

The following is reproduced from an [EIR Special Report](#) of February 2013, “Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two,” Appendix 2.

---

LaRouche on 9/11/01

---

## Let Calm Heads Prevail To Stop Destabilization

*On Sept. 11, 2011, just at the very moment that news reports were first coming across the wires about the terrorist actions against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, 2004 Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche was being interviewed by Jack Stockwell, morning radio host on K-TALK radio in Salt Lake City, Utah. The interview was conducted from 9:15 to 11:00 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time. We publish excerpts here from EIR, Sept. 21, 2001.*

*The following day, in an interview with WGIR-AM radio in New Hampshire, LaRouche re-emphasized that the terrorism “was primarily a domestic, covert, special operation, by people with very high-grade military-special operations backgrounds.” Rejecting the conventional wisdom that “it had to have been Osama bin Laden,” LaRouche pointed to the high degree of sophistication and coordination required for such a massive attack. “Look,” he said, “the United States could not have done that to the Soviet Union during the high point of the conflict of the Cold War. We didn’t have the capability to do to the Soviet Union then, what was done to us yesterday.*

**Stockwell:** ...I am sitting here looking at—two planes have hit the World Trade Center! Well, I’m looking at it right now at the Internet, at MSNBC. There’s a link on the very first page of MSNBC.

You’re kidding! A second plane has hit the tower. Well, that’s unconfirmed. We just heard that. Well, the picture I’m looking at, I can tell you right now how many casualties there are. They’re all casualties. Looking at this picture I’m looking at. The smoke is just billowing out of the top of the World Trade Center. . . .

Well, I’m going to go ahead and get my guest on here with me. Mr. LaRouche. Good morning, sir.

**LaRouche:** Good morning, Jack.

**Stockwell:** Well, what a pleasure and an honor to have you back on my program again. I was hoping to move the discussion initially, with what we were going to do here, into the area of the Sublime. But now, with what has just happened in New York . . . at the World Trade Center. I don’t know if you’ve seen these images or pictures yet on the television.

**LaRouche:** I haven’t yet. I was just sitting up here working, and just heard about it before I went to call you.

**Stockwell:** Yes. Well, the smoke is billowing out of the one tower here. My wife called me a moment ago. And apparently they caught, live, on film, the second jet smashing into one of the other towers.

**LaRouche:** Obviously, this is not exactly an accident.

**Stockwell:** No, sir. I don’t believe it is.

**LaRouche:** I mean, it’s not a coincidence. It’s obviously—this is so remote in probability that there has to be intention in this thing.

**Stockwell:** It’s one thing for somebody to strap on a jacket made of dynamite and walk into a diner in downtown Jerusalem. It’s another thing to jump inside of a Lear jet and go smashing in the side of a building like that.

### A Climate of Destabilization

**LaRouche:** The thing you have to look at, and the context in which this is occurring, is two things. First of all, the first suspicion that’s going to be on this is Osama bin Laden. That name is going to come up prominently, whether as suspicion—or just suspicion.

And the second thing, which is not unrelated to the Osama bin Laden question, is this festival which is planned—really a terrorist festival, for Washington, D.C.

**Stockwell:** At the end of the month.

**LaRouche:** Yes. We have a global process. Look, the financial system’s coming down. That’s always a dangerous thing. Because when the entire system is being shaken up the way it is now, by the financial collapse, political things happen, because various people try to intervene and orchestrate events by spectacular interventions, which will change, shall we say, get public attention off one thing and put it on another.

So, this is obviously—I mean, I can not draw a conclusion, except the circumstances tell me something

rather evil is behind this thing. And I don't know which, but they're both connected, because I know the Goldsmith brothers—for example, Jimmy Goldsmith was key in helping to create—he's now deceased—Osama bin Laden and people like that. The Taliban and so forth.

And at the same time, his brother, Teddy Goldsmith, who is still very much alive, is sort of the spiritual godfather of this movement which is planning to inundate Washington, D.C., with some pretty nasty stuff at the end of this month.

