

Lyndon LaRouche's Summary Report on the Strategic Situation Today

During the week of March 10-16, Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche issued this series of three statements, through his political committee, LaRouche in 2004.

The Truth About U.S. Imperialism, March 13, 2003

The increasing rage, from around the world, against the tyrannical follies of the current U.S. Bush Administration, tends to assume the form of a delusion among the U.S.A.'s critics, which could be as deadly to the world at large as the folly of the neo-conservative Chicken-hawks' present control over U.S. domestic and foreign policies. The reasons for such blunders by some Europeans should have been obvious.

The rising popular delusion among the U.S.A.'s foreign critics falsely attributes the combination of the President's unilateralism and his Chicken-hawk captors' imperialism to a specifically U.S. origin. What befuddles the Europeans, and others, thus far, is that the origin of both the presently onrushing collapse of the world monetary-financial system, and the imperial-war impulse, is the virtual takeover of the U.S. economy, the President, and the forces exerting top-down control over both political parties, by the successful importing of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of William of Orange and John Locke into a presently controlling feature of post-1964-71 U.S. economic practice.

To emphasize the crucial point, what affrights the world about the United States today is the lawful fruit of the same liberalism which is still a controlling influence within Europe (and other locations) today.

For related reasons, there are self-deluded ideologues within Europe—as Angela Merkel's visit to the U.S.A. reflected some leading circles in Germany's CDU-CSU—who assume that the catastrophic aftermath of a successful attack upon Iraq will weaken U.S. power, to the degree that Europe would then have more leg-room for expressing its own specific self-interests. Germans of that persuasion, for example, are to be compared to the deluded state of Marie Antoinette's "Then, let them eat cake." The combination of the actual unleashing of the control of U.S. policy by the nuclear-weapons utopians of the U.S.A. and Israel, would mean prompt descent into an early dark age for Europe, and sundry other parts of the world. Only a European leader in a towering state of terror-driven denial would draw a contrary conclusion.

Face reality. The neo-conservative Chicken-hawks, as typified by Wolfowitz and Perle, are essentially neo-Nietzschean fascists of the Leo Strauss, Carl Schmitt, Martin Heidegger, Michael Ledeen, et al. variety. They are, like Adolf Hitler in the bunker, doomsday utopians, enjoying a narrow but nasty base of support in the ranks of the illiterate unwashed Armageddon fetishists. They are not representative of a financial aristocracy—although not lacking the propensity to steal—but of a caste of feudal lackeys, which has taken control over the affairs of their masters' estates. The notable obsession of this pack of lackeys is their devotion to Bertrand Russell's doctrine of conduct of preventive nuclear war as a way of terrifying the world into submitting to a utopian world government of the qualities proposed by Russell and H.G. Wells. Their gospel is H.G. Wells' 1930s movie, *Things to Come*.

What is to be observed in Washington, is this lackey class (including Conrad Black's 2004 "Bull Moose" candidates



President Franklin D. Roosevelt (left) with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, in 1943. The continuing influence of Anglo-Dutch liberalism in Europe today, has blinded relevant Europeans from considering the urgently needed adoption of Franklin Roosevelt-like economic recovery measures. Roosevelt's "American System" economic policy was the point on which he and Churchill parted ways.

McCain and Lieberman, and Black's resident lunatic, Laurent Murawiec) seizing control of policy-shaping from the hands of the professionals and the financier circles themselves, just as Hitler took power from the hands of those such as the backers of Hjalmar Schacht.

The issue of war against Iraq thus packs into a single package, President George "Hindenburg" Bush's putting some Chicken-hawk Hitlers into power on the pretext of the Reichstag arson. Fools greeted Hitler's appointment by Hindenburg as a temporary affront to political good taste. Acquiescence to the alleged "inevitability" of the Iraq war, should remind us of the foolish German generals of 1933-34 who abandoned Chancellor von Schleicher for "reasons" no worse than those of Europeans prepared to accept the "inevitability" of an Iraq war today. Those German generals, among others, paid dearly for that mistake on the matter of von Schleicher, in July 1944. The cost to the world today, would be far worse.

In other words, the proverbial "bottom line" is, that there is no hope for the world in the near-term—perhaps for generations yet to come—except on the condition that certain sweeping, axiomatic changes are effected within the U.S. political system about now. There exists no alternative pathway to security for any part of the world.

