

Fight Fascism, the Way Franklin Roosevelt Did

Here are Mr. LaRouche's opening remarks to a LaRouche in 2004 campaign event, in Queens, New York on June 29, 2003.

I am going to address you today, on the subject—before you start addressing me, which will happen afterward—on the subject of World War II, Roosevelt's World War, and ours today. The similarity is twofold: First of all, Roosevelt was fighting a war against fascism, and I'll explain that to you. We are fighting a war, today, against fascism. In fact, it's exactly the same fascism, that Roosevelt fought against during World War II and before. I'll explain that to you. It is also a period like that of World War II, in which the danger of dictatorship, and world empires of that type, was threatened by the reaction of certain international financier circles, which I shall identify, to the fact of a general breakdown in the Versailles monetary-financial system. Today's danger of fascism, comes from the same people behind Hitler, some of whom are in the United States—not as living individuals, but as their descendants and heirs of the same nasty persuasion, gathered around people, in a sense, like Dick Cheney; the man whom I am proposing to have impeached promptly.

Now, this involves the question of what is the crucial role of the United States, today, as then? The role in the respect to preventing Hitler, or his equivalent from coming to power today, and for solving the international systemic monetary-financial crisis, which threatens the world as a whole, imminently, today. And believe me: Yes, Mayor Bloomberg is part of the problem, but he is only typical of the problem; he is not the extent of the problem, of this international monetary-financial crisis. (You can be fined for breathing deeply in Manhattan, let alone smoking.)

'Synarchism/Nazi-Communist'

All right, let's go back to a little bit of history. Now, I knew a great deal about these matters, both of economy, and so forth, and the nature of the enemies of mankind in modern history, going back to Greek times, or so. I knew that. But, there was some deficiency, in the precision of my knowledge, as to who exactly was who. Now, in about 1983-84, some government documents, from secret intelligence, were released to the National Archive, with the specific intention, that by declassifying and releasing them, I would have access to them. And, I was then told, "Go to the National Archive. There are some documents you want, waiting for you." They

covered the period from the 1920s through 1945. The documents are primarily, first of all, U.S. military intelligence. They are secondly, OSS documents from World War II. And thirdly, there are French intelligence documents, investigating the same matter. The subject or the title of these documents, as a collection, was "Synarchism/Nazi-Communist."

Now, what this involved at the time, was a group of financial interests, which are called in Italian "*fondi*." These are equivalent to the *fondi* or the financial interests, which are behind the Lombard bankers who orchestrated the great New Dark Age of the 13th-Century Europe crisis. The same people, or the same families; same type of families. These people, faced with the danger of a financial collapse, and faced with the fear that, in Germany, as in the United States, that the response to the financial collapse would be actions, such as those which Roosevelt did take, in 1933 on, inside the United States.

In order to prevent (they hoped), to prevent that from occurring, they proposed to establish a fascist dictatorship, in Europe, which would then be used to create a world empire. These were the people called the "Synarchists/Nazi-Communists." I'll explain why they were called that: These are the same people behind what happened to New York City in 1975, under a Felix Rohatyn, who was then, and is today, a representative of this group, which is called, in U.S. classification from the 1920s through 1945, "Synarchist/Nazi-Communist." That's what happened.

Today, as then, there are a group of financier interests, who, as we speak, using their agent Alan Greenspan, have a certain plan, for your financial future. What they've now done, is they've dropped the Federal discount rate toward as close to zero as they can get; and they're about to drop it further. The reason for this dropping of the discount rate, is to try to pump sucker-money into financial markets, by saying "the markets are going up, therefore, please, suckers, come invest your money in this wonderful future, which is being created by Alan Greenspan."

What will happen? In a short period ahead, this financial bubble will collapse. Bankruptcy will spread. Alan Greenspan will run the discount rate up to, maybe, between 7% and 10%, and all the suckers will be wiped out. Mortgage owners will be wiped out; businesses will be wiped out; pensions will be wiped out; insurance plans will be wiped out, and so forth.

This is the kind of people we are dealing with. These are the kinds of people who want world war. And these are the people who own and are using, a group of people, who are *Synarchists*, who are called in this country, "neo-conservatives," or something else.

"Neo-conservatives" means a group of people, who often were of Jewish and Trotskyist backgrounds, who are now running our government, under Cheney, who went over to Nazism. This includes the Social Democrats of America, which some of you know of. This includes a dead Senator, Moynihan, who some of you know about, who was part of



President Franklin D. Roosevelt in Sicily in 1943. In his wartime leadership, FDR was fighting the threat of a Synarchist/Nazi/Fascist world empire—the same kind of threat that now exists today, under a new, and even worse, economic-financial breakdown crisis.

this. Moynihan was the guy who gave you the replacement of the Bretton Woods health-care system, which worked, by the present health maintenance organization system, in 1973. He is the man, who, from his grave, is reaching out to kill you, too.

These are the kinds of people you are dealing with. Cheney is part of it. I think Cheney actually is a dummy; his wife is the ventriloquist, because she's the one who's on the inside, hmm. And, you see this scowl on his face, and you think, "Is that the third Edgar Bergen dummy, to go along with Charley McCarthy and Mortimer Snerd? Is Cheney the third one? What is really behind him?"

All right, but the same thing is true today.

Fascist Drive for World Empire

Now, what I got was this: Go back to Roosevelt's time. During the late 1930s/early 1940s, Winston Churchill, who then became the wartime leader in the United Kingdom, communicated to Franklin Roosevelt, then President of the United States, his fear that a certain organization, including key people like Lord Halifax in Britain and other traitors inside Britain, had a deal with Adolf Hitler's circles, especially Goering and others, and certain people in France, including a Lazard Brothers-related organization, called Banque Worms. These people were planning to set up a fascist dictatorship in Europe, to become a world empire. And Churchill said to Roosevelt, after laying out these facts, of what he was dealing with in the United Kingdom and on the continent: "You must help me. You must help us." And, that's what World War II was about. It was that Roosevelt was leading, and organizing the power of the United States which he was building up, at least under his leadership, to prepare to eliminate the danger of Synarchists, of this kind of dictatorship, this fascist world dictatorship,

led by the Nazis.

This dictatorship involved Mussolini, in Italy. The word "fascism" came when Synarchism was introduced to Italy, they called it Fascism, in order to "Italianize" a French disease, called "Synarchism." That is, they referred to the Roman *fascies*, which had been the symbol of the Roman legions, marching out to war, and called this "Fascism"; but it was actually Synarchism from France.

Exactly the same people, created Adolf Hitler in Germany. These are the same people who created Francisco Franco, in Spain. And that wasn't the limit of it. The German Nazi organization set up a Spanish division, based in Spain. This Spanish division operated in the Western Hemisphere, largely through an organization in Mexico, which later became known as the PAN, the political party called the PAN. From this base in Mexico, these Nazis operated throughout the Western Hemisphere.

An example of the connections: You had a woman in Texas, one of the Schlumberger sisters, who is associated with the Schlumberger oil tool interests; who is also associated with the Synarchists in France. She had a husband of Russian extraction, from France, Jean de Menil. They had an ally in Mexico—a Frenchman—Jacques Soustelle. They had a man in Peru, called Paul Rivet. These people were deployed from the United States, together with . . . guess who? The family of Buckley: William F. Buckley, Sr., William F. Buckley, Jr. and so forth. And this involved, things like in the 1920s, the Cristero War, which was organized and started, essentially, by the Buckley family and its friends, in order to grab Mexico's oil interests. And, that was the basis for this war.

