

LaRouche in Italy Outlines Exit Strategy From War

by Claudio Celani

Lyndon LaRouche's April 8-11 visit to Rome was full of public meetings and private discussions with political, religious, and media representatives in an Italy which finds itself in a paradoxical situation: Its government backs the U.S. war policy; its population overwhelmingly opposes it.

Italy saw the largest anti-war demonstrations worldwide, with up to 3 million people in the streets of Rome, while at the same time Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi called "legitimate" the Anglo-American decision to invade Iraq, in defiance of international law and the United Nations. As a founding member of the European Union, the Italian government thus gave the most important political backing to the invasion, and created a severe split with EU partners France and Germany. It opened a domestic crisis as well, by alienating a most important constituency—Catholic voters who followed the Pope—indicating that Prime Minister Berlusconi might have lost his popular mandate.

LaRouche provided leadership to both opponents and supporters of the government, illustrating the nature of the "chicken-hawk" faction controlling U.S. policy, and indicating how the political class must use the legitimized peace movement to provide a peace-building policy based on economic development strategy. LaRouche's intervention might have cast the seeds for switching Italian policy back to its traditional republican role.

LaRouche outlined the exit strategy from the war policy already in his public appearance April 8 at the Rome Capitol, as a special guest at a conference organized to present the new book by economist Dr. Nino Galloni. Other speakers were Paolo Raimondi, President of the Italian Solidarity Movement; Pino Battaglia, President of the Committee on Social Security Policies of the Rome municipality; Elisa Manna of the well-known CENSIS research center; Matteo Costantini, President of the Young Europeans Movement; and Mario De

Luca from the Lazio Region administration.

The Capitol meeting's theme was reiterated throughout LaRouche's Rome visit: The world is characterized by a drive for a world dictatorship led by a fascist clique controlling the U.S. Executive, and by the disintegration of the world financial and monetary system. The relation between the two aspects is similar to the relationship between the economic crisis in 1929-30 and Hitler's rise to power, he said, explaining how the Nazi party was rescued and put in power by Anglo-American money which did not want "New Deal" cooperation between Roosevelt's U.S.A. and the von Schleicher chancellorship. Like the 1933 Reichstag Fire, Sept. 11, 2001 was used to carry out a coup in the United States. Europeans must know the real nature of the problem, to take the first step towards the solution.

Peace demonstrations are not sufficient to avoid war, LaRouche said, but they give legitimization to those political leaders who develop actions to stop the war. Above all, these actions must occur on a strategic-economic level, with the perspective of Eurasia-wide economic development, made possible by putting the current bankrupt financial and monetary system through bankruptcy reorganization and establishing a new system able to generate credit for long-term investment and trade agreements on the Eurasian continent.

'Devastating Critique' of U.S. Policy

Nino Galloni's book, *Beyond Sustainable Development: Environment as Target, Growth as Constraint*, is initiating a revolution in the Italian left. It rejects not only "shareholder value" as the paradigm for economic policy, but also its false alternative, the neo-Malthusian ideology of "sustainable growth." Instead, Galloni maintains, we should go back to scientific and technological growth, the only "constraint" able to generate resources and improve environmental condi-



Lyndon LaRouche (second from right) in the Capitol in Rome at the announcement of a new book by economist Dr. Nino Galloni (fourth from right). Agenparl headlined: "LaRouche: Europe Should Have Close Relations to Russia, India, and China."

tions as well.

To make the point, Galloni went through elementary—but forgotten—illustrations of how a different, superior technology increases the availability of resources by orders of magnitude. LaRouche developed the subject by placing the issue of the relationships between man and nature in the context of V.I. Vernadsky's scientific theory, according to which human cognitive activity is an indispensable element of the physical development of the universe. This proposition was welcomed by all speakers and by long applause by the more than 100 persons filling the room in the Capitol building.

Commenting on LaRouche's speech, Mr. Battaglia from the Rome municipality remarked that LaRouche could hardly be called "anti-American"; and yet, "his critique is perhaps the most devastating one we have recently heard to the current American policy, and we thank him for that." Other speakers referred to LaRouche as setting the standard for the discussion, while members of the audience posed several questions, such as, "What is the difference between the historical Bretton Woods and the one you are proposing today?" This gave the American Presidential candidate the possibility to develop the idea of a credit-generating system, based on a national-banking policy and on trade agreements among groups of sovereign nations.

This issue was also a subject of discussion the next day, at a meeting with members of the Italian Parliament organized by Senators Patrizia Toja and Oskar Peterlini. Participants raised the issue of re-establishing a regime of international law as a political priority to prevent world chaos, and asked

LaRouche whether this should involve a strengthening of the United Nations' functions. LaRouche warned against a world authority as a remedy to world disorder, as a world authority gives impulse to a world empire. The UN is the best thing we have, he said, and we must keep working through it; but he suggested that Italy move through the EU as a group of cooperating nations, to stimulate Eurasian treaty agreements with China, India, Russia, etc.

