

Zepp-LaRouche Presents Election Program in Berlin

by Nancy Spannaus

The Chancellor candidate of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity party (BüSo), the LaRouche movement in Germany, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, presented her election program in the German capital Berlin on Aug. 4. Despite a concerted press blackout by the major media, Zepp-LaRouche gave her presentation to several independent journalists. In her speech, Mrs. LaRouche emphasized two major points: the need for Germany's return to its national currency, the deutschemark, and the acute danger of a global "asymmetrical" war.

With extraordinary national elections scheduled for Sept. 18 (although the Constitutional court could still cancel them), Germany is in the throes of election fever. But the only national candidate who is addressing the fundamental crisis facing Germany, and Europe, is Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Back to the D-Mark

Zepp-LaRouche began by laying out the economic crisis in its international dimensions, and stressing the imminence of a worldwide financial blowout. "In truth, Germany has not 5 million unemployed, as the Christian Democratic Union has said on its election posters, but up to 10 million," she said, citing a recent report by the Institute for Labor Market Statistics. Thus unemployment is by far the largest cost factor in the German economy. And no other party has put forward a program that will address this problem.

As Chancellor, Zepp-LaRouche continued, I would immediately pull out of the European Currency Union, and bring back the D-mark. This will allow Germany to implement the necessary 400-billion euro per year state credit program, which will create millions of jobs rebuilding necessary infrastructure. She cited the fact that other European leaders are also talking openly about leaving the euro.

"I know, from discussions with people in leading posi-

tions, that there is a discussion within elite circles, of a return to the deutschemark, state credit creation, and a new financial system. But it has been agreed to maintain silence about it in public," Zepp-LaRouche said.

She then outlined her proposal for a new world financial system on the model of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Bretton Woods. Such a financial reorganization would turn short-term debts into long-term debts, while banning speculative instruments such as financial derivatives. Fixed exchange rates must be established, she said, so that criminal elements cannot destroy people's livelihoods through speculation.

The larger context for this policy would be the resumption of the infrastructure projects of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, in the tradition of the Trans-Siberian Railroad and the Berlin-Baghdad Rail project. Only through the integration and reconstruction of Eurasia could Germany have a perspective of real economic growth.

(Mrs. LaRouche's full economic program appeared in *EIR*, Aug. 5.)

The Danger of World War

In the second part of her address, Zepp-LaRouche warned of the danger of a war of aggression by the United States against Iran. In that discussion, she highlighted the role which her husband, economist and politician Lyndon LaRouche, is playing in the United States, where he is mobilizing to stop Vice President Dick Cheney's "Guns of August" scenario for nuclear war.

"The pattern of threats by the Cheney-Bush regime resembles the construct of lies which was built up in preparation for the Iraq War," Mrs. LaRouche stated. These included the stories that Saddam Hussein had connections with al-Qaeda networks, and that he possessed weapons of mass destruction



EIRNS/Wolfgang Lillge

Helga Zepp-LaRouche at a press conference in Berlin on Aug. 4, discussing her candidacy for Chancellor in the expected Fall election. While other German political leaders are whispering about a return to the deutschemark and other urgent policy issues, she is the only one bold enough to say it in public.

which could be made ready within 45 minutes. All of this has been shown to be false. Today, total chaos reigns in Iraq.

If the United States hits Iran, a nation with 70 million inhabitants and much more military capacity than Iraq had, there is likely to be a huge counterattack against the U.S. troops in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Turkey. The great Asian powers, Russia, India, and China, have good relations with Iran. Whether such a U.S. action would cross the “red line” with these nations is not clear, but, altogether, such an adventure against Iran would certainly bring the danger of the third world war.

The only way to stop this threat, Zepp-LaRouche said, would be a timely mobilization of all political forces against the neo-conservatives and a rapid impeachment proceeding against Vice President Cheney and President Bush. A sign of strengthening resistance are the efforts by sections of the U.S. Congress to pursue criminal proceedings against associates of the White House, such as Bush’s political guru Karl Rove and Cheney’s chief of staff Lewis Libby, for their illegal exposure of the identity of CIA agent Valerie Plame. Plame’s husband, Ambassador Joseph Wilson, had provided important evidence showing that the case that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction was false, and was therefore being punished for that.

“In this race against time toward a possible new war, it is urgently necessary,” Mrs. LaRouche said, “to pull Germany’s soldiers and members of the aid organizations out of Afghanistan.” The mission of the German deployment has totally failed, as shown by the fact that the drug lords control the

region, and economic reconstruction of the country has not occurred. German soldiers have withdrawn for self-defense into their barracks. Their pullout should be ordered immediately. German security will not be defended in the Hindu Kush, Mrs. LaRouche said. Only a fundamental change in policy toward Eurasia could stabilize the area. (See below for a policy statement by Mrs. LaRouche on her proposal on Afghanistan.)

In the ensuing discussion, members of the press asked about the chances for her candidacy and about the feasibility of issuing the 200 billion euro (400 billion D-mark) yearly. “Purely technically,” Mrs. LaRouche said, “the Federal President has the possibility of calling in an expert to deal with the escalating crisis. That could be a technocrat, but it could also be a Helga Zepp-LaRouche.” On questions of credit, one must understand the difference between current budgets, and long-term economic growth and development. Only in the realm of long-term economic growth, above all for those of the lower income classes, could the budget be stabilized.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Statement

The German Army Must Pull Out of Afghanistan!

