

thing which would be utterly unacceptable to both Moscow and Beijing. In House International Relations Committee hearings on Feb. 25, committee chairman Benjamin Gilman (R-N.Y.) went so far as to assert that North Korea posed a security threat to America, saying, “We must now worry

about our safety in Seattle, not just Seoul.” The target of the ravings is Clinton’s 1994 “Framework Accord” with North Korea, regarding nuclear energy, an accord supported by both China and Russia. In the immediate term, Gilman et al. seek to prevent any steps that might be taken, by Clinton’s special

Only weeks away from a nuclear war?

What follows is the text of a mass leaflet released by the Lyndon LaRouche Committee for a New Bretton Woods, in a run of 500,000 across the United States. The same text is being mass-circulated in leaflets in Europe and Ibero-America, and, ultimately, on every continent.

March 7, 1999

The worldwide financial crisis has entered its terminal phase. Southeast Asia, Japan, Russia, Brazil, the financial derivatives bubble—these are all merely facets of the same general systemic collapse. But how is the international financial oligarchy—the beneficiaries of this bankrupt, plunder- and speculation-based system—reacting to the crisis?

Instead of implementing the urgently needed reorganization, and instead of protecting citizens and the real economy against the effects of the collapse, they are reacting just as financial oligarchies have always done in the past: Start a war—or, even better, a number of them—so that a wartime regimen can be used to get back in control!

Remember 1989-90? With the collapse of the Berlin Wall and Germany’s reunification, everyone was talking about a great historic opportunity for Europe—and with good reason. But then U.S. President George Bush and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher decided to launch the war in the Persian Gulf, for purely geopolitical reasons, in order to break Germany’s historic momentum, and in order to establish the “New World Order”—their new label for Anglo-American hegemony. The subsequent war in the Balkans was merely a continuation of the geopolitics of the Persian Gulf war, the chief aim being to prevent Germany from playing a pivotal role in the economic development of Russia and eastern Europe. For the same geopolitical reasons, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the International Monetary Fund’s “reform policy” was devised to ensure that Russia’s industrial base would collapse, and that it would be degraded into a mere supplier of raw materials. Russia, quite understandably,

felt that it had been betrayed by the West.

The systemic financial crisis has now reached its critical phase. President Clinton, who had, and maybe still has, the potential to act in the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt and implement the necessary reforms, has been paralyzed by a year of continuous bombardment from the Lewinsky affair—a veritable information war in its own right. And even though the impeachment vote failed, this attempted putsch against the U.S. Constitution was relatively successful nevertheless: Al Gore and the so-called Principals Committee (Cohen, Shelton, Albright, etc.), acting on behalf of the financial oligarchy, have succeeded in assuming control over American policy-making.

A strategic earthquake

As the result of this coup d’état against the office of the President, a strategic earthquake occurred last December—an event that escaped the attention of the absolute majority of people in the West, particularly in the United States. As a result of the December military strike against Iraq, which British Prime Minister Tony Blair, Gore, and the Principals Committee had manipulated the United States and Great Britain into undertaking unilaterally—at the moment when the UN Security Council convened about the situation in Iraq—international law suddenly ceased to have any meaning. From then on, the only thing that counted, was unilateral Anglo-American hegemony. The reaction in Russia and China, and in many other parts of the world, was deep shock—and also a complete re-evaluation of their own security situation.

At the same time, the old NATO was secretly laid to rest in an unmarked grave. And suddenly, without any public debate in the U.S. Congress, in the British Parliament, or in the German Bundestag, the United States and Great Britain declared that NATO now had a new mission: to act as a global intervention force, requiring no UN approval, against so-called “rogue states.” Interventions were to be carried out through a combination of air strikes, special forces, and information warfare. The message which the December strike against Iraq was intended to convey, was clear enough: This will be the future form of warfare, potentially, against any state. The question for continental Europe suddenly ceased to be one of integration into the NATO structure, but rather one of submission under U.S.-British hegemony.

envoy, former Defense Secretary William Perry, to review U.S. policy toward North Korea, in terms of lifting sanctions and restoring diplomatic relations.