And this spread, as a form of Nazism, as a Nazi network, Spanish-speaking, throughout the Americas.

Jean de Menil, for example, later bought the boat, the *Granma*, to send Castro into Cuba. He funded Castro. This fascist, this Nazi, funded Castro.

Jacques Soustelle went to France, was appointed by a section of British intelligence, to head the de Gaulle intelligence service, together with Paul Rivet and de Menil. They were later exposed by the French as being fascists. But, nonetheless, Jacques Soustelle got to be the head of de Gaulle's political party, and then, was the man who was organizing the attempted assassination of President Charles de Gaulle, at a later point. And a dear friend of mine (now deceased), who was the leading general for de Gaulle at the time, Jean-Gabriel Revault d'Allonnes, was out to kill him [Soustelle]. He said to me one day, "You don't know what I was going to do to him, if I ever caught him—and I had orders from de Gaulle."

All right, this is the kind of thing we're dealing with. The same people behind this, this operation, are the people in the United States, who are known as those *behind* the chicken-hawks. In other words, there's no difference between the neo-conservatives and the Nazis—*none*. They're simply a different variety of the same thing. They do not control the situation:



Felix Rohatyn, of the Synarchist-linked Lazard Brothers investment bank, oversaw New York City's 1975 crushing austerity regime known as Big MAC. Today's national collapse has left the cities bankrupt again, and Royatyn is not only reviving Big MAC, but backing a new global bank to impose such austerity worldwide.

They are instruments of control, as the Nazis were instruments of control, for the bankers behind Hitler, internationally.

So, we fought the war, from the United States, to free Europe and the world, from a Nazi empire, taking over the world. A Nazi empire, created and *run* by these kinds of banking interests, typified by Banque Worms, an associate of Lazard Brothers.

Lazard, of course, as you know, is a firm in New York, which is associated with Felix Rohatyn, who gave you Big MAC. And, in a sense, has given you Bloomberg.

The same kind of thing! Why would somebody do what Bloomberg is doing? This is not a program for building a city; this is not a program for solving the city's problems. This is a program *for destroying the city!* This is chaos! This is what Rohatyn did! Try to rent an apartment in New York City. Compare the cost of renting an apartment, in terms of the equivalent of incomes of 1974-75 with today. You can't get it; you can't even touch it. The services are collapsing. Everything is collapsing. The city is being destroyed. What you're seeing is a *force of destruction*. It's turned loose. Why? I'll get to that, when we make the comparison.

So, that's the situation we have.

Now, you say, "Why would they do that in the United States?" If you wish to set up a world empire, today, what country would you take over, to set up a world empire? If you were a bunch of financiers, like those behind the Synarchists then, *and today*, what country would you try to capture, as your instrument for world empire? The United States.

That is what has happened to us.

Then, back in the times of Roosevelt's concern, the idea was that if the Nazis could take over a combination, of all of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom—and they

came close to it. They came close to it, through the backing of people, who are descendants of those Nazis then from England, such as the Australian Rupert Murdoch and Conrad Black, two spawn of Beaverbrook, who went over from the pro-Hitler side to Churchill, because his butt was caught in the wringer. Same thing.

So then, these people represented the potential from Europe of having a preponderance of world power, under depression conditions, to set up a world empire. And World War II was fought, essentially, because *it had to be fought*, on the one hand—there was no way of getting out of it; and secondly, because the objective of the war, was to destroy world empire, to destroy the possibility of a Nazi world empire, which was being set up *in the Americas, in Mexico, and in South America*, as in Europe.

Roosevelt stopped them.

Roosevelt surprised them, in a sense, because the recovery in the United States was a model for economic recovery, then and now. And I'll get to that.

High Crimes and Treason

Today, the purpose of the policy of the people behind Cheney—and he's only a dummy, but he's a talking dummy (or else his wife is a very good ventriloquist); but, this guy, the purpose behind this, *is to destroy the United States!*

What is the military policy of Donald Rumsfeld? Ask leading generals, other flag officers, in the Army and Marine Corps, retired and serving. What is the function, that we are seeing exhibited, as what is being done to the U.S. military, as we see in Afghanistan, as we see in Iraq, and elsewhere? We're seeing the U.S. military being destroyed. Is this patriotic, this kind of war? Of course not! It's virtually treason against the United States. And, what Cheney has done, in *lying*, and being caught red-handed *lying*, to force the United States government into a war, or to induce the Congress to allow it to happen, is under U.S. law *a crime tantamount to treason*: which not only requires impeachment, but implies subsequent prosecution, five years for each count, for every act he perpetrated in support of those lies. What was committed was a treasonable type of offense—it's not called treason under our law; it's called "high crimes"; a high crime, which screams for the impeachment of the Vice President of the United States, who is the chief perpetrator in running another dummy, called the President of the United States.

That's the situation we're in.

So therefore, what we're trying to do today, again, is similar. Today, the United States is the leading power—mostly with air power. And the theory of these guys, is to use nuclear weapons *preventively!* You don't wait for the war; don't wait for the attack; don't wait for the threat. You say, "Well, they might in the future, become an opponent. Therefore, today, we're going to hit them with nuclear weapons!" *That is the policy of Cheney and Company*. That's the stated policy, and has been since 1991. And this policy of Cheney and Company

was put into effect since Sept. 11, 2001: This policy: nuclear weapons against the world. Nuclear war, nuclear attack against Iran threatened. Nuclear attacks against other countries. With nuclear weapons—countries which *have no nuclear weapons*.

And, this is the way they're trying to start a world empire: by creating chaos, economic collapse worldwide, and destroying the world by dissension, wars, so forth.

That's what we have to stop.

But, we have to stop this kind of thing, not by simply protesting against it. Roosevelt didn't stop it by protesting. Yes, Roosevelt allied with Churchill, in order to prevent, first of all, the takeover of the United Kingdom, which was then threatened, by the Nazis—led by Lord Halifax, and supported by the circles of Beaverbrook, the press lord, who was sort of the den mother of Conrad Black and Rupert Murdoch today—Fox TV, the *New York Post*, today.

The True Mission of the United States

But he had to do something else. He had to organize the world around a U.S. economic recovery, and build up our industrial might, which surprised everybody in the world, except a few of us here, in the United States. We had a policy—had Roosevelt lived, and not been replaced by that fool Truman—under which the nations of the so-called “developing world,” today, would have been decolonized immediately at the end of the war, *under U.S. power*. They would have been given independent status, and the United States would cooperate, under the new Bretton Woods system at that time, to build up these countries as nations.

Because the long-term objective of the United States, as a nation, is not world power: Our objective, historically, from the beginning, was to become, first of all, a sovereign nation-state ourselves. And to hope that we could find a world, where our success as a nation-state would inspire other countries to set up sovereign nation-states like our own. Our aspiration has been a community of sovereign nation-states, in the world, with which we cooperate, but in which *each* are sovereign themselves. That is our long-term U.S. interest, and has been our policy, under all informed Presidents.