This statement was issued by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Chancellor candidate of the Civil Rights Movement Solidarity (Büso) party, Aug. 5, 2005.

As was laid out in the *American Conservative* magazine, U.S. Vice-President Dick Cheney has instructed the U.S. Strategic Command to work out a contingency plan for the eventuality that the United States would be hit again with a terror attack like that of Sept. 11, 2001. Part of the plan involves comprehensive air strikes on Iran with the employment of conventional and tactical nuclear weapons, the so-called “mini-nukes.” As in the case of Iraq, the planned attack does not depend upon whether Iran actually participated in the terrorist acts against the United States.

As the author of the article, the retired CIA officer Philip Giraldi, later explained, various high-ranking Air Force officers, who participated in the planning, were shocked about the consequences of Iran being the target of an unprovoked nuclear weapons attack. So far, however, no one has been ready to put his career on the line, and to oppose these orders.

Terrorism and Psychological Warfare

British Prime Minister Tony Blair, who energetically forced through the Iraq war, is contributing to the best of his



BüSo

The BüSo's proposal for a new deutschemark bill for Germany features Friedrich Schiller and Clara Schumann, along with the German Constitutional statement affirming the democratic and social state.

ability, to prepare the psychological environment for such an aggressive war. He is holding “Islamic extremists” responsible for the recent attacks on London. Blair, naturally, is saying nothing—for one thing, totally neglecting the question of who were the real architects of the terrorism—about the fact that Islamic extremism is the long-term result of the policies of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Bernard Lewis.

These two geopoliticians played the so-called “Islamic card” against the former Soviet Union in the 1970s. At that point, Anglo-American circles trained Islamic Mujahideen for the war in Afghanistan, and in that way created the first radical-Islamic networks which spread out after the collapse of the Soviet Union, into the region that ranges from Afghanistan to Chechnya. And Blair obviously also says nothing about the fact that many terrorist organizations have maintained their headquarters in London for many years—with the apparent and often-criticized toleration of the British government.

In an eerie repeat of the propaganda campaign which led to the war against Iraq, Iran is currently being accused, in a flood of articles and books, of similar things that Blair, Cheney, and Co. had thrown at Iraq: That Iran is working on the production of weapons of mass destruction, that it controls international terrorism, and so on. The most hair-raising example of this propaganda is the book, severely criticized by the *Washington Post*, by U.S. neo-conservative Kenneth Timmerman, *Countdown to a Crisis: The Coming Nuclear Conflict with Iran*. Every conceivable kind of villainy is attributed to Iran, from complicity in the attacks of Sept. 11, to the attempt to procure nuclear weapons to menace the United States and Israel.

The Battle in the United States

Particularly important, then, is the fact that the U.S. National Intelligence Council, in some respects the umbrella organization of the different U.S. intelligence organizations, has come out with an official evaluation in direct opposition to the White House. Iran has no separate military nuclear

program, it says, and the civilian program is at least ten years away from the possibility of producing fissile material for atomic weapons.

Therefore, the revelations of former UN Weapons Inspector Scott Ritter are very informative: He recently reported that he had been given information by government circles at the end of last year, that the Bush government absolutely wanted to reach the appearance of peace in Iraq by June of 2005, because the Pentagon had instructions to be ready at this point for a massive air attack on Iran. That in the face of these circumstances, Iran announced that it would resume its work on the nuclear site in Isfahan, notably under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency, may perhaps not be the most diplomatically prudent step to take, but it is certainly understandable.

The international community must do everything conceivable to head off the escalation of the Iran issue. Unfortunately, only an effective opposition within the United States can actually stop this war plan, but we must strengthen this opposition. One of the strongest alarm signals is the “recess appointment” of John Bolton to be the new American Ambassador to the United Nations. Bolton, who in the past has spoken out openly for “preventive war,” would obviously be in place if the Bush-Cheney government wants to bring the Iran question before the UN Security Council. If a motion for sanctions fails, because of a veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council, the United States would proceed unilaterally against Iran—exactly the same scenario as in the case of Iraq.

However, there is one decisive difference: An atomic attack on Iran would, with very high probability, be the beginning of an asymmetrical world war, with apocalyptic dimensions. Upon an American nuclear strike, Iran, a country with 70 million people and considerable military might, would react with counter-strikes, by which neither the U.S. troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, nor Israel, should be surprised. One good question is whether at this point of military escalation, the “red line” for Russia, China, or India would have been crossed.

Orderly Withdrawal of German Army From Afghanistan

The dramatic sharpening of the crisis around Iran urgently demands a re-evaluation of the stationing of German soldiers in Afghanistan. A clear-headed analysis of the original objectives of this deployment shows clearly that the situation in Afghanistan has run out of control. At any moment there could be a catastrophe; for example, a huge attack or assault on the Germany Army troops deployed in Afghanistan, or the aid organizations working there.

The German troop deployment in Afghanistan must be newly examined, not only in the face of its obviously questionable motivation, which led to the demand for German