In fact, there are two most crucial implications of the kind of denial of reality we discover among relevant Europeans. One is the set of points just outlined above. The second is, that the continued influence of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism in Europe, as in Angela Merkel's CDU or Westerwelle's FDP, prevents the victims of the delusion from considering the urgently needed adoption of Franklin-Roosevelt-like economic-recovery measures. The latter delusion prevents Euro-

peans who are victims of that ideology from recognizing that only political overturn of that form of Liberalism in the U.S.A.—the so-called "American Tory" form of the dupes of John Locke—would free the U.S.A. from the deadly form of combined unilateralism and Chicken-hawk imperialism menacing the planet today.

How Liberalism Created Fascism, March 14, 2003

The principal source of the difficulty which most Europeans experience in attempting to understand the present U.S. internal crisis, is that the current eruption of wild-eyed U.S. imperialist practices is rooted in the same Anglo-Dutch Liberal model admired by most popular and official opinion in today's Europe. I describe some of the essential mechanics of that connection.

The Liberal system of government, economy, and social philosophy is chiefly a copy of the financier-oligarchy-ruled maritime power of Venice's former imperial heydays. Under the influence of Venice's powerful Paolo Sarpi and his successors, the Venetian model of financier-oligarchy-managed liberalism was imposed upon two emerging imperial maritime powers in Northern Europe—the England of Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke; and the Netherlands of William of Orange and the radical empiricist Bernard Mandeville. The philosophical liberalism reigning within the society was complemented by a thrust toward that relatively global maritime supremacy consistent with the adopted self-interest

of the financier-oligarchical class as both merchant and usurer.

The crucial feature of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal model which was thus essentially consolidated in conception over the course of the Eighteenth Century, is the relative independence from elected government, enjoyed by a privately controlled central banking system. In effect, that central banking system is the agent of the collective assembly-in-fact of the society's financier-oligarchical class.

During the interval from approximately 1763 to 1945, the chief challenge to the power of the Liberal model within extended European civilization was first expressed in wide support, among Europeans, for the struggle for independence of the English colonies in North America. Over the course of the 1763-89 interval, the shaping of the emerging American constitutional republic produced a Constitution whose Preamble represented the intellectual triumph of the leading U.S. patriots, who reflected the influence of Gottfried Leibniz over that of John Locke. Even today, despite the success of Britain's Edward VII in foisting what became the Federal Reserve System on the U.S.A., the American System of political-economy, as described by Franklin, Hamilton, the Careys, Friedrich List, et al., is based on a principle of the authority of constitutional national banking—over that of any foreign power, or domestic financier-oligarchy—in matters of mone-

tary and financial regulation.

The best way to understand the way in which Chickenhawk captive President Bush's imperial hubris is being expressed today, is to look at the way in which a concert of Anglo-American financier-oligarchical power led by Britain's Montagu Norman, using Norman's asset Hjalmar Schacht, et al., imposed Adolf Hitler's dictatorship on Germany. The "independent central banking" interest, so expressed, put Hitler into power, both to prevent a Franklin Roosevelt-like option in Chancellor von Schleicher's Germany, and to arm Germany for a world war intended to destroy both Germany and Russia.

Shift in the U.S. World Role

The war did not proceed as Montagu Norman et al. intended. Germany decided to strike West first, instead of East. That put London in the position of screaming for help from the Roosevelt they hated; and the U.S. role left postwar Britain to be faced with absolute U.S. economic superiority worldwide—not exactly the original goal of Hitler's London backers. In strategy, always expect the unexpected as the most likely outcome.

Look at today's bankrupt U.S. system against the lesson of 1933-34 Germany.

Over the course of 1964-2003, the U.S.A. has been transformed from the world's leading producer nation, to an economically parasitical "consumer society" like the ancient Roman Empire, one which lives on the loot garnered by a brew of nuclear weapons and other predatory power over the world at large. In this process, for about two decades now, the leading U.S. political parties concentrate upon a constituency of the upper 20% of family-income brackets (e.g., the so-called "suburban" dogma of the neo-conservative Democratic Leadership Council—DLC), controlling elections, top-down, through vast masses of raw financial power, and control of the principal mass media of the nation by those same oligarchically-minded financier interests. Conrad Black, a leading "fallen angel" of the Chickenhawk flock, like the so-called "Mega Group," is typical of those corrupt connections.