We have never been an imperial nation. We are not a racist nation. We have a lot of racists among us; but we are not a racist nation. We are a melting pot nation. We've been a melting pot nation from the beginning. Yes, we've been based largely upon the acceptance of an English-language culture, which has been trying to distance itself from British culture



“Some people criticize me for travelling all over the world, as a Presidential candidate,” said LaRouche. “And I say, ‘I have to educate you people in the ABCs of the U.S. Constitution, the functions of the President, and what makes a good President.’ The crucial function of the President of the United States, as the world’s leading power, is foreign policy!” Here, local press coverage of LaRouche’s visit to Bangalore, India in May 2003, where he addressed an international conference on “The World After the Iraq War.”

for a long time. But, the idea of having a common language as a *lingua franca* among our people, is simply a way of creating a republic. It has no racist implication, whatsoever. We are a melting pot nation.

Look around at us! Look at the composition of the population of the United States today. We're not an Anglo-Saxon people! We're a melting pot nation. And the melting goes on. As time passes, you can't tell whose ancestors are whose. They're all mixed up, everybody, from all over the world. People from the Orient; people from the Middle East. I was just in Turkey; I was just in India. Guess how many Indians there are in the United States, especially those who migrated recently? How many Turks are there in the United States? How many Arabs are there in the United States? What proportion of the population do they represent, cumulatively? How many Hispanic Americans are in the United States? How many people called African-Americans, are in the United States?

We are a melting pot nation, who come from all parts of the world. We need our sovereignty! Because that's the only way you can have a nation-state, which is capable of offering participation, to its citizens, to participate in their own national affairs. It's the only kind of nation that works, is a sovereign nation-state.

But, our objective is to have a community of nation-states, around the world, with which we cooperate, on the basis of common interests for common ends.

Great Projects for All the World

For example, today: Look what's going on in the Far East. We have the emergence, recently, from Iran, to Pakistan, through India, China, Southeast Asia, South Korea, to Russia, to Kazakstan, to Turkey, to large factions of Japan, who are committed, now, to the greatest mass of infrastructure projects the world has ever seen. China has presently in progress, and about to be added, the greatest water projects in all history. The Three Gorges Dam, which is now functional as a transport system, and otherwise, in a preliminary way, is one of these. The movement of large masses of water into Xinjiang, into the Yellow River area, and elsewhere, to open up the interior of China for actual development of its people, as opposed to being semi-desert.

This, plus the greatest railroad-building in any nation in the world, is now in progress under way, in China.

In addition, on the borders of India, the Brahmaputra River, which comes down with a great crashing descent, near the border of India, near Assam, the greatest hydroelectric project in the world is now under discussion between India and China. This project would benefit the whole area, open it up for development, would solve many of the problems in a downstream nation, Bangladesh, and would sort of prevent the mountains of Tibet from running off into the Bay of Bengal—where they've been going for a long time.

Great projects: India has great project needs, in water management. Southeast Asia. China and the nations of Southeast Asia have agreed on a great Mekong water-development project, which includes large parts of southern China, and all of Southeast Asia. To *transform* this area into a rich area of development. Cooperation with this project is coming from Europe—it's slow, but it's moving. France and Germany, together with Russia, are moving in the direction of this kind of long-term cooperation, with Asia.

A transformation of the world. We should be doing the same thing with South and Central America. We should have an orientation, as I've indicated, in that direction.

We, each, together, Eurasia and the Americas, should collaborate, to end the genocide in Africa, and bring about the development, which has been long awaited there, by helping them to develop large-scale infrastructure projects, which they *need* in order to have the ability to develop and control their own countries.

So, before us, is the greatest opportunity in humanity: This requires 25-year to 50-year long-term agreements—contract agreements, trade agreements, regulation, requires a new financial and monetary system. All of the things we can do. And therefore, we looking not at an abstract conception of a partnership among sovereign nations, we're looking at nations whose peoples are struggling for decency, in their condi-

tions of life. The solutions to these problems, are in large degree, common solutions, which involve several or more nations together. These are projects of 25 to 50 years' duration, in terms of agreement. That is, for example: To build a major water system, as in Asia, we're talking about a *50-year agreement on development, of a large area of the world*. The minimal, for a transportation system, like rail systems or the equivalent, we're talking about a minimum of about 25 years. The development of the interior of China: One generation to develop the interior for its infrastructure, and the second generation to harvest the benefits of that development of infrastructure.

So, we have the idea of a community of sovereign nation-states; it's not an abstract conception, not a formal conception, it's a *living* conception: of how we, on this planet, as a group of sovereign nation-states, can cooperate around *common* projects of *common* interest, as partners, while preserving the sovereignty of each of us.

This was the direction, in which Roosevelt was thinking, explicitly, as he approached the end of the war, and the end of his life. This is the solution today.

What is happening, essentially, is the Synarchists—the same group of *fondi* and banking interests, who are behind the Vichy/Franco/Mussolini/Hitler/Lord Halifax scheme, of Hitler's time, and Roosevelt's time—the same group of people, their grandchildren, today, are at the same game. This time, however, they have planned to move to take over the leading power of the world, the United States, to become the instrument of their policy, rather than Western Europe, as they did in Hitler's time. That's the difference.

We Need To Act, Now!

So, we're at an end point. We're already in the process of going into this kind of war. We're already at the edge of the greatest financial collapse in all history, right now. We don't know what day it's going to happen, or even what week. But, we know the conditions that now exist mean that that collapse is *inevitable*, unless we stop it.

So, we're not about the election of November of 2004, we're not talking about the inauguration of 2005: We're talking about *now!* We're talking about action, *now*. As Roosevelt and Churchill agreed—they didn't like each other, at all, but they both recognized that they had a common problem, and they had to find a common solution. And that saved the world, from hell.

Now, again immediately before us, as then, we must find that common solution. We must enter into cooperation with groups of nations around the world.

Now, for example, some people who criticize me for travelling all over the world, as a Presidential candidate. And I say, "I have to educate you people in the ABCs of the U.S. Constitution, the functions of the President, and what makes a good President." The crucial function of the President of the United States, as the world's leading power, is *foreign policy!*

Not the Secretary of State—the President of the United States.

What does that mean? The President of the United States is not trying to engage in diplomatic discussions with other nations, as mere diplomacy. The President of United States must be committed to forming long-term agreements, of a Constitutional character, among states. The function of the President of the United States, especially under these conditions, is to bring nations together, with us, to make long-term agreements, which rebuild this planet. And most nations are willing to do that, they're for it. I saw that in Turkey. I know that in India. I see that in China. I see that in other countries: *They are waiting for the United States to make the offer.*

And I propose to deliver the offer: That we will enter into long-term agreements, *to rebuild this planet*, in order to realize the kind of world that Franklin Roosevelt foresaw, had he lived, for the post-war period. Let us eliminate from this planet, the conditions among peoples and nations which lend themselves to the recurrence of things like this Synarchist phenomenon, which we're facing for a second time, today.

Historical Roots of Synarchism

Now, let me just go back a bit, and say, what is this Synarchist phenomenon? It has a great deal to do with the history of the United States. As a result of the religious wars which were organized by Venetian interests, between 1511 and 1648, religious wars culminating in the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648, the possibility of developing true nation-states in Europe, was aborted. There had been a great effort in the 15th Century, with the founding of France under Louis XI, and Henry VII of England, to develop modern nation-states, true nation-states, in which the principle of the general welfare, the common good, was the fundamental law of government. That was the first time, in all known history, that the principle of the common good, was actually an *obligation* of the head of state and government, and of the nation. That's constitutional government.