The national legislators informed LaRouche that an initiative is under way to introduce in the Senate the same kind of resolution for a "new world financial architecture" which was approved in September 2002 by the Chamber of Representatives.

The issue of international law was also up front in private meetings with religious representatives, who stressed the Pope's most recent speeches on the subject. Even political representatives of the government majority, who publicly support the U.S. government, told LaRouche privately that they consider the Iraq war's disruption of international legality as a disaster. What surprised them most, however, was the absence of opposition in the U.S. Congress, even compared to that against Prime Minister Tony Blair in the British Parliament. The problem, LaRouche explained, is that the same financial interests behind the chicken-hawks control the leadership of the Democratic Party. There are members of Congress who only need leadership, which is LaRouche's task, in order to stand up and wage an opposition fight.

The candidate also answered many questions at a meeting with members of the Italian Institute for Asia, where the dis-

cussion focussed on aspects of the Eurasian Land-Bridge development perspective, including how to protect Italian production from low-cost imports out of Asia. It has been calculated that 20-40% of Italian small and middle-sized enterprises risk disappearing because of low-cost competition from Asian producers. LaRouche's solution lies in long-term (25-year) trade agreements between EU nations and countries such as China. When such treaty agreements stipulate that European nations will supply China with capital goods and cheap credits, protective tariffs can be agreed upon, based on an estimation of what the long-term trade balance will be.

LaRouche was also guest of the Sandro Pertini Center, a political association named after the late State President (1978-85), Resistance and socialist leader. He was interviewed by the regional television Teletuscolano (see below). The Parliamentary news agency Agenparl reported on the Capitol meeting: "The American economist Lyndon H. LaRouche started off posing the themes dealt with in Galloni's book, in the broader context of the two main crises facing us today: the final phase of collapse of the present world financial system, and the influence of a minority group, . . . which supports the logic of war. LaRouche made a parallel with the economic crisis of the 1930s, and the rise to power of Hitler. LaRouche concluded by proposing a perspective of economic recovery for Europe, only through cooperation with Russia and other countries with an economic growth trend, such as India and China." Two other press agencies, AISE and OP, reported the news. Furthermore, on April 9, the online magazine *Vita* published an interview with LaRouche in which the candidate was quoted that "Bush's chances for reelection, if the U.S.A. continues to exist under its Constitution, are less than zero."

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Time for Mankind To Come Out of Childhood

This speech was given in Rome on April 10, on the occasion of the public release of a book by Italian economist Dr. Nino Galloni, Beyond Sustainable Development: Environment as Target, Growth as Constraint. Subheads have been added.

To take the basic theme of Nino's book, and put it in the present global situation, we have presently two major crises facing all mankind: First, we are in the terminal phase of an economic collapse of the present world monetary-financial system; and the second problem is, we have, in my own country, a group of fascists, who are in control of a very limited President, who are determined to have world empire and

world conquest, and are now engaged in launching world war. The two crises are related in the same way, that the crisis of the 1930s was related to the coming to power of Adolf Hitler. And therefore, while peace movements are useful politically, they will not stop war.

Remember, this war is organized by a tiny minority inside the United States, a *dirty* tiny minority. They are opposed by the leading generals of the Army and Marine Corps, with some of whom I've been in communication. It's opposed by the leading diplomats in the United States. Unfortunately, to stop the war, you have to pull the strings of power, to prevent these people, who presently control these strings, from carrying out the war. And, it's an often-overlooked principle of statecraft: *Someone must have the will, to stop war, who's in a position of power to stop it.* But also, it means the conditions to stop the war, because the continuation of the collapse of the world economy, will mean were inevitable, in any case.

Eurasian Development

So, let's look at Nino Galloni's book, in terms of the Eurasian aspect, of the conditions for stopping the war-drive, in Eurasia, as such. Now, Western Europe is now hopelessly bankrupt. The level of production will not maintain society at its present standard of living. On the other side of Eurasia, we have China, India, and other countries, which are the largest part of the world's population. China is growing. China will grow. If we can stop the danger of war with North Korea, we have a North Asian group of Japan, Korea, and part of Russia, which are key to this recovery. The ASEAN+3 group, which includes Southeast Asia, is engaged now in large-scale Mekong development project, for the whole region. We saw with the recent visit of Germany's Chancellor Schröder to Shanghai, the policy of technology transfer between Germany and China, was a key part of this discussion. We're trying to find a way to have peace in the Koreas, to unify them, at least in practice. It's a difficult problem, but I believe it can be solved, which is made worse by the Iraq War, which put the North Koreans into a stubborn mood. We're discussing these matters with our friends in India.

We have, now, therefore a China-India-Russia complex of cooperation, which is growing organically. Therefore, Western Europe can recover, economically, through large-scale trade with China, India, Southeast Asia, and so forth, through Russia. The potential is gigantic.