Prior to that 1964-81 cultural-paradigm shift, during 1933-63, the U.S. political system was based in relatively large degree on the social and economic forces associated with independent farmers, manufacturing, regulated basic economic infrastructure, and so on. Today, nearly forty years since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the true entrepreneur is a vanishing species. The economic-political landscape of power is dominated by predatory forms of financial speculation, such as Enron and Halliburton, rubbing shoulders with the multi-billionaire barons from organized-crime pedigrees. Thus, we have a President, whose family ties are to a facet of that financier interest, but who, although nominally lord of the Federal estate, is being controlled by a pesky pack of wild-eyed "Leporellos," the "Chickenhawks."

If You Thought Adam Smith Was The Founding Father of America's Economic Strength—

Think Again.

READ

*Friedrich List: Outlines of
American Political Economy*

With a Commentary by Michael Liebig and
an Epilogue by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

"I confine my exertions solely to the refutation of the theory of Adam Smith and Co. the fundamental errors of which have not yet been understood so clearly as they ought to be. It is this theory, sir, which furnishes to the opponents of the American System the intellectual means of their opposition."

—Friedrich List to Charles J. Ingersoll,
July 10, 1827

\$19.20 plus \$4 shipping and handling

ORDER FROM:

Benjamin Franklin Booksellers
P.O. Box 1707, Leesburg, Va., 20177
(800) 453-4108.

We accept MasterCard, Visa, American Express, and Discover.



This is the pack of lackeys associated with the pro-fascist ideological legacy of Chicago University's Leo Strauss, Carl Schmitt, Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger, et al. The rascals appear to be running the Presidential chicken-coop, at least for the time being.

Choice Between Roosevelt and Hitler

The role of those Chicken-hawks represents an active and immediate, new Hitler threat.

As I shall explain in a forthcoming sequel to today's brief report, the world has only two significant choices: between today's Franklin Roosevelt and today's Hitlers; between Roosevelt-style recovery programs and Chicken-hawks wielding, and intending to use, nuclear weapons. It should be obvious that an FDR strategy means putting the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system into cold storage, at least for the duration. Thus, Europe may recognize the homicidal lunacy of Rumsfeld's and Cheney's Chicken-hawk Hitlers; but to prevent those Hitlers from taking over, the Anglo-Dutch Liberal models must be replaced by reorganization of the presently hopelessly bankrupt world monetary-financial system according to the principles of the American System of political-economy, List's system of national economy—at least “for the duration.”

Lyndon's FDR vs. Joe's Hitler, March 14, 2003

The decisive issue of U.S. policy in the Democratic Party today, is the fight between those who back the strategic posture recently stated by Senator McCain's warmongering crony, Senator Joseph Lieberman, and those who are committed, as I am, to applying the lessons of President Franklin Roosevelt's successful leadership over the 1933-45 interval, to the present global depression. I point to the ugly fact of Lieberman's recent policy declaration, in which he demanded that discussion of the U.S. economic crisis be banned, in favor of focussing popular attention totally on rallying support for the war-policy of Dick Cheney's Chicken-hawks. Lieberman also demanded, explicitly, that the legacy of President Franklin Roosevelt be rejected.

There are two leading points to be emphasized in this, the third of my current series of short reports on the nature and origins of the present imperial war-drive by Cheney's and Rumsfeld's Chicken-hawks. First: Consider those fundamental differences on economic policy between FDR and Hitler,



“The imposition of spiraling fiscal-austerity programs, such as those being accelerated within the U.S.A. today, creates the condition under which a monster like Hitler, or an ugly McCain-Lieberman ‘Bull Moose’ third-party combination, may become able to grab power.”
Left: Adolf Hitler with financier Hjalmar Schacht.
Above: Sen. Joe Lieberman.

which are now, once again, the crucial issues inside U.S. domestic and foreign policy. Second, focus upon the significance of the backing of the 2004 “Bull Moose” candidacies of “Tweedledum” McCain and “Tweedledee” Lieberman by press-imperialist Conrad Black's nuclear Chicken-hawks' roost, the Hudson Institute.