The enemies of this process, in the 16th and 17th Century, plunged Europe into a great series of religious and related wars, from 1511 to 1648, culminating in the Thirty Years' War, based in Germany. The ending of that war, by the Treaty of Westphalia, in 1648, became, then, the moral standard for modern European civilization: *We do not kill each other over religious differences.* We do not conduct religious wars, or similar kinds of wars among ourselves; nor do we allow them on this planet; we do not allow religious persecution, on this planet. That's the principle of the thing.

Because, if we *don't* prevent that, and we start to cut each other's throat again, then the predators will take us over. We must, for positive reasons as well as negative ones, ensure that that never happens.

But, unfortunately, because of things like Louis XIV, and other things in Europe, it became impossible to revive a modern nation-state in Europe, in the 18th Century. As a result of that, you had circles gathered around the tradition and legacy

of Gottfried Leibniz, who picked as "their man" in the United States, Benjamin Franklin. And Benjamin Franklin organized a group of younger people—sort of like a youth movement—around him. And these people he organized around him, became the core of the struggle to found the first modern sovereign nation-state republic in the United States. And, that's the United States.

At this point, in 1789, at the same time that we had agreed upon our Federal Constitution, with its famous Preamble, forces in Britain and on the continent of Europe, moved to prevent the spread of the idea of a true republic, into Europe—in this case, France. That Bailly and Lafayette had, together, drafted a constitution for the French monarchy, which would have put French society on the basis of the kind of nation-state—although under a monarch, otherwise a copy of the United States Constitution. At that point, the British agents, directed by Jeremy Bentham from London, organized two British agents in France, the Duke of Orléans, called "Philippe Égalité," and Jacques Necker, a Swiss banker and a pig, who was also a British agent, to organize the storming of the Bastille, as part of an election campaign for Necker, for his appointment as Prime Minister of France. The whole thing was staged.

From that point on, France became torn apart by an increasing internal violence, and slaughter of people who had been of republican persuasion, inside France. The result of this process of destruction, the Jacobin Terror and so forth, became Napoleon Bonaparte. Napoleon Bonaparte was the first modern fascist. There were certain resemblances between Napoleon Bonaparte and Louis XIV, the earlier French King—the so-called "Sun King," or "Son-of-a-Bitch King."

But, Napoleon was new. Napoleon was the first Nietzschean head of state. The first man, who was the image of destruction, for destruction's sake. Synarchism is nothing but a continuation of the tradition of Napoleon Bonaparte. The idea is, which is the idea which came out of Hegel, who was sort of an admirer of Napoleon, who made a theory around this idea: the theory of the state, the philosophy of history. It's the idea which Napoleon III represented. Napoleon III, who kept trying to conquer South America; Napoleon III who played a key part in various troubles we had here, in this hemisphere. He was actually the image of the man, behind what developed as the PAN, in Mexico: The basis for Nazism in Mexico, the PAN organization, was Napoleon III.

During the middle of the 19th Century, this group of people, mainly a group of bankers, *fondi* so-called, formed what they called the "Synarchist movement," or "anarcho-syndicalist movement," the idea that in any crisis, to create chaos, and then to have a man so terrifying as the leader against the chaos, that the people would submit to this terrifying man, who would commit any kind of crime imaginable. This idea, of this kind of leader, became the doctrine of Friedrich Nietzsche: the idea of the doctrine of the Superman, the Beast-man. The pure beast, who would commit acts so horrible, that



Synarchist product Benito Mussolini. "The word 'fascism' came when Synarchism was introduced to Italy; they called it Fascism, in order to 'Italianize' a French disease, called 'Synarchism.' "

people would fear him, simply because of his willingness to commit horrible deeds, that no human being would think of doing, even a bad one.

That was Hitler. What Hitler did with the Jews in Germany, was simply Nietzsche, the Nietzsche, who was followed, by whom? In philosophy? Followed by Martin Heidegger; followed by Leo Strauss, who is the teacher of most of these people, who are working with Cheney—including Cheney's wife, Lynne Cheney, who is a Straussian! His doctrine is the Hitler doctrine! His doctrine is that of *terror*; or what Goebbels called *Schrecklichkeit*. That's the policy.

It came along at the end of World War I. This group of people, who were already calling themselves Synarchists. That is, the bankers and the types of people who worked with them as agents, formed the Synarchist International. This became the basis for launching, in Italy, Mussolini, through a Frenchman named Sorel, in France. Through the organization of Germany, under Hitler: Hitler was a product of this. Francisco Franco was a product of this. The Carlists, the right-wing Catholics of Central and South America, are part of this! The right-wing Protestants in the United States, are part of this! The anti-Semitic Zionists of the United States, are part of this. Same thing: Synarchists. Nazi-Communists. Right-Left. Destroy society. Create a man on horseback, a man of terror; intimidate the population into submission to a man who is so terrifying, they'll do anything to get out of his way, not to be killed—even obey him, or commit crimes, on his order! So, that was Hitler.

That was Vichy France. Vichy France was organized. Also, the French opposition to Vichy, was also organized by the same people! That's why de Gaulle had problems in France, after the war.

Synarchists and Project Democracy

So, we have this, in the United States, in the form of the kind of people, who are behind this process. What we did, is,

we brought *Nazi thinkers*—I mean, Leo Strauss was a Jew. But, he was a Nazi Jew! And since he was a Jew, he was not qualified for Nazi Party membership! So, he got the head of the Nazi law doctrine, of Nazi Germany, Carl Schmitt, funded him, and sent him to study Hobbes, in London! After being infected with the disease called Hobbes, he went to New York, and taught at the New School for Social Research. He then was appointed, personally, by the collaborator of Bertrand Russell, who himself was a Synarchist in thinking, Hutchins of Chicago University, and made a super-professor out there. And he was *used* to create a kind of cult, of students of his, whom he divided into two groups. One group was the inner group. The inner group of the followers of Leo Strauss, recruited largely from Social Democratic organizations in the United States, gathered around the followers of Moynihan, who was an interchangeable part himself.

And this group of Synarchists succeeded in doing something else: They succeeded in setting up in the United States, from 1975 on, a new kind of organization, called "Project Democracy." Typical of Nazi ideology, it's called "democracy." It's fascism. What they did, they had a meeting in Kyoto, Japan. It was a meeting called for the Trilateral Commission. It was called by Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was the creator of the Trilateral Commission. And Brzezinski's man, Samuel Huntington, the man of the "Clash of Civilizations," the war against Islam, wrote a paper for that called *The Crisis of Democracy*. This doctrine was then introduced, by Brzezinski, as National Security Advisor, into the Congress as a proposed new law, and then was implemented shortly after the inauguration of Reagan.

Under this arrangement, Synarchists control both political parties, *from the top down*, under the name of Project Democracy. That is, both parties are controlled top down, and coordinated from the top down, in organization, by Project Democracy—which was made a law. And thus, by that law, *you have no rights* in any political party in the United States.

Except the rights you're capable of *taking* by appropriate means: such as the ones I'm taking.