**Stockwell:** Something to a much greater degree than what happened in Seattle.

**LaRouche:** Oh, absolutely. This thing went from Seattle—Seattle was basically a terrorist operation. But, you know, if you look at the history of how terrorist operations are run, you would run a hard-core terrorist operation, and around it, they would run sympathizer operations which were not necessarily wittingly connected to the terrorist operation. But they were run and coordinated simultaneously.

In Seattle, you had the so-called legitimate protest, which was largely trade union-backed. But into the same scenario, you had coming out of Canada, based in Canada—and the Canadian-U.S. border is rather leaky, you know. And they were coming across in droves over there to do funny things.

Then you had the operation, a conference in Pôrto Alegre, Brazil, just a short time ago, which Teddy Goldsmith chaired. And this cuts into the people who are generally the ambiance of international terrorism.

Then, from there, from Genoa, they went to some other things. But the big thing—from Pôrto Alegre to Genoa, where they staged an upscale terrorist operation.

Now, from what I know of the details of the terrorist operations being prepared in Maryland and Virginia for Washington, D.C., where they're being pre-staged, this is intended to be much bigger than Genoa.

So, what you have is a challenge to the integrity of the nation's capital, of what is ostensibly the most powerful nation—a nuclear power—on this planet. And that is not funny.

**Stockwell:** If you can—the FBI is now saying that a plane was possibly hijacked for this attack. If you can do that with the World Trade Center, what could you do with the White House?

**LaRouche:** Absolutely. I've been very concerned about this. You know, I'm not very sympathetic with

what some of these agencies do. But I'm concerned, not just as a Presidential pre-candidate. But I'm concerned with the security of the United States and the peace of the world. And this is not good for the health of the nation or the world. These things should not happen.

And we could prevent this kind of stuff. But we just don't do it, because, I don't know, someone says, let it happen.

**Stockwell:** How would you prevent terrorist activity?

**LaRouche:** Well, the thing is, if you don't—if you dispense with the myth that there are a number of unknown people out there coming out of the mists, and nobody knows where they come from, then you would say, How can you stop the terrorist operations?

If you know how the world is actually organized, you know you can not organize a sustained preparation for terrorist operations in any country without the backing of a powerful government, or governments.

So that, if you know what the operation is—and I would say, you know, I have been warning against this Teddy Goldsmith operation all along, because I know what it's connected to politically. It's extremely dangerous.

And if I had been President, or in a similar position during this period, I would have had an all-out, very discreet, but very all-out and effective discussion with some other governments in the world, and we together would have taken appropriate steps to try to neutralize this kind of danger.

Of course, you can't be 100% in this sort of thing. But you can do a pretty good job. And two planes. Now, that's pretty big. That's—one plane, that might not be preventable. But two in the same short—

No, that's not small-time stuff.

### **Who Is Osama bin Laden, Really?**

**Stockwell:** No, this is pretty serious. . . .

Lyndon, is there any reason to assume that this would be something other than Osama bin Laden?

**LaRouche:** Sure. There are many. Osama bin Laden is a controlled entity. Osama bin Laden is not an independent force. Remember how he came into existence. Osama bin Laden was a wealthy Saudi Arabian. Back in the 1970s, during the Carter Administration—or shall we say the Brzezinski Administration—the idea of running an Afghanistan war on the borders of Soviet territory was cooked up by Brzezinski as a geopolitical operation. Well, Brzezinski was responsible. He didn't

necessarily cook it up. But all right, this thing started, and an Anglo-American unit, running together with a certain section of the Pakistani military, the funny-funny boys in the Pakistani military, set up this operation.

The United States government and British government and others—that is, our funny-funny boys—went out and recruited a lot of Islamic people to fight communism and defend Holy Islam, and so forth. That sort of line.

They recruited in many countries. And they deployed them. Now later, they killed some of the same people they deployed. You know, they're expendable.

---

---

*So, now [people] can blame Osama bin Laden. At some point, you go in and kill him, and you say the problem was solved. But you never considered who sent, who created Osama bin Laden, and who protected him, and deployed his forces and name for these purposes.*

---

---

So they don't really have an insurance policy that goes with their recruitment.

But they were recruited. Osama bin Laden was one of the big funding agents of this, a funding conduit which was used by people, among others, then-Vice President George Bush. This is Iran-Contra, or what's called Iran-Contra, which I've called by other names which I wouldn't put on the air.