As documented in the complementary studies by Michael Liebig and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and others, the 1931-33 alternative to bringing Hitler to power in Germany, was posed by Dr. Wilhelm Lautenbach's presentation to a 1931, secret, high-level Berlin meeting of the Friedrich List Society. Had Lautenbach's proposal been implemented, rather than the fiscal austerity follies of ministerial Chancellor Brüning, Hitler could never have come to power in 1933. Through the implementation of policies akin to those of Lautenbach, President Franklin Roosevelt averted an intended fascist takeover of the U.S.A. Had a coup orchestrated by New York-financed London banker Montagu Norman not pushed President Paul von Hindenburg into dumping Chancellor von Schleicher, on January 28th, to install the choice of Germany's liberal party leader Hjalmar Schacht, Adolf Hitler, on January 30th, it would have been Kurt von Schleicher, not Hitler, heading the government of Germany at the time Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated as the new U.S. President. Germany's and U.S.A. policies would have been complementary.

The imposition of spiraling fiscal-austerity programs, such as those being accelerated within the U.S.A. today, cre-



Theodore Roosevelt's (left) 1912 "Bull Moose" operation split the Republican Party, defeating incumbent President William Howard Taft, and securing the election for Woodrow Wilson. Sen. John McCain (right) and his "Tweedledee," Joe Lieberman, are pursuing a similar tactic today, under the sponsorship of the Hudson Institute.

ates the condition under which a monster like Hitler, or an ugly McCain-Lieberman "Bull Moose" third-party combination, may become able to grab power. The Lautenbach proposal of 1931 typifies the alternative to such ugly scenarios, still today. That policy, when studied in the light of the successes of FDR's recovery programs, would have worked to prevent that economic-cultural breakdown then; the same principle could work in the U.S.A. and elsewhere today.

Against that ominous historical background, contrast President George W. Bush's pathetic version of "a fiscal stimulus package" to the genuine alternative posed by the Lautenbach and FDR precedents. The President's—and present Democratic Party leadership's—refusal to launch, even tolerate discussion of an FDR-style, infrastructure-based type of stimulus program, is already tending to create the preconditions for the kind of U.S. fascist dictatorship which the Hudson Institute's McCain-Lieberman "Bull Moose" project threatens to bring into being by January 2005, or even earlier.

President Bush is right in thinking that the collapsing U.S. economy desperately needs a Federal stimulus package. His mistake is attempting to breed by stimulating the sexual passions of the wrong choice of species.

The President had the misfortune to enter adulthood at a time that the official Indo-China war was already under way, and the perversion of the "rock-drug-sex youth-counterculture" was rampant on the university campuses, including his own. Then, or in his business experience, or experience in government, later, he never had adult experience of the way a real economy works; he belongs, in fact, to a generation of

university-trained strata which is predominantly ignorant of the way in which real wealth is reproduced.

He belongs to a generation which, in large, has become obsessed with immediate pleasure-seeking, and with the user's delusion, that it is money breeding money, which is the principle of wealth. So, we should not be surprised to see, that neither he, nor any visible figure of his government, appears to know what a healthy economy is. Therefore, his financial schemes do nothing but provide hyperinflationary stimulus to the same monetary-financial policies which have undermined and wrecked the U.S. economy, increasingly, over the entire period of three decades, since the trio of Henry Kissinger, Paul Volcker, and George Shultz foisted their August 15, 1971, "floating-exchange-rate" monetary swindle on John Connally and President Nixon. There lies the source of the danger of fascism currently typified by the Hudson Institute's disgusting duo, McCain and Lieberman.

What Must Be Done: Then as Now

The immediate problem of both the Federal and state governments, today, as in 1931-33 Germany, is that the use of fiscal austerity measures in the attempt to balance government accounts, is the medicine which kills the patient, rather than the disease. Such fiscal austerity measures might appear to balance the accounts of state and municipal governments over the short term of a few months, but, beyond that point, the result will be the hopeless bankruptcy of those governments, and explosive social conditions for a terrified and desperately ruined citizenry in general.

The alternative, as emphasized by Lautenbach in 1931,

as by FDR, is to decrease the rate of physically productive unemployment, up to the level that the resulting increase of the tax-revenue base brings currently incurred accounts into balance, or slightly better. There are chiefly three ways in which state, local, and national government can produce such beneficial changes quickly.

The foremost action by governments, beyond emergency general-welfare relief measures, is accelerated investment in creation of needed public works, chiefly by activating well-defined public works investment in public transportation especially mass transit, generation and distribution of power, water management, urban development, land management for conservation, forestation, space-oriented science-driver programs, and health-care and educational facilities and programs.