Running the Democratic Party, from the top—and the top is the Democratic Leadership Council; it's organized crime, it's every kind of filth you can imagine. Donna Brazile, for example, the one who elected George Bush: Donna Brazile was a campaign manager for Gore and Lieberman. She rigged it, so that damned fool Gore, who didn't understand anything, instead of taking a clear victory in Arkansas, which would have given him a clear electoral vote majority, went to Florida and wasted his time, trying to get support from Joe Lieberman's Cuban fascist supporters.

And guess what happened? Who did it? Donna Brazile! Typical of these types.

So, that's the problem.

Now therefore, for us, what does this mean? We have certain Constitutional rights in our system of government. We have the rights to form and control political parties, as political

parties—otherwise, *we have no freedom*. We have some clowns, who are working for these fascists, such as Joe Lieberman and John McCain. McCain is certifiably psychotic, and Lieberman is certifiably immoral. They're run by the same group, the Hudson Institute; both of them: the same people. They're both fascists. They're the ones who launched, if you remember in Germany, at a Wehrkunde meeting, they're the ones who launched the attack for World War III—nuclear World War III, at a Wehrkunde meeting. The pair of them, along with Richard Perle, and others! These guys are Synarchists, out for war.

Who Has the Guts To Take Leadership?

So therefore, we've come to the point, that we say, what? Are we going to sit back and "see how the election turns out"? Or, are we going to show guts, and take over the Democratic Party? And find among Republicans, those allies, who don't want fascism in America? And others, who don't want fascism in America? Are we going to do what is necessary, to get these guys, like Cheney and Company, who are agents of these fascists—*get them out of government, now!* Don't wait for the next election! You must get them out of government, now!

Now, either Cheney is impeached, which he should be; or he resigns, complaining of heart fibrillations, or something; and, the desperate need to grow potatoes in Wyoming. But, if we get him out, either way—either by impeaching him, or by causing him to resign, the whole pack of chicken-hawks, of neo-conservatives in government, will be out! Because the anger that has been building up *against them*, as a crew, among all respectable people in the United States, including political parties as such, that they will push them out—*if we get them out, now!*

Then, we have a "new deal" as they say. Not Roosevelt's New Deal, but a short-term new deal, we desperately need. And, that is to make the political process of the United States real. What does that mean? That means that the President of the United States, who, admittedly, is a dummy—hmm?—the man doesn't understand anything. I mean, it's a pitiful case. But, we've had pitiful cases as heads of state before. We have a pitiful mental case, here in New York City as Mayor. If we catch him smoking, we're going to fine him to death!

In any case, so we've got to get these guys out. We've got to mobilize people in both sides of the parties, work together; we've got to call back, into the political process, that large proportion of the people in the lower 80% of family-income brackets, who have been *out* of politics, and *pushed out* of politics, since the Brzezinski Administration of 1977-1981. Most Americans are out of politics. They may vote a little bit. They say, "Which dummy am I supposed to vote for?" They say, "Well, I'll vote for this guy, because he promises me this deal. He promises me a sewer in my neighbor's backyard. Okay, I'll vote for that." But, they are not involved in politics in a pro-active way. They're not concerned with what the

policy of the nation is. We're in a depression! They're losing their employment! They're losing their cities! They're losing their basic economic infrastructure. They're dying! They've lost their health care! Their children are idiots, with no education; but it's called "education." *These* are the kinds of things, which citizens can readily understand, and will fight to say, "I want a government that takes care of this, the way it used to be done!" We've got to bring them back into politics. Don't let them be excluded from the parties. They've got to be brought back into the parties.

We've got to organize a force, with its influence, which with its very existence—as I've been doing with the youth movement—its very existence, has got to send a message to government in Washington, which *tells* government, that it must make changes. "*We must have immediate Middle East peace*, and we expect George Bush to deliver it. *We expect him to deliver it! Period.*"

We wish to stop this nightmare. We wish an admission of what happened in Iraq, which the U.S. military, ground forces and Marine Corps, are perfectly willing to admit; as a matter of fact, they're already complaining about it.

We wish to have an *admission* that Afghanistan was a farce. Afghanistan was done to set the stage for the attack on Iraq. That was the *only* reason it was done! They had to activate NATO and related agreements in Europe, to use U.S. basing rights, through Europe, to get the U.S. forces in place, and supported in the Middle East, for launching a war against Iraq.

The only reason for attacking, at the beginning, was the purpose of going after Iraq. The purpose of going after Iraq, is to go after Iran, and Syria, next! The purpose is to go against North Korea—next! The ultimate purpose, is to destroy China. And to crush every country in between. That's their purpose. They must be stopped. We must stop them first in the Middle East. We must stop them in the case of Israel and Palestine.

That must be stopped. The President said he's committed to it; if the American people are mobilized, with enough pressure on him, *he will do it*, particularly if we get the chicken-hawks out, the neo-cons out, and Cheney out. He'll do it!

Because he's interested in one thing: What his Mummy tells him, and that is: "Get re-elected!" When in doubt, "get re-elected."

Somebody says to him, "Yes, I may be a failure. But my Mummy's behind me! She says, 'Get re-elected.' I'm gonna get re-elected!"

So, under those conditions, with the normal institutions of government, with the Senate and the House of Representatives, scared into some kind of decency—and there are some decent people there, but they're cowardly; they have no guts, the problem with my man Kerry. Kerry's the only Democratic rival I have, who's worth mentioning. All of the others, are either people who are losers to begin with, they have no chance, they would never have any chance— not because

they don't have popularity, but because they have no reason to *get* popularity. Dennis Kucinich has a nice constituency, but he has no guts. So, you're not going to vote for a man with no guts, for President, under these kinds of conditions, where guts are needed. You're not going to vote for another Hamlet: We had one of those, and Shakespeare gave us one of those before. We don't need another one!

Al Sharpton is Al Sharpton. Let him run! He has no chance of winning. All he wants is money. He wants money to continue his political influence in the United States, to do what he's working for. All right, if he wants to do that, that's allowed. But, it's not a serious proposition, when it comes to the Presidency.

The only one is Kerry. And Kerry, unfortunately, is a Hamlet. Now, you say, "Is Kerry a coward?" Well, ask yourself: Was Shakespeare's Hamlet a coward? What was Shakespeare's Hamlet? He was a swordsman! He wasn't at home, when his father was killed, because he was out killing people! He was fighting wars! There was a rustling behind the curtain: He threw his sword through the curtain and killed Polonius! Without even knowing who was there! The man is a killer! He is not what you would call a wimp. What was wrong with him? He said, as a character, in the Third Act soliloquy: The fear of immortality was so frightening, that he would rather destroy himself, and kill the pain of doubt, by destroying himself in war, than think about what the concerns of immortality might be: "Thus doth conscience make cowards of us all."

That's the kind of coward that Kerry is. Not a coward of a man who wouldn't go to war, wouldn't fight his battles, wouldn't show courage on the battlefield. But a man, who, *faced with the questions of immortality*, faced with putting his life on the line, for a *clear purpose*—not that he intends to die, but he's putting his life at risk for a clear purpose, a good purpose; a good purpose, which does not make him afraid of his immortality. He's not afraid of what'll happen after he dies. He's going to do a good thing. Therefore, if he dies in the process, he has *nothing to fear, after death*.

