Africa. Because, nobody in Westinghouse, or in Hitachi, Toshiba, or Areva, would be interested in doing these small reactors. Because selling one small reactor, you don't make any money; you know, a 50 MW reactor doesn't bring you any money. And until and unless you have a huge number of reactors on order, you do not go into that manufacturing line at all. You rather go with the 1,000 MW, and if you sell one, you make a substantial amount of money, which can then be channeled into more reactors and research work.

So, it is of utmost importance that those nations who are developing nuclear reactor technology at this point in time, must think about: This is the requirement of the future. Because the large populations that are without power, and without water—they will be served very well by these reactors. And as I said, you can add clusters, you can add a 50 MW reactor, and then a 300 MW reactor, in the same cluster—it doesn't create any problem.

So therefore, this is one of the areas we are pushing very hard in India, to go for these small reactors in large scale. And if you look at India's entire southern peninsula, anything below the middle of India, there is really no river. The rivers are very short, and they do not have enough water. So therefore, the only way that area can become what it should be, is through desalination—and of course power can always be used—but it is the [lack of] water which I think is the bottleneck for India's development, in the southern peninsula. And nuclear power can serve that very well. And you can dot the entire coast with these little reactors, which will be doing the desalination, and also will provide a little power which can be consumed by the local industries, small and medium-scale industries, that the area has, or will have.

So, in my thinking, at this point in time, the British Empire's biggest target is Africa. Because Africa has no



www.chinese-embassy.org.uk

A Chinese engineer (second from left) teaches workers who are building coal mines and power stations in western Tanzania. Like India and other developing nations, Africa will benefit enormously from the introduction of small thorium reactors.

option, other than burning coal, or burning any other kind of fuel. They don't have the nuclear capability, and they do not have any nuclear technology going anywhere in Africa. So, with this climate change and the global warming and all this kind of thing, the first thing that will happen to Africa—and already there is huge starvation—starvation will be incorporated, it'll be installed in perpetuity; and secondly, then, whatever little money they generate out of selling their mineral resources, that will be then channeled into developing solar and wind power, and things like that.

Because then, the argument will be the same that I'm giving: The argument will be that since Africa doesn't have a grid to carry power, a large amount of power, it must have local power generation and local consumption, and this power should not be a large amount, but should be a small amount, and that's going to sustain the African way of life. And that's the way second green revolution that Kofi Annan and Bill Gates and people like that, talk about in Africa. They also suggest the same thing: There's an "African way of life" which is basically otherwise, to say, that you live your life in great poverty, and do not worry about deaths, because that's the "way of life" in Africa.

Isherwood: I was going to say, "enjoy underdevelopment—don't let the place develop," and create a culture of that.

Maitra: Yes, yes. “That’s your fate, that’s your destiny.”

Now, the large nations, like India and China, and even Indonesia, can not afford to do that, unless they want to break up their own country. So they have taken the decision that they have to provide for the population, and the only way they can do it, is by adoption of nuclear, and rejecting the climate change policies that are being touted and imposed through this global mafia.

Australia: Breaking with the British Empire

Baker: Well, Glen, the mention of thorium, and even though it’s abundant around the world, it’s handy in Australia—that’s my understanding.

Maitra: It’s number one.

Isherwood: Well, down here, we’re a big island and we have a lot of beaches.

Maitra: Yes, monazite [a mineral containing thorium and other elements—ed.].

Isherwood: We have monazite—we’re very famous for our beaches, but we haven’t been utilizing some of these great gifts that we have. And it has been the policy of the CEC and the LaRouche movement on this continent, to bring Australia into an integration of development with the whole Pacific region. I mean, this was the orientation coming out of World War II, where we had an alliance between Australia and the United States.

What was known as the John Curtin-Franklin Roosevelt partnership, was an intention to really get away from British colonialism, and develop every region of the world. And John Curtin had that orientation, but unfortunately he passed away just after Franklin Roosevelt did. And the British Empire was able to regroup itself and reestablish the influence over Australia, through the green ideology, through the ideas of “conservation,” and all these terms which came out of the eugenics movement, to pretty much keep people in a backward state without real development.

Now, our movement has been pretty much combatting this ideology. And the one thing that Australia has to do is develop a solid nuclear industry, to take the thorium in abundance in the sands of the beaches, and also to take the uranium—but not just to dig it out of the ground and send it off overseas for processing, which is the policy now, under Rio Tinto and the British mining cartels; but to take these resources and establish here, the types of manufacturing industries for reactor ves-

sels, to take the minerals, and process and develop them here. And do it in such a way that you’re going to integrate the whole of the nation. Which, I mean, you’re talking about developing high-speed rail corridors, of the best modern rail systems, to link our cities. You know, Australia is very large, and very spread out, so you need the rail to integrate the system.