The second class of actions by government, is the mobilization of credit and selective investment-tax-credit for assistance in the area of physical production, such as farming and manufacturing, by the private sector, emphasizing private entrepreneurship more than corporate absentee shareholder value. The combination of the investment tax-credit and accelerated space-mission programs by President Kennedy's Administration, are typical.

The third class of government actions, is establishing long-term, low-interest, government-regulated technology-sharing programs of between twenty-five to fifty years maturities, with foreign partners.

In adopting such measures, we must proceed from the painful lesson of two generations' experience. We must recognize that the economic collapse of the world's present, doomed monetary-financial system, is the result of a wrong turn made, in the U.S.A., as under the United Kingdom's first Harold Wilson government, since the time of the launching of the official U.S. war in Indo-China. The cultural-paradigm-shift of 1964-72, aggravated by the inevitably ruinous 1971-2003 "floating-exchange-rate" monetary-financial system, was a truly tragic kind of folly. We must combine the rebuilding of the house which FDR built up out of the ruins of the Coolidge-Hoover Depression, with an orientation to the vast markets for long-term technology-sharing investments opening up in Eurasia.

We must let the present collapse of the U.S. economy bring us back to our senses. We must build a new, more durable system of global security, chiefly by taking a leading position in promoting advance of humanity from childhood to the maturity of a set of relations among states composed as a community of principle among perfectly sovereign nation-state republics.

That is the only effective way to defeat both the current world depression and the fascist schemes of the neo-conservative imperialists allied with John McCain, Joe Lieberman, and their Chicken-hawk accomplices. Learn the lesson of Hitler's 1933 accession to power, while the choice is still available to you.

Iraq Treatment Set for Ibero-America by Rumsfeld

by Gretchen Small

U.S. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's crowd, through the mouth of U.S. Southern Command chief Gen. James Hill, is pumping the line that al-Qaeda-linked Islamic terrorists are running around in the so-called "ungoverned areas" of Ibero-America, and that this constitutes the greatest threat to hemispheric security. Several hundred diplomats, military officers, and policymakers from around the hemisphere, attending a conference March 2-4 in Miami on "Building Regional Security Cooperation in the Western Hemisphere," were told that Ibero-American nations must change their military force structures and missions, so as to function as a subordinated part of a multinational strike force which the U.S. intends to lead against these terrorists.

The menacing statement was added, that no government in the area is *yet* considered an "accomplice state" of these terrorists. With the bombs now falling on Iraq, the implication of that threat is clear. With this policy, Rumsfeld's boys have created a greater security threat to the United States in the Americas, than existed before. Anger and hostility against the United States is rising rapidly across Ibero-America, giving Wall Street's narco-terrorist recruiters a field-day. Those who would be U.S. friends find no possibility of being so. With their war, their imperious demands, and their lying intelligence reports, Rumsfeld's chicken-hawks have buried any possibility of establishing the U.S./Ibero-American cooperation which *is* urgently needed to crush the narco-terrorists rampaging across the Americas. Not until U.S. policy is radically reversed, can the damage be repaired.

'Preventive War' in Ibero-America?

In his speech to the Miami conference, General Hill elaborated the imperial agenda which Rumsfeld first unveiled in November 2002, at the Fifth Defense Ministerial of the Americas, in Santiago, Chile. Rumsfeld's line was that "effective sovereignty" over the "ungoverned areas" of the Americas could only be re-established through the creation of regional military forces. He outlined two U.S. initiatives to create those forces, one maritime, the other a broader "peacekeeping and stability" force.

That the Rumsfeld initiatives flow out of the assertion of a U.S. right to carry out the kind of "preventive war" of those convicted at Nuremberg, was made even clearer in a speech delivered at Georgetown University in Washington on Jan. 14, 2003, by Richard Haass, director of the State Depart-

ment's Policy Planning Staff.

Haass—who was on record advocating a return to an imperial world order long before Sept. 11—argued that “the global struggle against terrorism” has changed the nature of sovereignty. He spoke, as does Rumsfeld, of sovereignty being challenged in “ungoverned regions. . . . The attacks of Sept. 11, 2001 reminded us that weak states can threaten our security as much as strong ones, by providing breeding grounds for extremism and havens for criminals, drug traffickers, and terrorists.”

