

Today's Dangers from the Standpoint of the 1930s

Jacques Cheminade has stressed in his recent statements the need to consider the events of today through the eyes of those leaders in the early 1930s, who were not able to anticipate the dangers to come. At that time, the financiers of Wall Street and the City of London found it expedient to put Hitler into power in Germany, to impose the type of financial fascism necessary to save their system; and fascist regimes were set up in other European countries for the same reason.

At that time, the policy of social triage was just beginning, and a certain elite in France thought it would be better to deal with a Chancellor Hitler than to allow the left-wing Popular Front to come to power in 1936.

Journalists and many in the population react with shock and incredulity to the LaRouchePAC poster of President Obama with a Hitler moustache, and Cheminade is constantly asked to explain what it

means. In one interview, he stressed that the parallels cannot be understood “from the standpoint of 1946 and the abominations and the horrors of the Shoah [Holocaust], but from the standpoint of 1934-35. What did the Nazis begin to do? They began to massacre the mentally handicapped, and the weak. That was the beginning. And today, the policy of social destruction in the United States is starting to go in that direction, slowly.”

With the IPAB (Independent Payment Advisory Board) set up under Obama's health-care reform, Cheminade said, “we begin to put a price on human life, and that is very, very serious. . . . It can lead to all kinds of excesses. For the moment, we have not gone that far, but the potential is created, under a policy which does not ensure mutual development in the United States, or in England, or in Europe. Look at what's happening in Greece. We put the country in a stranglehold and then say: Now pay back the money! It's impossible.”

On April 2, Cheminade's campaign put out a statement again clarifying his position on this issue, which is often brought up as a way of avoiding the solutions he proposes, and saying that the candidate wants to be interviewed on the latter from now on.