And then, what you actually need to do, is we need to develop high-speed shipping in the North, to get out our materials, our manufactured goods up there, into the Pacific and into Asia, where this massive development is required.

So, there’s much we’ve said on how we must develop all these things. And really, the break with the British is the key point, being under the Commonwealth, and being in the system under globalization, which Australia has been stuck in for quite some time. It really is the challenge on the plate now, for us: to break with the British Empire of monetarism, to go with the traditions in our country, which are very deep, of a credit system, as it’s understood in the U.S. Constitution; it’s understood from the work of people like Alexander Hamilton. That the only way that you can go towards these types of economic programs, is you’ve got to put this system in the grave where it belongs, and go with a system of cooperation with sovereign nations.

And the first thing that you would do, under an agreement like that, among sovereign nations, is cooperation on nuclear power development: Because that will solve the water problems, it solves the energy problems, as Ramtanu was mentioning with India, and China, and Africa. And the real challenge for us, if Australia is to be a developed nation, which is our cultural impulse, is, we will be involved and cooperate in that. And that’s really our challenge. And that’s why we’ve got—we’re producing the materials to educate the population towards taking that Pacific orientation on themselves, as a personal responsibility.

A Strong Kinship with the American Revolution

Baker: Let me put a plug in here for two things: Your website is www.cecaust.com.au. And just to underscore, you have in tabloid form, this multi-page *New Citizen*, that’s the October and November issue, that has in it, the history of Australia, and the Empire that needs to be defeated from the vantage point you’re just describing—from the development vantage point, going back to the 18th Century. And it’s terrific reading.

You're talking about using it like crazy as a tool in the midst of this upheaval in Australia, but other people will benefit greatly by going to that.

I hear you've had a big reaction to it, when you started to get it into circulation.

Isherwood: Yeah, let me just say, on this *New Citizen*: this is a very historic document. A team of us from CEC have been researching for the last two years, the true history behind the founding of Australia. And really this is absolutely important, as Lyndon LaRouche mentions all the time, that in every nation, there's a deep-seated cultural identity, and the most important thing that everyone must understand, is the true history of their nation. And we in Australia, we've actually been lied to, and we've been told cover stories in the history class, about the true reasons why the British Empire chose to colonize Australia.

Just to give a clearer picture of that: Australia came into existence, pretty much following immediately after the American Revolution. And after the American Revolution, the British were completely bankrupt. You had, at the same time the American Revolution was won, the independence of Ireland, and a massive optimism spread through Europe: Republicanism and real optimism to get rid of this tyranny of empire and monarchy, and all this medieval, feudal system. And the British, being desperate, sent these republicans—they gave them a bodgy trial for being treasonous and what-have-you, and they sent them off to Australia. But their real intention was to secure the British Empire in the Pacific. And one of the things that they were terrified about, was, would Australia repeat the type of revolution that America just went through, which threw off the tyranny of oligarchism, and the culture of feudalism and oligarchy which they had rejected.

Australia, in this way, is unique, and this is what this newspaper goes through: We were a nation that was founded without the subservience or respect for oligarchism, which was embedded in European culture, because of the optimism, and because of the inspiration



JCPML: Records of the Curtin family



Australia's wartime leader John Curtin (above, right) worked closely with the United States to win the war in the Pacific. He is shown here with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in 1944. The photo of President Franklin Roosevelt (left) is inscribed, "For The Rt Hon John Curtin, Prime Minister of Australia From his friend Franklin D Roosevelt."

that the United States represented. And throughout our history, we've always had a very strong kinship with the ideas of the United States and its Constitution.

I'll just mention, for those who don't know, in Australia, in the beginning of the 1900s, we had an American who came to Australia, called King O'Malley, who pretty much successfully set up a National Bank here in Australia, modeled explicitly on Hamilton's. And King O'Malley said, "I am the Alexander Hamilton of Australia," because no other figure in history could be improved upon on this question of economic policy. And through this, you had this massive influence of development programs, inspired from the United States. And that's been the struggle in our whole history; this is what you're not taught in the classroom, obviously. This is what the British Empire has tried to keep out of the minds of Australians, and keep us in a state of thinking small, thinking local, thinking isolated.