Governments which allow such things to occur, even if out of weakness, Haass asserted, must be held to account. “Countries have the right to take action to protect their citizens against those states that abet, support, or harbor international terrorists, or are incapable of controlling terrorists operating from their territory,” he proclaimed. “When states are reluctant or unwilling to meet this baseline obligation, we will act, ideally with partners, but alone if necessary, to hold them accountable.” Haass specified that such states “jeopardize their sovereign immunity from intervention,” and may face “anticipatory action,” as “preventive” war.

This is the policy laid out by Hill, albeit more circumspectly. He argued that: 1) narco-terrorism is growing in the “ungoverned spaces” of Ibero-America; 2) drugs are “weapons of mass destruction”; and, 3) “radical Islamic groups associated [sic] with Hamas, Hezbollah, al-Gamaat, and others” have hooked up with these narco-terrorists, to generate hundreds of millions dollars a year from Ibero-America.

That combined threat requires changes in military operations in Ibero-America, Hill argued. Claiming he “would never say that the day of the traditional military capability has passed,” he did just that: demanding changes in the configuration, training, equipment, missions, and operations of Ibero-America's armed forces. He insisted that “we need to re-evaluate our armed forces and security forces and collective agreements,” in order to deal with so-called “21st-Century threats” which are “transnational,” and therefore require the expansion of the “structure of multilateral security cooperation in the Americas.”

The list of “ungoverned spaces” targetted for supranational action had grown since November. Hill named Colombia, southern Panama, northern Ecuador, northern Peru, Bolivia, portions of Venezuela (including the island of Margarita), the tri-border area where Paraguay, Argentina, and Brazil meet, and the entirety of Surinam, as “problem” areas.

Never Touch Wall Street

This campaign is no more driven by real intelligence, than is the war on Iraq. Neither Rumsfeld nor Hill mention the crushing economic conditions created by decades of looting under the dictates of International Monetary Fund and free trade, as the single greatest force creating “ungoverned spaces” in the region.

Neither do you hear any Bush Administration officials mention the role of Wall Street in aiding, abetting, and profiting from the drug trade, which they profess to be so concerned about. The latest glaring example of this hypocrisy, is the fact that not a peep has been said about the fact that the drug trade held a public, hemisphere-wide organizing meeting in Mérida, Mexico only two weeks before the Miami conference—financed, as usual, by the drug-legalization machine of speculator George Soros, and featuring Soros's top drug man, Drug Policy Alliance (DPA) director Ethan Nadelmann.

Several hundred legalization activists, narco-terrorists, coca-growers, and government officials from America, Europe, and Ibero-America met Feb. 12-15 at the Mérida conference, “Out from the Shadows: Ending Prohibition in the 21st Century.” Billed as “the first hemispheric conference organized to call for an end to prohibition and the drug war,” its organizers were the U.S.-based Drug Reform Coordination Network (DRCNet), the Italian Radical Party's International Anti-Prohibitionist League, and the internet news outlet, “Narco News.”

Present were the drug trade's key “fifth column”: the “grand old man of Latin American legalizers,” former Colombian Attorney General Gustavo de Grief; Colombian Congressman and former Supreme Court Chief Justice Carlos Gaviria (infamous as the author of the 1994 decision legalizing the use and possession of drugs in Colombia); and Bolivian narco-terrorist turned Congressman Felipe Quispe. (Soros's people had been promoting the fact that the head of Bolivia's coca-growers, now-Congressman Evo Morales, was scheduled, but he stayed at home at the last minute to attempt a coup.) Peru's coca-growers, a myriad of user-activist associations campaigning for drug use, and Congressmen from Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, and Uruguay were all there for the confab.

Soros and his drug machine never came up at the Miami Western Hemisphere conference. Instead, in an interview with the *Miami Herald* following the conference, Hill echoed the disgusting “Muslims are the enemy” line of the Clash of Civilizations crowd, as the supposed terrorist danger. To justify his assertion that Ibero-America has become a major fundraising base for radical Islamic groups, Hill cited the fact that “the fastest-growing religion in Latin America today is Islam,” and “we think that there are between 3 and 6 million people of Middle Eastern descent in Latin America”—both apparently crimes in Hill's view.

Not surprisingly, one of the Miami conference organizers admitted to *EIR* that he found generalized opposition from the Ibero-Americans at the conference. Conferees “made it loud and clear” that they don't want the United States telling them who is a terrorist and who is not, he reported; they would fight terrorism differently from the United States, and *certainly*, not do what the United States is doing in Iraq. “All bets are off” that even Chile, which originally supported the Rumsfeld initiatives, is still on board.