

## Editorial

# Leadership Against War and Depression

The U.S. Congress has given President George W. Bush—whom it should have declared insane for demanding aggressive war in violation of the Constitution and all international treaties—the *carte blanche* for war, amid an economic depression. British and American forces have already taken actions intended to make the war inevitable. Large-scale deployments and maneuvers of U.S. and British troops throughout the Persian Gulf area have already triggered the war in the air—and in Kuwait! The first casualties were two U.S. Marines—one killed, another wounded—in a firefight with two Kuwaitis who attacked the Marines' maneuver on Oct. 8, in what is supposed to be the only firm anti-Iraq ally in the region.

Sen. Robert Byrd (D-W.V.) did his best to halt Senate passage of the measure, which he correctly identified as against the Constitutional injunction that Congress, not the President, must declare war. Senator Byrd has also been at pains to point out that the very people who are insisting that there's an immediate threat of biological and chemical weapons being used by Iraq, are the same officials who gave Saddam Hussein these weapons back in the early 1980s! While Senator Byrd may not have been successful in stopping the passage of the war resolution, the debate was intensified by his outspokenness, and by the recent CIA report whose conclusions were revealed by the *Washington Post* on Oct. 7—that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to use "weapons of mass destruction" *unless he believes a U.S. attack is imminent*.

While many polls continue to contrive—by the questions asked—majority support for the war, one poll, by ABC News, asked a different question and reported that 70% of those polled want the President to think less about war and take more action to reverse the U.S. economic collapse. Both journalists and members of Congress keep reporting that their readers' and constituents' mail runs overwhelmingly against an Iraq war. Firsthand reports from Capitol Hill underscore the fact that many more Congressmen oppose the war plan, than would vote against the President's insistence on the right to take military action. They refused to act in

response to the flood of public sentiment against the war which is reported to be hitting their offices.

When the widely read "BankIndex.com" website posted candidate Lyndon LaRouche's statement, "The United Nations Should Declare President George W. Bush Insane," they reported their "Internet server nearly broke down" with the flood of e-mails, largely in support of LaRouche's idea—an indication of the deep opposition to war in a population which wants *economic* action.

The constituency base of the Democratic Party is angry at the capitulation of the party's leadership. They are not stupid, and recognize that with a few exceptions, there's no real leadership function at the top of the Democratic Party. This is true not only on the question of the war; it was true two years ago when that leadership could have stopped John Ashcroft's nomination as Attorney General, and did not; above all, it is true on the economic depression which, globally, is the worst in living memory.

Lyndon LaRouche and his movement started the fight to stop this "perpetual war" faction, as he started the fight to stop Ashcroft in December 2000, to defeat Enron in January 2001, and to stop the shutdown of public health care in the nation's capital, D.C. General Hospital. The Democratic Party leadership gave up all those fights, when they reached the point they could be won. LaRouche did his job; they did not. They're not capable of leadership. LaRouche is.

Any leadership—and this goes for every active citizen as well—which does not have the economic situation in focus, can't stop the war, or be able to handle the situation when a war does start. The economic collapse is the real national security threat; recovery measures, put up by Presidential candidate LaRouche, are the only real actions to take for "those who care about the national security of the United States."

A combination of national and international forces can still stop this war, which has already started. Americans have to realize, as some other nations' leaderships and people have begun to, that only LaRouche provides the leadership to do it.