And this is why this *New Citizen* is so powerful, because it's understanding that we share this common outlook that the United States does: that mankind is not an animal, under the yoke of some form of oligarchy. And we go through that, and we go through the founding of Australia, and how this culture was always fighting with the British Empire. And, so it really must be a lesson that Australians and people around the world understand, to have this kind of orientation.

THE NEW
CITIZEN
Official Publication of the Federally Registered Political Party,
 Citizens Electoral Council of Australia

For More Information:
CONTACT US
 1-800-636-432
 PO Box 978
 Colongoi VIC 3058
 Web: www.cecaust.com.au
 Email: cececaust@cecaust.com.au

LaRouche:
**Defeat the British Empire
 of Monetarism!**

Mass Strike Shapes U.S., World Politics—
"The British Plan" Reveals the Truth

A team of CEC researchers explored the true history of the founding of Australia, which came into existence just after the American Revolution. That Revolution has always been a touchstone for Australian patriots, who reject the monetarism of the British Empire. An in-depth study appears in the October-November 2009 issue of The New Citizen.

The Climate Mafia Will Vanish

Maitra: I think the climate crowd, the climate mafia is basically rejected by anyone who has legs to stand up. And you know, I think that they will be on the defensive. But the most important thing that is top priority for all the nations at this point in time, particularly, is to put in place a nuclear-power-generation program, which will—it's like, in my book, like food security; it is what will keep the sovereign nation-state intact. And, that if we will force nuclear power generation in every country, you'll see the climate people will just vanish, because there is nothing to counter that, because it's such a strong argument. And anybody can see why nuclear power is necessary for a country's development; and not the power itself, but the nuclear-power-related technologies, which will give them a long-term potential to develop and become a prosperous nation.

And so, that should be the key, that you know. Okay, climate change is happening, so we will go for nuclear, and we'll develop every bit the entire fuel cycle of nuclear, and generation and manufacture of nuclear reactors, and that's what our goal is. And that itself will completely put them out to sea, and they will not be able to do anything, and that's what is necessary at this point in time. I think so.

Baker: Right, and Tanu, it strikes me that the time period—you mentioned food security and food sovereignty for a nation, that the exact time when India was collaborating with the American, Norman Borlaug, who was working with Mexico—so in other words, trination development, Mexico-the United States-India—that was the period of interest in nuclear power in India.

Maitra: Right.

Baker: The initiation—and food sovereignty. So, India did become food self-sufficient when? 1974?

Maitra: I think by the end of 1970s, they were already food self-sufficient at that time. India's program started in 1958, that was under the visionary nuclear scientist we had, Dr. Homi Bhabha, whose standard statement was, "No power is more expensive than no power." So, he basically convinced the authorities that you can not look at nuclear power as a capital expense. It is the building block of a nation. And not only nuclear power has power, it can create water, it has got radioisotopes which are used in industries all over, nuclear medicine—you are bringing in a host of developments which, through use of one technology, which in my book is of extremely great use to every nation.

Isherwood: There's going to be this coming week, in light of these developments, the leader of the Citizen's Electoral Council in Australia, Craig Isherwood, national secretary, is going to be giving his first national webcast address to organize the population and get them on board.

Baker: Give us the time and place, and website, again.

Isherwood: It'll be for us, Dec. 10 at 7 p.m. on our website www.cecaust.com.au—that's at 3 a.m. Eastern Standard Time in the U.S. [The webcast, titled, "Australia's Mission: The Shift to a Pacific-Centered World," is archived at <http://citizens.ibn.com.au/>]

Baker: Well, we'll look forward to it. Good luck! This is very good news. And Dec. 12, we resume here, on The LaRouche Show, at 3-4 Eastern Time. And I hope to have Harley Schlanger as host with one of the newly announced Congressional candidates, Summer Shields, to get rid of the likes of Nancy Pelosi.

Thank you, Glen Isherwood, Ramtanu Maitra. This is Marcia Merry Baker for The LaRouche Show.

Obama's 1984

The appropriate image for President Obama's speech in Oslo, when he received the Nobel Prize, has been cited by numerous authors: It's nothing less than George Orwell's *1984*, in which the dictator, known as Big Brother, declares that "war is peace." Except, with Obama, we are not dealing with a work of fiction, but a policy of the United States Administration that could lead to the destruction of civilization for centuries to come.

It is precisely because the President had the nerve to deliver this brazen defense of a war policy, while accepting a Nobel Peace Prize, that he has received kudos from neocons and Fabian liberals alike, from around the world.