So, this thing is left behind. And suddenly now we find Osama bin Laden becomes the name. And Osama bin Laden could not last, the way he's running around, if he didn't have big protection. And it's not just from a section of the Pakistani government or Afghanistan. It's from other governments who would like to see the effects that Osama bin Laden produces thrown around.

So, now you can blame Osama bin Laden. At some point, you go in and kill him, and you say the problem was solved. But you never considered who sent, who created Osama bin Laden, and who protected him, and deployed his forces and name for these purposes.

And as we saw in terrorism in Italy in the 1970s, for example, the people who were running the so-called terrorist operations in Italy, were not really the groups that had the credit for it. They were actually runaway NATO asset organizations at a very high level. The

same people that killed the former Prime Minister, Aldo Moro, in that period.

So, in a case like this, don't assume that the popular names that everybody knows, or that the FBI quotes and so forth, that this is the real problem. They may be part of the problem.

**Stockwell:** Well, our mind, especially in our degenerating Western culture, always runs for the simple answer. We want the kind of answer that will free us from our guilt and our responsibilities of the neglect of our government and our fellow man all these years. And so, we run to the simplistic.

And the simplistic, of course, is there; he is the big, bad bogey man from the Middle East, who has caused us so many problems before. And I certainly understand what you're saying there, that the more simple we can make the presentation, then the less obligated any of us are.

Anyway, why would they be doing this? I mean, here we have a market crashing. We don't just have a market crashing. We have an entire economy crashing, within the arena of a culture that's crashing.

If war, massive war, were to break out in the Middle East any second, nobody would be surprised. If Putin were to be assassinated, if Arafat were to be assassinated, if Sharon were to be assassinated, nobody would be surprised.

I mean, we are sitting on powder kegs of powder kegs. And with all of the other provocations that could occur around the world to stop a lot of the economic unity and development that is beginning to gain some momentum between the large powers on the other side of the planet, why in the world fly a jet in the World Trade Center?

**LaRouche:** This is to create a provocation inside the United States. I mean, that's the only reason that would be done. As you probably know—for example, stories may come out that this is done by some Arab group which is protesting the U.S. government's sympathy for Sharon, or for the Israeli Defense Forces. I don't know if the Israeli Defense Forces are going to kill Sharon tomorrow, I mean, because there's real conflict there. And these guys tend to shoot, then think.

### **The Bush Administration: 'These Guys Are Nuts!'**

But some story like that. But what we're into is a period where the word is not terrorism. Terrorism is a part of the picture. The word is "destabilization." The

problem part, from my standpoint, is, look at our own government.

And we are, in a sense, still sort of a superpower. I think the term is probably not quite appropriate for our present state of affairs. But we used to be a superpower, and we still have a dominant position in the world.

But what kind of a government do we have? Well, the Bush Administration. And the thing was crashing. You see poor Secretary O'Neill babbling around. You see Rumsfeld has become a joke in his own Defense Department. . . .

The point is, President George Bush doesn't function. He's been in there, and as I said, this January 3rd, when I first announced and made a prognosis to what his administration would be, it's been one catastrophe after another.

Nothing he has proposed has actually worked. Some of the things he proposed have been done, but they are disasters. And he's not capable of being a President as such, unless he were controlled by a group of advisers who would give him good advice and solve his problems on how to deal with situations.

But he doesn't have that. He has a nut like Wolfowitz over there underneath Rumsfeld nominally, who's actually running the Defense Department. You have Armitage in the State Department, and similar kinds of things.

These guys, as I know them, are nuts. And they are nuts in there. Then you look at the Democratic Party. And you have the statement from Daschle, who's the Senate Majority Leader now, saying he can't do anything, it's up to Bush, the President, who Daschle knows can't do anything. . . .

**Stockwell:** You know, when Oklahoma City first happened, the first two or three days—and I remember, I was glued to the television set—the first two or three days, there was a large implication towards the Middle East and the Arabs that were running around town. And then they kind of covered that up, and that was out of the picture, and they never mentioned it any more.