But the key, then, comes back to the question of this book: The largest concentration of so-called "natural" mineral resources in Eurasia, is in North and Central Asia—the largely arid region of Central Asia and the tundra region in the north of Asia. Central Asia is dry; great rivers flow into the Arctic Ocean. Here, from these natural resources, come the *future* of the population, the growing population of Asia—East Asia and South Asia.

So, to take a different view of this matter, take the work of the great Vladimir Vernadsky, who, from the standpoint of experimental physical chemistry, defined the universe as

composed of three elements: Those universal principles which are abiotic; those physical principles which occur only as an effect of life; those changes in the Biosphere, which are the effect of man's mind. The challenge is, therefore: In order to have a long-term, 25- to 50-year prospect for peace and security in Asia, and Eurasia, we must manage the Biosphere and Noösphere, for man. We must have a sense of unlimited frontiers for human development through scientific progress.

We must couple this, with correcting a great injustice on this planet. We've discussed Italy in terms of the Mezzogiorno. We have large areas of populations, which are deprived of the rightful conditions of life, in the desperately poor populations of India, for example. So, the question of social justice and the question of economic development can not be separated. Our job is to create the conditions of development, under which the goals of human justice can be fulfilled, and, this must be planet-wide. But Eurasia is the largest single component.

We must stop treating man as an animal, who has limited technological capabilities. Man is not an animal. Man has a creative power of discovery of universal physical principles, which no animal has. If man were an animal, he would be a great ape, and there would be about, never more than several million such great apes living on this planet. We have over 6 billion people living on this planet today. Man is not an ape!

Therefore, we must provide the conditions, which put the emphasis on the nature of man. Man in the image of the Creator. Man developing his powers of reason, to make and implement the discoveries, which meet the goals of human requirements. We must, as Nino Galloni does, take the blinders off our eyes, and see what man can do. We don't have limited resources; we have too many limited mentalities. If we want to find our identity, our immortality, in the brief life we have, we must use our life to give a gift to future generations, so they can live better, and more secure, than we. It's time for mankind to come out of childhood, and grow up. My view, that only a vision of what we can do with this planet, for human beings, will give us the power to ensure that *no future world war occurs*.

Thank you.

Environmentalism and the New Bretton Woods

In reply to a question:

I don't agree with the Stockholm Resolution, on scientific grounds. I believe that the arguments that were made, were scientifically incompetent, just as the global warming doctrine is incompetent. If you increase the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, by a modest amount, the plants will be very happy. You will have richer harvests. And it will not adversely affect normal people, who do not have lung impairments.

These ideas, that there are limits to growth, inherent in nature, have never been scientifically proven. The problem is, is we have a social-political problem.

Now, with New Bretton Woods, the difference is this: We have a system now, which is doomed. Either the human race leaves this planet, or the present monetary-financial system leaves this planet—one of the two. The total amount of debt, in the world system, is such, that could never be paid. The level of government expenditure required to maintain society in decent condition today, *exceeds the revenues* that government can acquire. *The system is bankrupt*. If we don't stop the bankruptcy, we will kill the people.

Now, the solution is obvious: The obvious solution is, *the nation-state, which is the representative of the people as a whole, must put the system into bankruptcy*. There also must be cooperation among sovereign nation-states, not just by one at a time. The last successful attempt of this type, was 1944, at Bretton Woods. It worked for the development of continental Europe and other parts of the world, up until about the beginning of the '70s.

Two things produced the bankruptcy: Beginning about 1964, in the United States and Great Britain—the United Kingdom—there was an ideologically motivated shift away from a production society, to a consumer society, which was associated with the spread of the ideology, of the so-called “rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture.” So, we destroyed the conception of society, in which people produced, in the United States, and in the United Kingdom. Continental Europe continued to progress, however, into the 1970s, while the United States and the United Kingdom were already in *physical* collapse. So, the United States and United Kingdom prospered by sucking the blood of the rest of the world, through their heart.

Then, we had the 1971 change of the monetary system, the floating exchange-rate system. That system is now totally bankrupt.

So, the point is, governments must now intervene, to set up, to put the thing into bankruptcy reorganization. We have two models for this: We have the model of Franklin Roosevelt in the United States, from 1933 on. How do we reorganize a bankrupt economy? The second one we have, is the post-war reconstruction coming out of Bretton Woods. So, we're going to have to do the same thing then, that we did between 1946 and 1958 in Europe. Those rules—they were changed afterward, but they still worked somewhat—but, 1958 was the end of the first, initial phase of rules.

So, New Bretton Woods has two meanings: One, is its practical meaning, because it's the only experience in recent generations' history that would work today. The second is political: You can not introduce sudden, vast changes in society, unless you have a precedent that the people in society can understand. The argument is: What we had from 1946 into the 1960s worked; what we had since 1971, has proven to be a catastrophe. Go back to what worked, and start there. Of course, there will be differences, but the principle is the same.