President Obama could not present a cogent argument in defense of his expansion of the war in Afghanistan, of course. He called it a "just war" with the very same arguments that were advanced by George W. Bush when he launched this insanity to begin with. Afghanistan was never the source of the 9/11 attack, even though dupes from the Osama bin Laden network were involved. The problem lay with Britain, Saudi Arabia, and their mercenary accomplices, but the controllers of the President wanted war against the Muslim world—and they got it.

Obama's echoing of Bush didn't leave much to the imagination. He defined the U.S. as "the world's sole military superpower." He glorified the U.S. military role since World War II (in which U.S. soldiers were sent into one unnecessary war after another), and came close to Big Brother himself by saying, "the instruments of war do have a role to play in preserving the peace."

Even worse, the President proceeded to outline a theory of warfare which, if followed, would commit the United States to waging a slew of other wars as well. Specifically, he reiterated the argu-

ments of the author of the second Iraq War, Tony Blair, when he called for overthrowing the principle of the Treaty of Westphalia—national sovereignty—in favor of perpetual intervention and war.

"I believe that force can be justified on humanitarian grounds, as it was in the Balkans, or in other places that have been scarred by war," the President said. "It is also incumbent upon all of us to insist that nations like Iran and North Korea do not game the system. . . . The same principle applies to those who violate international laws by brutalizing their own people. When there is genocide in Darfur, systematic rape in Congo, repression in Burma—there must be consequences."

Here we go again. The President of the United States is both lying (about genocide in Darfur), and presuming to dictate standards of so-called human rights and democracy, to nations around the world—at the point of a gun. Once again, he is enunciating *British* policy—permanent crisis-management and war in a world where national sovereignty has been destroyed.

The *American* doctrine of war and peace was defined by leaders such as John Quincy Adams and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. They rejected the idea of policing the world, but sought to establish a community of principle through offering cooperation on mutual economic development. FDR couldn't have been clearer about his own thinking, when he declared that the key to world peace after 1945, would be the creation of a thriving world economy, that would lift all people out of the misery of colonialism and desperate poverty. Should FDR's policy have been adopted after his death, war could have been set aside—as it should be today as well.

How long are Americans going to tolerate a President who adopts British imperial policy instead?

See LaRouche on Cable TV

INTERNET

- BCAT.TV/BCAT Click BCAT-2 4th Fri: 10 am (Eastern Time)
- LAROUCHEPUB.COM Click *LaRouche's Writings*. (Avail. 24/7)
- LA36.ORG Click on The LaRouche Connection. Select desired show.
- MNN.ORG Click *Watch Ch.57* Fri: 2:30 a.m. (Eastern Time)
- QUOTE-UNQUOTE.COM *Click on Ch.27*. Tue. 6 pm (Mtn.)
- SCAN-TV.ORG Click *Scan on the Web (Pacific Time)*. Ch.23: Wed. 7 am Ch.77: Mon. 11 am
- WUWF.ORG Click *Watch WUWF-TV*. Last Mon 4:30-5 pm (Eastern)

INTERNATIONAL

THE PHILIPPINES

- MANILA Ch.3: Tue 9:30 pm

ALABAMA

- UNIONTOWN GY Ch.2: Mon-Fri every 4 hours; Sun Afternoons

ALASKA

- ANCHORAGE GCI Ch.9: Thu 10 pm

CALIFORNIA

- CONTRA COSTA CC Ch.26: 2nd Tue 7 pm
- COSTA MESA TW Ch.35: Thu 5:30 pm
- LANCASTER/PALMDALE TW Ch.36: Sun 1 pm
- ORANGE COUNTY (N) TW Ch.95/97/98: Fri 4 pm

COLORADO

- DENVER CC Ch.56 Sun 10 am

CONNECTICUT

- GROTON CC Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- NEW HAVEN CC Ch.27: Sat 6 pm
- NEWTOWN CH Ch.21: Mon 12:30 pm; Fri 7 pm
- NORWICH CC Ch.14: Thu 7:30 pm
- SEYMOUR CC Ch.10: Tue 10 pm

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- WASHINGTON CC Ch.95 & RCN Ch.10: Irregular

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 CC Ch.99; FIOS Ch.42: Tue & Thu: 10 am; Fri & Sat: midnight
- P.G. COUNTY CC Ch.76 & FIOS Ch.42: Wed & Fri: 6 pm
- MONTGOMERY COUNTY CC/RCN/FIOS Ch.21: Tue 2 pm

MASSACHUSETTS

- 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
- SHELBY TOWNSHIP CC Ch.20 & WOW Ch.18: Mon/Wed 6:30 pm
- WAYNE COUNTY CC Ch.16/18: Mon 6-8 pm