**LaRouche:** Well, largely, this is a domestic covert operation, which we had word of beforehand. Everybody had the word, and if I had been President, I mean, on the basis of just what I knew, I would have taken certain actions immediately, which would—security/surveillance actions in anticipation of exactly that kind of problem.

So, we were not mystified. The problem is that fun

and games is being played by various institutions, and we don't have anybody really effectively in charge. . . .

## What We Should Do

**Stockwell:** Just to underscore what you were saying at the very beginning, that if we can find a couple of guys running around New York right now, trying to get out of town, or Boston, or wherever the thing took place, trying to hurry up and get on the next ship back

---

---

*If the President reacts, in "We're going to get revenge, we're going to teach everybody a lesson," the President will have the worst possible effect for the United States. This is not the way to react.*

---

---

to Saudi Arabia or whatever, like that was the end of the problem.

But as you were pointing out there at the beginning, it's just part of a network, a network that can only exist by the support and the organizational strength of some major superpower on the planet.

**LaRouche:** I can make a flat statement on that, Jack.

If I were President of the United States right now, I would have already acted before this happened, not even knowing that this was going to happen. And I would have had the following cooperation. I would have had cooperation from Russia, from Germany, from France, from Italy. I probably would have gotten a good deal from certain forces in Britain as well. And Japan, and China. And Arab countries, including Egypt. And we would have put our heads together real quick, pooling our resources, and said, whether we agree on other issues or not, this kind of thing is not going to happen, and we're going to see to it, it doesn't.

And that would work. The problem is, you've got the foolish President of the United States—and I say that advisedly. . . .

The time now is needed, to reassure, in particular, the American people that somebody is in charge, that those persons in charge know what they're doing, and they're going to fix the situation, and they will call upon the American people for support as needed.

That would work. But this kind of thing, of ven-

geance-seeking and snarling and growling to prove how mad you are, this isn't government. This is side-show. This is Bozo the Clown putting on an act. . . .

**Stockwell:** It is confirmed now, on several news sources, that the Pentagon is experiencing explosions right now. My goodness!

**LaRouche:** They mean business!

**Stockwell:** They're evacuating the White House at the moment, and yes, obviously, they mean business. . . .

**LaRouche:** This is a very systematic operation. If they're snatching planes . . . if all three of these planes—the two we have from New York and this thing on the Pentagon—to get that kind of thing, to snatch planes like that, that's a pretty sophisticated operation.

**Stockwell:** Oh, yes. This isn't a bunch of malcontents, of some grass-roots organization, finally striking back. You're going to have to have some rather heavy-duty intelligence network, and some real intelligence experience with this.

**LaRouche:** The question is, where were the relevant intelligence agencies which are in charge of monitoring this problem?

Now, I've been putting this out for some time—not this, I didn't know this airplane thing, but I assumed almost anything could happen . . . but on the Washington, D.C. targetting. So obviously, the Pentagon means that this is obviously, clearly a Washington, D.C. targetting. This is obviously intended to imply something coming out of the Middle East. This means that there's been some kind of either incompetence or fix on the whole security operation, because you *can't* get this kind of thing without a real goof-up, on the security side. So somebody in charge of security was really not very effectively in charge.

You can't go around snatching planes in a coordinated fashion, like this. You can't do it. Somebody has to be really sloppy. . . .

**Stockwell:** . . .The FAA has just grounded all flights in the United States. This hasn't happened since World War II. All flights are now grounded in the United States. . . . President Bush is currently in Washington state [sic], at an elementary school, talking about education. . . .

I've got another one for you. The smoke in downtown Manhattan is clearing, and there is no second tower. What response can the United States possibly have now?

**LaRouche:** The United States needs a Franklin Roosevelt, who will say we have nothing to fear as much as fear itself. Yes, we have things to fear, but nothing as much as fear itself. Nothing as much as panic itself. This is the time for cool heads. You do not win wars by panicking, by flight-forward. What I'm afraid of from this White House is, because of its very weakness, it would tend to go into flight-forward.