That's what he lacks. He vacillates. He vacillated on dealing with Iran-Contra. He was at the point he could go to the knife, on Iran-Contra—he didn't. He flinched.

On this issue, where he had the chance to attack Cheney, as he should have, he diverted his attention to the poor fool, Bush. What did he want to impeach Bush for? You can't impeach Bush, not an honest impeachment; for anything but incompetence. You can't. But the problem is, if you go after Bush for incompetence, and succeed, what do you get? You get Cheney as President.

That's not a very smart move.

Besides, you can't go against Bush, because you can't convict him of *knowledgeable intent*. He'll get off! The psychiatrist will come in, and give his speech, and the judge'll say, "Okay! Case dismissed!" You may transfer him to an asylum, but you're not going to impeach him.

So, Kerry, at the point of getting *Cheney*, whom he knew was the guilty party, and pushing for Cheney's impeachment, which would have saved the nation, and solved this whole problem—*didn't do it*.

We don't need a man as President, who has that fault, that weakness. It's like a war-time President: We don't want a war-time President, who's not up to the job. And, this is like a war-time Presidency; that's what I represent. And that's why I'm unique: I'm qualified to be a war-time President. But, you have to have that kind of war-time President, not just to make war, but also to, in this case, *to prevent it*.

Worldwide Support

There's no problem on this planet, which, if the United States would behave itself, and provide the right leadership, we couldn't solve. I can tell you that, from my international travels and discussions. *There is no closed door to us, virtually on this planet*—any major nation. I go into any major nation, or secondary major nation: There's no closed door for us, no closed door for me. They're afraid of what the United States will do to them, if they meet with me, sometimes. But, there's no closed door.

If you put the world to vote on my Presidency, most of the present governments of the world would elect me President of the United States. Because they know, they need that role from the United States, the role that I've promised, the role I've explained. And that's what we're out to do.

We're not worrying about what's going to happen in November of 2004, or January of 2005. Yes, we're concerned about that. I'm already in the process of trying to begin to build what I intend to be my government! And, looking for some good talent, of the right type, which is needed for the composition of a government—the same way Franklin Roosevelt did, when he was running for President. You have to pick the people; who you're going to work with; what their assignment is going to be; what kind of role they can play, because, on the day you're inaugurated, you're going to have to do what Roosevelt did. You're going to have to unleash a whole set of measures *immediately*, set them into motion within the famous "first 30 days." And the future of the United States will depend upon that decision. I'm trying to work to put together a team, or select a team, or pre-select a team, that'll play that role. So, that's serious.

But: In the meantime, what we have to do, is establish a dynamic of leadership in the United States. Focus on getting this neo-con problem out, over with; getting the Synarchists out of power in the United States: identifying them, exposing them, destroying them politically!

And, in that process, what we have to do, is we have to clean up the party system, especially the Democratic Party. We have to make the Democratic Party, once again, a real party. A party of Franklin Roosevelt, again. And, if we do that, we will have in the Democratic Party, an *instrument*, which is not going to be a *dictatorship* in the United States,

but an instrument through which we can work, as a people, to force into deliberation, in the Congress and elsewhere, the kind of measures, the kind of discussions, which are essential. And to get the projects going, that have to be under way. That's the situation.

So again, history doesn't repeat itself, but it sometimes burps. And, we're in that situation now.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Here is a selection of the questions and answers that followed Mr. LaRouche's address.

The Future: Securing Immortality

Q: I want you to talk about the future. When we win, what will our society look like? What is the potential that humanity has? And, if you could talk about maybe the latest in science and technology that we could develop; and where our world can go; and what's the prospect for things like space travel? I'd like to hear some optimism.

LaRouche: But, you'll also get a lot of assignment to work, from me! Because, you know, I'm running a youth movement; you may have heard about it. And, the task there, is to set a standard for knowledge, immediately, among people in the 18-25 age-bracket, that does not exist in most universities today.

The key to it, is the issue of immortality. Now, the most important part, the most important thing about a human being, is the human individual personality is the only immortality in the universe—apart from God. Now therefore, the fundamental requirement of education is, what is immortality? And how do I defend my own? How do I accomplish my own?

Look at the case of Senator Kerry: Kerry, like Hamlet, is not an uncourageous man, by ordinary standards—quite the contrary. *But*—I think his wife is even more courageous. But: The problem is, he has a Hamlet problem, and you should study, very carefully, *Hamlet*, one of the most important lessons in history and politics, available to anybody today. If you do not really understand Hamlet, you really don't understand politics. Because this question, of the leader in a time of crisis, faced with the threatened destruction of a nation, who is not capable of meeting the challenge of the definition of immortality, *will flinch, will fail*. And, the nation will fail, because the leader fails.

Now, in the case of the individual in society, the same lesson applies. How do you get great leaders in society? Just as you require a sense of immortality—a valid one, for the leader of a nation—you also require the same thing, implicitly, of every member of the nation. What is our problem? Our problem is, that our people are, in a sense, immorally and intellectually immature. They do not have a sense of immortality. They may have a sense—an arbitrary sense: “Oh, I got—you know, Falwell promised me immortality.”

Now, you want to call fraud, that is really a fraud!

Immortality is a sense of the difference between man and the beast. This problem comes up in society, why? Because heretofore in civilization, and before civilization, as far back as we know, society has been composed of three classes of people: those who rule, or prey—not in church, but prey anyplace, upon somebody else. What they prey upon are either people they *hunt down*, and kill, and maybe eat, like cannibals; or they *herd* them, like cattle. They send them out to the fields to eat; they send them back to the barn to work, making milk and meat; they milk them. They say, “Hi, Bossie.” They stroke them, all these kinds of things. But, they treat them (if they treat them well) as cattle, *as cattle*.

Now, in most societies, today, as in the United States, most people are educated to be, conditioned to be, human cattle!

What's the difference? Man, the individual, has the power of discovering what we call “universal laws of the universe.” *No other living creature can do that!* These laws take the form of discoveries of principle; they take the form of Classical artistic principles, and things of that sort. Only human beings can discover these. By discovering these things, or rediscovering them, and transmitting them to the future, and perpetuating them from the past, we achieve, in fact, a tangible form of immortality.

We know we're all going to die. We're born and we die. So therefore, what do we do with this life, which we know is limited? What purpose is it? Are we a beast? To go into the field, and eat hay? Come back to the barn to be milked? To be slaughtered when our time is come? The way the present HMO policy works? Or, are we human beings? And, if we are human beings, what is our real interest? Since we're all going to die anyway, what is our permanent interest?

Our permanent interest is in doing something, which aids in the process of transmitting the discoveries of the past, to the present and to the future, and adding to the stock of knowledge. Not in the sense of learning this, or learning that! A cow, a cat, can learn this or that! They may scratch you in the process, but they'll learn it, sooner or later. But they're not human. They have no sense of immortality. It's when you have a sense that your life is important, because you are *doing* something, in terms of defense of a principle, promotion of a principle, discovery of a principle, which is useful for the future of humanity; you used to get that. People would build bridges, or build buildings, and they would take their grandchildren out, “I built that!” “Grandpa, you built that?” “Yeah. I built that.”