MINNESOTA

- ALBANY AMTC Ch.13: Tue & Thu: 7:30 pm
- CAMBRIDGE US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLD SPRING US Ch.10: Wed 6 pm
- COLUMBIA HEIGHTS CC Ch.15: Tue 9 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 CH Ch.12: Mon 5 pm
- ST. CROIX VALLEY CC Ch.14: Thu 1 & 7 pm; Fri 9 am
- ST. LOUIS PARK CC Ch.15: Sat/Sun Midnite, 8 am, 4 pm
- ST. PAUL CC Ch.15: Wed 9:30 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

- BOULDER CITY CH Ch.2: 2x/day: am & pm
- WASHOE COUNTY CH Ch.16: Thu 9 pm

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- CHESTERFIELD CC Ch.8: Wed 8 pm
- MANCHESTER CC Ch.23: Thu 4:30 pm

NEW JERSEY

- BERGEN CTY TW Ch.572: Mon & Thu 11 am; Wed & Fri 10:30 pm
- 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.15: Thu 11:30 pm
- UNION CC Ch.26: Irregular

NEW MEXICO

- BERNALILLO COUNTY CC Ch.27: Tue 2 pm
- LOS ALAMOS CC Ch.8: Wed 10 pm
- SANTA FE CC Ch.16: Thu 9 pm; Sat 6:30 pm
- SILVER CITY CC Ch.17: Daily 8-10 pm
- TAOS CC Ch.2: Thu 7 pm

NEW YORK

- ALBANY TW Ch.18: Wed 5 pm.
- BETHLEHEM TW Ch.18: Thu 9:30 pm
- BRONX CV Ch.70: Wed 7:30 am
- BROOKLYN 4th Friday CV Ch.67: 10 am TW Ch.34: 10 am RCN Ch.82:10 am FIOS Ch.42:10 am
- BUFFALO TW Ch.20: Wed & Fri 10:30-11pm
- CHEMUNG/STUEBEN 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.56: 4th Sat 2 pm RCN Ch.85: 4th Sat 2 pm
- QUEENSBURY TW Ch.71: Mon 7 pm
- ROCHESTER TW Ch.15: Sun 9 pm; Thu 8 pm
- ROCKLAND CV Ch.76: Tue 5 pm
- SCHENECTADY TW Ch.16: Fri 1 pm; Sat 1:30 am
- STATEN ISLAND TW Ch.35: Mon & Thu Midnite. TW Ch.34: Sat 8 am
- 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
- WEST SENECA TW Ch.20: Thu 10:35 pm

NORTH CAROLINA

- HICKORY CH Ch.6: Tue 10 pm
- MECKLENBURG COUNTY TW Ch.22: Sat/Sun 11 pm

OHIO

- AMHERST TW Ch.95: 3X Daily
- 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

PENNSYLVANIA

- PITTSBURGH CC Ch.21: Thu 6 am

RHODE ISLAND

- BRISTOL, BARRINGTON, WARREN Full Channel Ch.49: Tue: 10 am
- EAST PROVIDENCE CX Ch.18; FIOS Ch.25: Tue: 6 pm
- STATEWIDE RI INTERCONNECT CX Ch.13; FIOS Ch.32 Tue 10 am

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

- BRATTLEBORO CC Ch.8: Mon 6 pm, Tue 4:30 pm, Wed 8 pm
- GREATER FALLS CC Ch.10: Mon/Wed/Fri 1 pm
- MONTPELIER CC Ch.15: Tue 10 pm; Wed 3 am & 4 pm

VIRGINIA

- ALBEMARLE COUNTY CC Ch.13: Sun 4 am; Fri 3 pm
- ARLINGTON CC Ch.69 & FIOS Ch.38: Tue 9 am
- CHESTERFIELD COUNTY CC Ch.17; FIOS Ch.28: Mon 1 pm
- FAIRFAX CX & 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.77: Mon 11 am, Wed 7 am BS Ch.23: Mon 11 am, Wed 7 am
- TRI CITIES CH Ch.13/99: Mon 7 pm; Thu 9 pm

WISCONSIN

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

WYOMING

- GILLETTE BR Ch.31: Tue 7

MSO Codes: AS=Astound; BD=Beld; BR=Bresnan; BH=BrightHouse; BS = Broadstripe; 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.

Get The LaRouche Connection on your local cable TV system! Call Charles Notley 703-777-9451, Ext. 322. Visit our Website: www.larouchepub.com/tv.


[updated Nov. 13, 2009]

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.larouche.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouche.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 _____