Actually, George W. Bush is not exactly a combat veteran. So, you don't expect him—I mean, he may have been in the National Guard, down in Texas—but he's not the kind of guy you'd want in charge of a military major unit in time of war. You want somebody with a cool head. You want the MacArthurs at time of war. You want commanders like that. You want leaders like that, who do not blow their gaskets, even in the face of the most horrible penalties, do not lose self-control. I'm afraid that the people in Washington are going to delight and are having a sexual fantasy about losing self-control. They're going to pull out some kind of favorite horror movie and try to act that out as a scenario.

**Stockwell:** This advice, of nothing to fear but fear itself, goes right down to the last man listening to this program right now. We have people in Washington right now, I can see them sitting at a table, saying, "We have got to have the President order martial law immediately." That kind of crazy thinking.

**LaRouche:** Absolutely. The worst thing they can do. It's the worst thing for the security of the United States to pull a stunt like that. Anyone who would do it has to be a real, certifiable, historical idiot!

**Stockwell:** What can be, what should be, the U.S. response in the next 24 to 48 hours to this?

**LaRouche:** I would hope that some of these guys get smart enough to call me up. Because there are people that I would think of as the kind of team that could be pulled together, as a special team, to advise the President and other institutions on how to respond to this. That could reach out to other governments informally, for the *informal* kind of cooperation which would make the *formal* cooperation work. . . .

**Stockwell:** What they're saying now, Lyn, is that the second plane flew into one of the structural corners of the second building, knowing that it would bring that—they think that's what brought the second one

down, was that the plane—obviously, well, I don't know obviously, because I don't know either, but I would suspect that anybody that would be going to that kind of an extreme move, would have those planes loaded with sufficient explosives.

**LaRouche:** Well, the fuel alone is something, you know. Shortly after takeoff, a fueled plane has a certain amount of explosive potential.

No, I just think we've got to get more evidence on it. But obviously, what we know is that this doesn't conform to any coincidence of any kind. . . .

**Stockwell:** I'm thinking that it's almost impossible for the United States to not do anything. You know, when you looked at what happened in Oklahoma City, nothing on this scale. Nothing against, I'm sorry for the people whose lives were lost and families and such, but this, if this is as bad as I think it is, what happened today, the United States can't just do nothing.

**LaRouche:** Well, the United States, first of all, the President of the United States, or someone who's next to him, who's intelligent, should immediately call President Putin of Russia. And between the two of them, they should talk to all the key leaders in France, Germany, Italy, and so forth. Japan, as well. Bring the Chinese in on it. The Chinese will have their own reaction, but bring them in on it. Through a group of leaders.

And say, this has happened in the United States. "You guys all know what this kind of thing means. Let's put this thing, this genie back in the bottle." And, that's what has to be done.

Then tell the American people you're doing it. Say, "We are not going to allow this kind of situation, which obviously had roots, to continue. We and other nations are going to cooperate to bring this under control." That's what the American people have to hear from the President, or somebody around him, or somebody else in charge. Maybe Don Rumsfeld, maybe Powell, Colin Powell, is the guy to deliver that message. But somebody's got to deliver that message now. . . .

Putin would accept a call, of course, from Bush. Bush, say he's calling on his behalf, put the right people on the phone. It's still daytime in Moscow, or evening time—ten hours difference. So, to call him right now. And to call the relevant people in Germany, France, somebody in London—I don't know that that dumb Prime Minister's any good for anything, but—and Italy. And Japan. And China. And a few other countries. Consult with them. Set up a consultative arrangement. Say,

we're going to stop this thing now. That's what it takes. . . .

See, the President of the United States has certain constitutionally inherent emergency powers. I would not really declare a national emergency—that's probably the wrong thing to do, because it would activate the wrong things. But I would use the emergency powers of the President, and I would use the person of George W.

---

---

*This is a provocation with an intention behind it. To create a programmed reaction from the institutions of the United States. This is not some dumb guy with a turban some place in the world, trying to get revenge for what's going on in the Middle East. This is something different.*

---

---

Bush. He's President, after all. Forget how he got there—he's President. He has got as President, to enter into an emergency discussion, with prominent leaders of other nations, and to try to bring the world community more or less into agreement—but quickly, and report that agreement to the American people now. Preferably within hours. . . .