The policy pursued by the BAC is, instead, outright war. As revealed in a Seoul paper, a plan devised by Paul

Wolfowitz and Richard Armitage, formerly members of the Bush Defense Department, calls for a “two-stage approach”: the imposition of “Iraq-style” inspections in North Korea, and, if Pyongyang refused to comply, a U.S. military buildup in South Korea, combined with a blockade of North Korea.

Evidence is mounting that around the beginning of April, there will be an escalation of the warfare against Iraq, including mass bombardment, in parallel with deployment of ground troops, set to occur simultaneously with a Turkish military intervention into northern Iraq. The timing can be expected to coincide with a peaking of Israeli operations against Syria, the idea being to effect a “general cleanout” in the Middle East, in the course of which both Saddam Hussein and Syria’s Hafez Assad are to be eliminated. And in the event that the plan goes awry, use of tactical nuclear weapons cannot be ruled out.

And now, the unthinkable: The architects of this scenario are convinced that Russia’s reaction to a tactical nuclear strike in the Middle East and Central Asia, would be unpredictable. Part of this “war game” is therefore a limited exchange of nuclear strikes between Russia and the U.S.A., that would result in the combined loss of “only” about 50 million human lives on both sides. The calculation also includes a possible war between the U.S.A. and North Korea, according to former Bush adviser Robert Blackwill, who made this brutal announcement at a Center for European Integration Studies conference in Bonn on March 4. And, of course, nuclear weapons could play a role in North Korea, too.

As we have already indicated above, this “catastrophe scenario” is being played out against the backdrop of an impending systemic collapse of the entire international financial system.

Stop the insanity!

We must put a stop to this insanity! The matter must be brought up for inquiry in parliaments and congresses of every nation. Governments must immediately provide clarification on the following points:

- Are preparations currently under way for a new, escalated military strike against Iraq in early April, and, if so, what is the purpose of this war?
- Are parallel preparations under way in Israel for a war against Syria, using “Islamic terrorists” as a pretext?
- What is the significance of the new NATO doctrine that is to be officially adopted at the upcoming NATO summit in April? Do the United States and Great Britain have war plans that anticipate deployment of nuclear weapons in the near term?
- Does President Clinton know about such plans?

These questions — questions which will determine the very existence of our nations — must be clarified immediately.

But if humanity is to be saved from plunging into barbarism, the underlying cause of civilization’s present crisis must be removed as well. And that means that the bankrupt world financial system must be rapidly reorganized. President Clinton must exert the authority of the office of President of the United States, and must immediately convene a conference to establish a New Bretton Woods system. The present bankrupt financial system must be replaced by a new system that encourages production, instead of speculation.

A ‘Survivors’ Club’

Russia and China are not enemies of the West. President Clinton is correct when he states that the preservation of peace in the 21st century depends on the strategic partnership between the United States and China.

China, Russia, and a growing number of Asian nations have realized that they will only be able to survive, if they act to protect themselves against the effects of globalization and the world financial crisis, which for some time now have been spilling over into depression of the real economy. China, Russia, and India have therefore joined together into a “strategic triangle,” which other nations will now join. This strategic partnership represents no threat to the West; rather, these nations, constituting a kind of “Survivors’ Club,” are simply committing themselves to the same values and principles that at an earlier time were also the natural tradition of the United States and western Europe: national sovereignty, scientific and technological progress as the basis of all social wealth, and the state’s responsibility to ensure the general welfare of its citizens.

It is also in the best fundamental interest of the United States and Europe, that the Eurasian Land-Bridge be expanded — i.e., that Eurasia’s infrastructure and economy become integrated, so that it may function as the keystone for global reconstruction of the world economy. And that includes the industrialization of Africa and Latin America.

We call upon you, fellow citizen, to ensure that the response to this crisis is not war; instead, let our answer be a new, just world economic order!

Give us a call! Join us in a worldwide mobilization!