That is manifesting an approximate sense of immortality, that my life was devoted to some purpose. Most of us, up to recently, until the Baby Boomers came along, we used to be a future-oriented people. We would think of our past, where we came from. We would think of what we learned from the past, what we acquired from the past. We would think of what we would give to the future of humanity. We would be proud



Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche and part of the audience of 400 at his June 29 campaign meeting at LaGuardia Airport in Queens, New York.



people, if we thought we were doing the right thing. And, this was the basis of our morality.

What happened after 1964, with the Baby Boomer generation, with the rock-drug-sex counterculture, a change occurred. A *fascist* change. Induced by the Synarchists; this was fascism. The rock-drug-sex counterculture was fascism, or the leading edge of fascism. Why? What was the difference? The point is, you said, “No longer is the past important. No longer is the future important. History has ended!” What you get now, is your “life-style.” You get your kicks. “You fix your head!” Like Janis Joplin did: Fixed it permanently.

And you have people today, 50, 60; they’re running the country, in most positions. They’re having post-mid-life crises. They’re trying to discover a newly invented life-style, because the old ones have all become boring. They’re looking for the fifth sex, hmm? They are frightened, and hateful, against their own children! They don’t like their own children, because their children are a nuisance: “They interfere with the way I want to live. I don’t like this. I got a life-style to take care of! *I have my own lifestyle to take off!*” And, when people are approaching their senior years, and they have that attitude, what’s going to happen to them? What is going to become of them?

So that, in youth, you have to do two things: Become the masters of the discovery of science—not “learn” things from textbooks. The youth also have to do some other things: The youth have to look at their parents’ generation, which is mostly a disaster, a moral disaster; a collection of futile life-styles, wandering in search of a purpose—or non-purpose. And, you have to give your older generation, your parents’ generation, back some morality. A sense that this nation was

not a failure. That Franklin Roosevelt was right, what we built out of this nation in the post-war period under Roosevelt, was *right*. Maybe there were mistakes, there were things wrong—but, we built the nation. We saved the world from Hitler. It was right!

So therefore, we should be proud of the fact that we did something right. And dissatisfied, that we didn’t do better. But, you’ve got to get the parents’ generation—who, by and large, with few exceptions, are off searching for a new life-style—to compensate for the pure boredom of being themselves. And, by seeing *you* doing something, about the future, you’ve got to get them back, to thinking about their role in the future. Because *you are their future!* They, like me, are going to die soon. *You* are their future. And what comes after you, is the future.

This is not the secret of our immortality, in itself; but, is an expression of it; is a way of thinking about life, in a practical way, which is *consistent* with a sense of immortality. If you’re going to fight the kind of issues we have to fight around the world today, you’ve got to inspire people with a true sense of immortality. The kind that Shakespeare’s Hamlet lacked.

And everything else you learn, everything else you master, should be governed by that.

Confidence for Leadership

Q: Lyn, it’s a great surprise to see you here. It’s pretty cool to see you. I didn’t expect that. On my way, I stopped at a Dennis Kucinich fundraiser, thinking that I could give him an intervention. So, tonight on the airplane back, his campaign fundraiser promised that he would be reading the material, and it’s all about how you’re launching the impeachment

effort. And, she said she's hearing about you, and about the effort to impeach Cheney, as opposed to Bush, so I think it's working. So, that's pretty cool.

My question is—there are all sorts of strategic interventions, that seem to be useful and effective. My question is, when do you give up hope? You know, God says, never give up hope. People are never beyond hope and redemption; but, you're in a horse-race, and it's a temporal world, and immortality will always exist. But, when we're trying to get you to be elected, it's important to be strategic and effective. And, it seems that there are some people—I was at a wedding and I saw [California Gov.] Gray Davis there. And I thought, "Wow, there this opportunity!" But, there's an undeniable level of corruption in people, and you can smell it and feel it.

And, I'm susceptible inside myself, so it's always a cat-fight. But, I guess I'm asking, how do you stay effective? How do we do this in time? And, how do we know when we're wasting our time?

LaRouche: Oh, we're doing just fine, actually. It's a tough fight. It's a grinding fight, and you run into a lot of stupidity, from a lot of people who shouldn't be stupid. But, nonetheless, they do it. I don't worry about it. I've seen so much stupidity in my life, and here I am. Having a grand ol' time. I'm running for President, and there's not a qualified rival in sight!

If the American people are going to survive, the obvious conclusion is, I'm going to be the next President. It's obvious. It's that simple. Don't worry about what people think! Or, what they say!

You know, this is a problem of leadership: It's like leadership in combat, in military affairs. Leadership is simply having the guts to use reason, rather than fear, to control your behavior. You have to say, "What *should* I do?" You have to be critical, self-critical: "What *should* I do?" But, once you know, what you *should* do, and you're clear on that, you don't allow anything to get in your way. You must do it! Particularly, if you do it for humanity.

You know, I see the world. I've been in many countries recently, directly and indirectly; or in touch with people in these countries, at high levels on policy questions. I know the world—not every part of it, not every detail, but enough of it. I know the world. This world is aching *for what we must do here in this country*. And, if we don't succeed, *there isn't going to be this country*. There is no alternative. It doesn't exist! Look at this crazy Mayor of New York, just for an example—the Blooming Idiot, huh? This is going nowhere! Absolutely nowhere. This is chaos! Mayor of Chaos! So, against this, who's right? Against this, what do you do? Well: You can not solve the problem of this Mayor, in New York City. There are things that can be done, to get him out. He will probably be run out of town, because he doesn't like the jokes that are being made about him.

But: The problem of the United States lies at a higher level

than the Mayor of New York. It lies at the highest level: We have to have, from the head of the state, from the President and from the people around him or those circles, we have to have the kind of leadership which changes the rules of the game; which enables us to fix these problems, in areas like New York City. You can't do it inside New York City.

And, don't worry about the dummies, like Kucinich. I mean, he's got his own problems. But, think of under his leadership, what will happen to the United States? There will not *be* a United States. Under the leadership of the other candidates, what will happen to the United States? There won't *be* a United States. If you allow this Cheney and Company to continue to control the country, what will there be? There will be Hell on this planet. There will be a destruction of civilization. You can not go around launching nuclear wars against one nation after the other, and not unleash a condition on this planet which is impossible. Plunge the whole planet into a New Dark Age, in which you're lucky if a billion people survive that process! Not just the war itself, but the after-effects of it.

So, you get to a time, as now, when your conviction is less questioning, because you know *you must do it*, because you know what the consequences are, if you don't. And, that's what I face. And, I'm happy, that I'm sure it's a possible thing. We can do it. Therefore, I'm determined to do it.

I've nothing else to do!

How To Deal With Terrorism

Q: Hi Mr. LaRouche, it's a pleasure to speak with you. When I'm talking with people about what our country's doing, specifically overseas, and the drive for war, the thing that I hear the most from people, is that we're defending against the terrorist networks that are all around the globe, specifically al-Qaeda. Now, I'm familiar with the way with our government aided the establishment of these terror groups. But, even in *EIR*, a few weeks ago, in the Editorial, in the back, it stated that al-Qaeda was thought to be behind these bombings in Saudi Arabia. But, the question was, who was controlling al-Qaeda?