**Stockwell:** [With reference to the World Trade Center,] and because of the image of the United States, and the position that it holds in the rest of the world, and what New York means to the United States, it's like going for the jugular. Or in this case, the carotid.

**LaRouche:** Somebody wants this thing to go out of control. That's why they're doing this. This is not an attack; this is a *provocation*. It's a provocation with an intention behind it. To create a programmed reaction from the institutions of the United States. This is not some dumb guy with a turban some place in the world, trying to get revenge for what's going on in the Middle East. This is something different. . . .

**Caller:** Mr. LaRouche, with your knowledge of protocol for the institutions of government and their reaction to something of this magnitude today, do you have any feelings on martial law?

**LaRouche:** I think it would be the wrong thing to do. I think we should set a quiet emergency, where law enforcement and other agencies head an alert, pull in

their reserves and have them available, double check the security, pull security assets (if they were off duty today) back in, go over the files and check. Because we don't know what—see, you're going to have things that are going to go off, not necessarily as the result of any centralized plan, but things will go off simply by being

---

---

*The U.S. should be mobilized to have a heightened sense of security, but not martial law, and not a national emergency, despite the horrible degree of awfulness of what happened in New York. . . . Every place that they get hit is going to require assistance. That kind of mobilization—yes. But keep it calm.*

---

---

ignited by the kind of atmosphere. You're going to have people going crazy.

You're going to have obvious kinds of problems. So, therefore, I would say the United States should be mobilized to have a heightened sense of security, but not martial law, and not a national emergency, despite the horrible degree of awfulness of what happened in New York. New York has an emergency. They have a physical emergency that's going to require a lot of assistance. Every place that they get hit is going to require assistance. All right. That kind of mobilization—yes. But keep it calm. The worst thing that can happen to us now, is that the nut factor turns loose, and complicates what is already a terrible problem. . . .

**Stockwell:** Well, we have about a minute left, Lyn. Can you bring something sublime out of this?

**LaRouche:** I think the point is, when you get a crisis, which is like a war. I mean, this—what is reported in New York, you're talking about 50,000 people possibly killed. Do you realize that's in the order of magnitude of the official death toll of—

**Stockwell:** of Vietnam.

**LaRouche:** —of Vietnam.

So this is not a minor thing. This is not something that happened. This is not a terrorist incident. It's something much bigger.

But when you get into a crisis like this, the first thing you have to do, especially terrible crises, the more ter-

rible they are, the more this principle applies. *Do not panic. Do not shout "fire" in a crowded theater.* Get the people safe and out.

And what's needed now, is to recognize that we got to this mess because the institutions of our government—forget who did it. Forget who did whatever's done. But think about—this could not have happened if our government functioned. And the reason our government didn't function and doesn't function—I hope that changes quickly now—is because nobody was paying attention.

**Stockwell:** Yes.

**LaRouche:** Therefore, let us pay attention and recognize that when we are running the economy the way we are running it, the things we've been doing, we have set ourselves up for this kind of crisis.

The thing to respond to a crisis like this, is to remove long-term and medium-term causes of the crisis itself, of the situation which allowed this to happen, to come to this pass.

## For Further Reading

"The New International Terrorism," by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., with dossiers on Afghanistan and South Asia, *EIR*, Oct. 13, 1995, [http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc\\_2241.html](http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc_2241.html)

"London's Irregular Warfare vs. the Nations of the Americas," with case studies, *EIR*, Nov. 10, 1995, [http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc\\_2245.html](http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc_2245.html)

"RIM: London's Narco-Terrorist International," *EIR*, Nov. 17, 1995, with dossiers on the Revolutionary International Movement, [http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc\\_2246.html](http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1995/eirtoc_2246.html)

"British Monarchy Rapes Transcaucasus, Again," with dossiers on Turkey, the Transcaucasus, and Central Asia, *EIR*, April 12, 1996, [http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1996/eirtoc\\_2316.html](http://larouchepub.com/eirtoc/1996/eirtoc_2316.html)

"Put Britain on the List of States Sponsoring Terrorism," an open letter from *EIR* to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, *EIR*, Jan. 21, 2000, p. 52, <http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2000/eirv27n03-20000121/eirv27n03-20000121.pdf>