So, my question is: It seems as though, although we had a part in forming these networks, that some of these networks have gotten, say out of our control, and may be—or, has that happened? *Do* we actually control them? Or, if not, to what extent have these networks gotten out of our control? And, if that's the case, to what extent are they a legitimate threat, to the citizens of the world? And, in light of that, what should be—I don't think we should go on a whole Mideast takeover, that's obvious—but, if they have gotten out of our control, and are able to commit acts of terrorism, to what extent should we react to that?

LaRouche: You have to look at what our policy is; our international policy now is desperate. What you have for example: Let's take the Arab world. I talked to some leaders of



A sizeable part of the Queens audience were leaders and organizers of the candidate's LaRouche Youth Movement, whose growth is a major force for fundamentally changing the Democratic Party.

the Arab League, oh a couple months ago, on just this question. They're not completely realistic; in fact, they're rather passionate on this question, because their ox has been gored. And they will tend to defend Osama bin Laden more than they should.

This thing was created, largely originally from London—this whole problem, in terms of the Arab world. It was created in London. It was created largely, first, out of the *India* office, of the British intelligence service. And then, after World War I, this was varied, and they set up the Arab Bureau from British intelligence, and they ran operations out of there.

Since that time, you have two other major groups—the Soviets used to play their games in this area—two other major groups, that are involved in these kinds of operations. One is the U.S.: Iran-Contra is an example of that. Who created Osama bin Laden? Well, essentially, the initiative for that came from George Bush's network. And I can give you the documentation on that, as to who did it. And, they're all the people we call "chicken-hawks" or "neo-cons" today.

I was consulting the National Security Council, on the question of my project, which was this SDI. I was meeting with representatives of the head of the National Security Council on a fairly regular basis, because of these discussions that were going on. At the other end of the offices, at the National Security Council, where I was going in, was this whole crowd around Ollie North: This included Roy Godson, de Graffenreid, the whole crowd in there. They were running it. Together with people on the British side, who were running the operation.

So, George Bush, the former President, then as Vice President, and the heads of British intelligence who were running

the operation in Pakistan and other countries: Their idea, which Brzezinski set into motion in the first place, was to engage the Arab world, through Pakistan intelligence, the ISI, in Afghanistan, in a war against the Soviet Union. And, they said, "Muslim brothers must go out and fight against these heathen Soviets." They created an operation, which was funded largely by drug operations, the same operation that set up the Iran-Iraq War, for their purposes, the same kind of purposes, and this stuff was left to run.

The other one is Israel: Now, the worst terrorist organization in the Middle East, is Israel! To my knowledge, my personal knowledge, Ariel Sharon and Henry Kissinger, in 1982, were involved in setting up Hamas. Hamas subsequently split into various parts, the factional parts. The Israelis *play* it. And, the way it works, is, there are two ways of running it: You run it directly; or, you know something's out there, you have your influence on it, and you play it.

If you look at the history since Ariel Sharon came back into power—even before he came back into power, including that storming of the Temple Mount—every bit of terrorism, centered on Israel, in the Arab world, has been *orchestrated by Ariel Sharon* and his crowd personally. . . . Are we going to have terrorism? If I were President of the United States, we probably wouldn't. Because I would have a certain relationship with the Saudi government, and other Arab governments, which I think *I've earned*. And, with me as President, or representing the Presidency of the United States, as a private citizen, I think we could deal with the problem. Not by killing. We might have a few police, law-enforcement problems running around loose. But we would come to an agreement.

The basis for peace, is not simply law enforcement. The

basis for peace, is what makes law enforcement unnecessary. And, if we can get agreements with governments and people, which make them optimistic about their futures, they will help us. They will help us control the problem, and reduce it to a minor law-enforcement problem.

My objective with terrorism—and I understand a great deal about it; I've been studying this thing for a long time—but my objective with terrorism, is to reduce it to a law-enforcement problem, by policies, shared among governments and peoples, which create the conditions under which it *can* be managed as a law-enforcement problem.

Most terrorist operations I know of, are protected in one way or another. They're protected by governments. From a government standpoint, apart from my responsibilities on the law-enforcement side, my major concern is to make sure the governments do the thing, putting these things under control.

What has to be *punished*, is a government which engages in this kind of practice. We have to agree to this, and governments have to agree, together: "We are going to stop this nonsense!"

"Terrorism" is a bad word. It's a word which describes an effect, and everybody can use it for what they perceive to be the effect they don't like. But, actually, terrorism belongs to a category I've called "irregular warfare." It's a level of warfare which goes from strikes, strike actions, civil disobedience, all kinds of things. These are all forms of irregular warfare. They're forms of conflict in society, whether orchestrated or otherwise, which may or may not become serious problems. The way to deal with this, is to deal with the roots of the problem, the roots of the conflict. Which government can do.

The problem is, we have a very cruel society. We abuse people, horribly. People do not consider attacks on us, shameful. They consider them honorable. Why? Because we've put them in a desperate position, where they have no option! No peaceful option is offered to them. No alternative is offered to them. They go crazy. And, they kill, and they hate. And, that is—some people call it terrorism. I don't use the term terrorism, as such. Sometimes, I'll say, or use the word, "terrorism"—but rarely; only if I'm defining the context I'm using it in.

We have a problem with this around the world. We have an evil world! We are *cruel* to people! We are doing things that are cruel. And, if we have policies which are better, particularly with the power of the United States to *influence* the world—I know personally! That most of these kinds of problems we're concerned about, could be solved. Most Palestinian-Israeli conflicts could be stopped—how? Very simply: *Step on Ariel Sharon!* Step on these guys, these fascist mass-murderers, who are in the right wing in Israel. Step on them! The United States says: "*You are not allowed to do this, any more!*" They say, "We got a right to"—"No, you haven't got a right!"

So, shortly—because it's a long question you've opened

up—there are two aspects to it: There's a law enforcement aspect; there's a countermeasures aspect, which has to be dealt with. All right. That's law enforcement, or extended law enforcement, or military in some cases. But, the other thing is, the main thing is policy: We have insane foreign policies in practice. We allow people from our government and other governments, to do things that should not be allowed. They should be brought to public attention, exposed, and held accountable before the world, as to what they're doing. Under those conditions, like the case of Israel and Palestine, we must not tolerate any more of that! We now have a significant population of Israel, who are for peace; others who are like Yitzhak Rabin, who recognize that war is foolish; they have to come to peace. Some are actually for peace; others realize that peace, as a realistic proposition, must be solved.

If the United States intervenes in the right way, and if we crush the *gangsters in New York*, who are supporting Sharon in Israel, we can bring about peace. We have the power to do so, with the countries, which would *help* us make that effort agreeable.

If we destroy that problem; if we do something about the mess we've made in Iraq; if we give the Iraqi people back their country; if we take the threat of war away from Iran, and other countries, I assure you, that if I were President, we would have peace. And, to the extent I'm influential in projecting the attitude of our government, we can win.

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

EIW

An online almanac from the publishers of **EIR**

Electronic Intelligence Weekly

gives subscribers online the same economic analysis that has made *EIR* one of the most valued publications for policymakers, and established LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world.



EIR Contributing Editor,
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Issued every Monday, *EIW* includes:

- Lyndon LaRouche's economic and strategic analyses;
- Charting of the world economic crisis;
- Critical developments ignored by "mainstream" media.

\$360 per year Two-month trial, **\$60**

For more information:

Call **1-888-347-3258** (toll-free)

VISIT ONLINE:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw