

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

September 14, 2012 Vol. 39 No. 36 www.larouche.com \$10.00

Israel Trigger Set for World War III
World Water Meet Poses Life-or-Death Choices
In Memoriam: Gail Billington

**LaRouche: War Among Nations
Today Means Thermonuclear War**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: *Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Edward Spannaus, Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey
Steinberg, William Wertz*

Editor: *Nancy Spannaus*

Managing Editors: *Bonnie James, Susan Welsh*

Technology Editor: *Marsha Freeman*

Book Editor: *Katherine Notley*

Graphics Editor: *Alan Yue*

Photo Editor: *Stuart Lewis*

Circulation Manager: *Stanley Ezrol*

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: *Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg*

Economics: *John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher*

History: *Anton Chaitkin*

Ibero-America: *Dennis Small*

Law: *Edward Spannaus*

Russia and Eastern Europe: *Rachel Douglas*

United States: *Debra Freeman*

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: *Javier Almaro*

Berlin: *Rainer Apel*

Copenhagen: *Tom Gillesberg*

Houston: *Harley Schlanger*

Lima: *Sara Madueño*

Melbourne: *Robert Barwick*

Mexico City: *Gerardo Castilleja Chávez*

New Delhi: *Ramtanu Maitra*

Paris: *Christine Bierre*

Stockholm: *Ulf Sandmark*

United Nations, N.Y.C.: *Leni Rubinstein*

Washington, D.C.: *William Jones*

Wiesbaden: *Göran Haglund*

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.executiveintelligencereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: *John Sigerson*

Assistant Webmaster: *George Hollis*

Editor, Arabic-language edition: *Hussein Askary*

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly

(50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc.,

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach

Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany

Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirma.com>

e-mail: eirma@eirma.com

Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,

basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.

Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:

eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Ave Morelos #60-A, Col Barrio

de San Andres, Del. Azcapotzalco, CP 02240,

Mexico, DF. Tel: 5318-2301, 1163-9734, 1163-9735.

Copyright: ©2012 EIR News Service. All rights reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement

#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O.

Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Managing Editor

This week, we lead with a must-read discussion, on the widely viewed Internet radio program, The Alex Jones Show, with Lyndon LaRouche, on the eve of his 90th birthday (*Strategy*). LaRouche, as always, doesn't pull any punches, in confronting his audience—and by extension, you, our readers—with the reality that we are perhaps only days or weeks from the outbreak of thermonuclear world war—unless we succeed in permanently removing London's own puppet Barack Obama's finger from the nuclear trigger. And while there are significant war-avoidance measures being taken by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and their counterparts in the two other nuclear superpowers, China and Russia, those efforts will come to naught, unless the American people take the appropriate action—and fast! The means to do so, are outlined immediately following, in “The Case To Impeach Barack Obama Now,” which presents *seven* counts of indictment against the Narcissist-in-Chief, any one of which is solid grounds for impeachment.

“Israel Trigger Set for World War III” (*International*) amplifies LaRouche warnings, by zeroing in on the lunatic threats by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to strike Iran, a strike which could be the spark that lights the fuse for world war. Helga Zepp-LaRouche covers the European crisis, in a message to the citizens of Germany, “No to Nuclear War and Eurozone Hyperinflation!” Nobel Peace Prize laureate Archbishop Tutu refuses to appear with Britain's war criminal Tony Blair, declaring his lies that led to the Iraq War “morally indefensible”; and Mohammad Mahfoud, an independent Syrian activist, counters the black propaganda flooding the news media about the war in that nation.

Our *Feature* presents a first-hand report from the Stockholm World Water Week, where two world views—that of the greenie, malthusian West, and the desperate, water- and food-starved nations of Africa and Asia—were in stark contrast.

In the midst of these world-shaking events, we take time to remember Gail Billington, a longtime, leading member of the LaRouche political movement, whose effect on all those whose lives she touched, from Prime Ministers to ordinary people, moved them to want to join her lifelong battle for economic and political justice.



Cover This Week

A Trident II D-5 intercontinental ballistic missile lifts off from the submerged nuclear-powered strategic missile submarine USS Tennessee.



DoD/PHCM David Campbell

4 LaRouche on the Alex Jones Show: War Among Nations Today Means Thermonuclear War

Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed by Alex Jones, on his Internet radio program, Sept. 7, on the eve of his 90th birthday, for a discussion which centered on the two most significant sources of threat to humanity today: “One is the British monarchy and the other is the British monarchy’s puppet, which is Obama.” Countering those threats are the war-avoidance efforts of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and those of the Russian and Chinese leaderships.

10 The Case To Impeach Barack Obama Now

The bill of indictment against President Obama, citing the key features of the U.S. Constitution, which offer an airtight case for removal of the President.

International

13 Israel Trigger Set for World War III

President Obama’s abrupt cancellation of a meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu scheduled for later this month in New York City has raised alarm bells that the President has given Israel a de facto green light to launch a preventive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities—a strike that Lyndon LaRouche has warned can trigger a thermonuclear World War III.

16 Message to Germany: No to Nuclear War and Eurozone Hyperinflation!

By Helga Zepp-LaRouche.
Germany’s existence is currently threatened by two existential dangers. First, the possibility of an Israeli military strike against Iran this Fall, which threatens World War III. Second, the ECB’s decision to carry out “unlimited” government bond-buying portends an imminent hyperinflation, as in 1923 Weimar Germany.

19 Archbishop Tutu Opens Gate for Prosecuting War Criminal Blair

Nobel Peace Prize winner Archbishop Desmond Tutu refused to appear with Tony Blair, charging him with war crimes related to the Iraq War.

21 Interview: Mohammad Mahfoud—There Is Still Time To Find a Peaceful Solution to the Syria Crisis

Mohammad Mahfoud is an independent Syrian activist and president of the Danish-Syrian Friendship Society; he was interviewed by Tom Gillesberg, chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark on Sept. 3.

26 Africa Report

Drug-smuggling networks spanning Africa provide the basis for threats to nations. The case of Mali, Part I.

Feature

27 World Water Week: Two Opposing Worlds Meet; Development or Death

EIR's Hussein Askary attended the Stockholm World Water Week conference at the end of August, where he found a deep fissure between the trans-Atlantic malthusian perspective, and the urgent need and desire among Asian and African nations for economic development, especially water projects.

33 Interview: Mohammed Bahaa el-Din Saad—Solving Africa's Water Crisis

Bahaa el-Din is the Egyptian Minister for Water Resources and Irrigation. He was interviewed by *EIR* on Aug. 26, at the World Water Week conference.

34 Interview: Rafiq Hussein—Common Aims for the Mediterranean Nations

Dr. Rafiq Hussein, the Deputy Secretary General of the Union for the Mediterranean, was interviewed by *EIR* on Aug. 26, at the World Water Week conference.

37 Build the Gaza Desal Project Now!

40 PIDA: A Tony Blair, Deadly Pretense

In Memoriam

42 Gail Billington: A Magnolia Made of Specialty Steel

A loving tribute from Dennis Small to longtime LaRouche activist and frequent *EIR* contributor Gail Goerner Billington, who passed away on Sept. 1. "She was a seemingly slight and frail person, but . . . inside she was endowed with steel—you might say specialty steel—that allowed her to move souls and mountains, in her lifelong commitment to economic and political justice for all mankind, through her leading role in the LaRouche movement."

45 LaRouche: On the Death Of Gail Billington

Lyndon LaRouche's remarks to associates, on learning of Gail's death.

46 The Angel of Freedom by Margaret Billington Greenspan

Excerpts from a letter from Mike Billington's sister Margaret, to Gail and Mike, on the eve of his return to prison in 1992.

Editorial

49 A Pyrrhic Victory?

LAROUCHE ON THE ALEX JONES SHOW

War Among Nations Today Means Thermonuclear War

Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed by Alex Jones, on his Internet radio program, Sept. 7 (<http://www.infowars.com/>). Here is an edited transcript.

Alex Jones: The more I learn in my own research, the more I learn how right he is, which has become a big media event, that “Jones is a LaRouchean!” But what I am is a seeker of truth, that’s what I’m seeking out. And that’s why he’s here with us.

And sir, I hear that you are just about 90 years old, but I tell you, you don’t look a day over 75. What’s your secret to youthfulness—longevity?

Lyndon LaRouche: I don’t know, maybe there’s some virtue there, somewhere, or some reward for something I had done or not done! I just enjoy doing what I do. I feel committed to what I’m doing.

Jones: What is your birthday, is it today or tomorrow?

LaRouche: It’s tomorrow.

Jones: Wow, so you’ll be 90 years old, on Sept. 8.

LaRouche: Yep!

Jones: Well, happy birthday!

LaRouche: Thank you.

Jones: No one can say that you’ve sat around on your hind end for 90 years.

LaRouche: No! A lot of other places, but not that.

Jones: Let’s get into world events first. . . . I just read over a snapshot of news today; I see the world lining up like we saw before the first two world wars. Am I wrong, in intellectually, historically, but also in my gut,

feeling the serious tremors in the force?


LaRouche: I think there are only two major sources of threat: One is the British monarchy and the other is the British monarchy’s puppet, which is Obama.

The situation is, that as the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States have shown, they understand that any war that breaks out now, such as in the Middle East or elsewhere, will be a thermonuclear war. There may be other minor things and conflicts which are going on, but any time the force comes in, and someone says we’re going to start the attack, it’s going to be a full, global attack, and it’s going to be thermonuclear. And the question is, will anybody survive, eventually, not merely out of the war.

Because you forget the Russian and Chinese capabilities, which are very significant, against the United States and Britain and something from France, which is the other side; and these forces are going to go against each other on a thermonuclear basis from the get-go! And that means that our major submarines are going to launch in their time; it’s going to be a full launch, probably one or two rounds; maybe within an hour and a half, it’s all over! And the world looks pretty dead.

So we’re at a point where the idea of simple war, or war breaking out, or incidents leading to war, is not going to happen. What’s happened is, Russia and China have made a very firm commitment *not* to start a war, but also to defend against it.

Most people in the United States want no part of



LPAC

On the eve of his 90th birthday, Lyndon LaRouche told listeners on the Alex Jones Show, “As the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States have shown, they understand that any war that breaks out now, such as in the Middle East or elsewhere, will be a thermonuclear war.”

this. The only person really behind it, is the President, Obama; and Obama’s with the Queen, but most of the people in Britain are not for this nonsense either.

So we’re on the verge of the worst kind of warfare one could imagine, which would break out very suddenly, with very little warning on any part. Certain services, such as the U.S. services would understand, and know that this is going on immediately.

War Avoidance by Senior Military Figures

Jones: Let me stop you there, sir, because what you’re saying is obviously right on target. But people may not understand: The last two chairmen of the Joint Chiefs, the last three heads of CENTCOM, have refused to attack Iran, saying it would bring in China and Russia. Now, they’ve sent the fleets over to menace China, and they think that that’s going to allow this attack. But now, even [JCS Chief Gen. Martin] Dempsey came out and said—the exact quote was a headline, “Do not blame us when Israel strikes, and don’t think we’re supporting it.” So, to have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs saying that, shows that the military establishment—who love wars, I mean that’s what they do—are saying, “Do not do this.” How significant is that? That signifies a mutiny within the saner sectors of the power structure?

LaRouche: I’m not sure the word “mutiny” is quite

the right term. The point is, because nothing that the Joint Chiefs and others are doing, to that effect, is a violation of anything on their part.

Jones: Sure, that’s the wrong term. It’s a sanity call. What would you call it, then?

LaRouche: The point is, you’ve got to throw this President out of office. Even though he’s just been nominated, I don’t think it’s going to stick, and he’s not in a winning position right now.

Jones: But what does it mean inside the government, where you have so many connections, to have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs come out and say something countervailing what the President and certain sectors of Israel are pushing?

LaRouche: Yes, but the Joint Chiefs are operating within their powers of government. And the President doesn’t dare challenge that directly! Because the President is not a popular President!

Jones: Am I right to say that it’s seismic, though? How big of a deal is it to have the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs come out, say that, and he gets almost no press?

LaRouche: You’re talking about, if you’re a member of the Joint Chiefs and you’re a patriot as I am, you’re not going to play games, guessing games or anything with this policy. We know that any major war that breaks out on this planet will be a *thermonuclear war!* There are no minor wars possible! You can not have a continuation of the war within the Middle East at all. Any such war *will* lead to thermonuclear war, immediately. And that means, that within about an hour and a half, *most of the world is dead.* And anyone who is competent, like the Joint Chiefs, or other people of the same interests—Russians or Chinese, all the same thing—*this war must not occur!* And if somebody tries to start it, we should get them out of the way, quick.

Because we’re in the age of thermonuclear warfare, and nobody can *win* thermonuclear warfare. The human race might go *extinct* within the aftermath of such an attack. So no sane person—and I wouldn’t include this President as sane—no sane person wants to start such a war.

There are other means we’re going to have to use, to deal with conflict. Many of the means are not conflict at all; they’re just arguments about how we’re going to

settle things. But we've come to a time where we have to learn the truth: You can not have war among major nations today. No sane head of government would launch it.

But I think there are some people who are not so sane, including our current President. But don't assume with all the boolah-boolah, that he's going to win this election. Right now, he's running as a loser, not because the other guys are smart, but because he is so bad, and he is losing anything resembling friends and supporters at a rapid rate.


Obama's Unconstitutional Wars

Jones: Again, you have a lot of connections inside the Pentagon, CIA, you name it; I want to get their take on where this is going. Are there October Surprises that this regime could pull? And how we do avert kicking off a wider war in the Middle East? The big proxy war is already on. . .

LaRouche: The point is, I think the powers that be, really do not intend to have a thermonuclear war. They intend to have a limited kind of conflict, hope that they can break up resistance, take over, and then kill people. Now, the best way to kill people is being done in the United States, by those interests who have shut off the food supply, those who are insisting, like this President, on cutting out food consumption, in an area where we're running short of the food necessary to feed people, and he's trying to turn it into gasoline or something of that sort.

It's this attempt to use bluff, threats, even terrible threats, exemplary cruelties, these kinds of things, trying to break the will of nation after nation, the way we *unconstitutionally* got into a war in Libya, which was a violation of our Constitution. And it's that wear-and-tear process, working on people's nerves, and trying to drive them, intimidate them and so forth.

And the problem we have here, as you see it in the election campaign: Now, Obama is not winning the election right now. I don't know what's going to happen in the future; that's a different matter. But the game is, the bluff, intimidation, bluff, threats. The murders he's perpetrated in the Middle East, daily, weekly, murders



DNC

"We're on the verge of an actual disintegration of the world economy, a chain-reaction kind of breakdown," LaRouche said. "If this policy continues, if Obama were to continue as President, I can assure you, that you would not have civilization on this planet." Here, the Narcissist-in-Chief applauds himself.

this President is doing. Without any constitutional authorization for it.

So, what you're seeing here, is you're seeing a few people, who are using the method of bluff to intimidate.

If we ever got our act together in the United States, we would have him out of there, right away. And that can be done very quickly! We have the evidence to throw him out of office. The problem is, we have a weakness on the Republican side on this thing, as well as the problems on the Democratic side.

Jones: Well, as you point out, Congressman [Walter] Jones from North Carolina has introduced legislation [HCR 107] to begin the impeachment.¹ Obama says that Congress should just sit down and shut up!

LaRouche: Well, I think the truth of the matter is, that there are some of us in the United States who are influential. As you know, there are a limited number of people who are really influential in the sense that they can push things in a direction which is, say, positive, or the other way. And it's a limited number of people. The rest of them tend to follow pressures put upon them.

And I think we're at the point that the really responsible layers in the United States, apart from the very

1. See [EIR](#), Sept. 7, 2012.

much frightened and quieted ones—remember, the poverty of our people, the suffering of our people, is beyond anything! This is worse than the last Great Depression! And our people are suffering this under this President in particular. I mean, the deliberate action by him, in cutting down the food supply in order to make more gasoline, in order to starve farmers and others to death—that’s the kind of thing you’re dealing with right now.

And if we get our act together as a nation, together with other nations who you may not like, but will cooperate with us on this, that cooperation can settle this matter. The problem is, we haven’t gotten that organized well enough together right now.

Curiosity—In Defiance of Obama

Jones: Amazing. Lyndon LaRouche is our guest, and you can also visit their website, www.larouchepac.com, or also www.larouchepub.com. Lyndon, tell us what else is going on from your contacts, that we’re not aware of, that we don’t know about, that’s happening inside of the power structure?

LaRouche: Well, just take the things that don’t get discussed, one way or the other, at least not in a significant way. Let’s take the case of Curiosity: We launched a successful flight of this instrument to Mars, and that may seem just like something very spectacular. It got a lot of support from people, a lot of sympathy. It was done in defiance of Obama. And that’s important.

Now, the issue here is this: The problems we’re talking about on politics, are not so much the real issues for the long term. The great danger that we’re facing, is the danger from rocks in space. Now, this issue’s been around for a long time. The famous Edward Teller, who’s now deceased, was a key sponsor of this effort, to deal with this problem: It is an actual, serious threat to mankind.

Now, we have, over periods of time, these giant rocks, hitting different parts of the planet, and taking out areas, such as the equivalent of entire city areas, metropolitan cities, things like that. But once in a while, in the history of mankind—not in the terms of the living history of mankind, but of the territory—you get one big rock hits the Earth, and everybody on Earth dies, or everything on Earth tends to die; it may come back later.

So we’re now in a point where the key issue before us, in terms of defense of nations, is the defense of Earth from these rocks, and the increase of the danger from

that source is notable. So therefore, we’ve got to do something about it.

And what happened was, by putting this thing on Mars, over the President’s *strongest* objections, Curiosity on Mars, we set into place an absolutely indispensable mechanism, by which, at the speed of light—which is the communication between us and Mars—we can determine things and make decisions and plan actions which will enable us, now, to realize what Edward Teller tried to deal with while he was still alive, the danger of rocks from the area of Jupiter down, and so forth...

Jones: That’s right. When they saw Schoemaker-Levy crash into one of the gas giants, and they did calculations, they know now that every few thousands years we get hit by big rocks, every hundred thousand or so, we get hit by these mega-rocks, every million or so, ones that kill most life on the planet... How would you quantify that?

LaRouche: Well, I would quantify that by the British Monarchy quantification: Reduce the human population, presently estimated in the range 7 billion persons, to 1 billion persons, in short order! And that’s the British policy; that’s the policy of Obama. He hasn’t put it in exactly those terms, but that’s what it is. What has he done? We don’t have production of food any more! We are destroying food supplies, as they’re being produced, by turning them into chemical fuels!

So we are actually in a process of a small group of people, really—it’s not a big crowd, it’s a small group of people. But our people have been so crushed, most people in the United States are crushed. Their very existence is being crushed. And since the past three administrations, the rate of destruction of our economy is horrible.

So the real issue is to get back to a real economy, which means we have to get rid of this hyperinflation, and that can be done by one law! We can get rid of the whole hyperinflation...

Jones: Bring back Glass-Steagall?

LaRouche: Yep! It’ll do it, because...

Why Are They So Evil?

Jones: Let me ask you this question, because I know you’re a historian in this area. I mean, this is a Venetian, Black Nobility, balkanization form of warfare, developed between the city-states in what is Italy today; we know that it’s exported to England, and that then becomes the model of Empire. But—give us some of the

minds of these people: why do they want to not have a space program? Why do they want to make people poor? I mean—why are they so evil?

LaRouche: Well, take the case of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire died, and all these empire systems have died. They've died out of their own self-destruction beforehand; Byzantium, the same kind of thing. The old Venetian system, again, the same thing, the Dark Ages with the old system.

Then you had a revival of the same kind of system, which came up with the Anglo-Dutch version, which was called the New Venetian Party. The New Venetian Party then established the British monarchy, and established it as an empire. So therefore, you have a history of this tradition of this kind of system, of what we call the oligarchical system, comes up, where a few people try by various means to control the planet, or large parts of it, and do a general destructive thing.

The problem has been, that despite our Constitution, and despite our intention, and the intention of some other countries to this effect, we have not been able to *secure* an actual system of government which conforms to what our intention was in creating the United States. Even the United States was unable during much of its history, to avoid being crushed and gobbled up by oligarchical influences. And that's the same thing now: You have a very small minority of the influential part of the populations of various nations, who are now raising hell, literally, against the human species. And this old thing is there, and we have somehow lost the guts to get rid of it.

Because, what you're seeing with the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, and you're seeing with similar institutions in Europe, and other parts of the world, that we do have the implicit ability to mobilize the kind of reforms which could be readily applied now, to give us a system of global nation-states, which would be—they might not all agree with each other, but we have a way of living together, as nation-states.

Jones: Can we get your take on the current state of the economy, and what's happening in Europe, and where you see all of that going?

LaRouche: We're on the verge of an actual disintegration of the world economy, a chain-reaction kind of breakdown. If this policy continues, if Obama were to continue as President, I can assure you, that you would not have civilization on this planet.

So, the Republicans aren't doing anything good.

But Obama is something, with his foreign influences, which is the greatest threat to the existence of the United States and other nations, that I know of on this planet today.

Jones: What did you make of his statement, telling entrepreneurs, and scientists, and inventors, that "you didn't build that"? I mean, that was a calculated statement: What is the point of a statement like that?

LaRouche: Well, the man lies! There's no truth in him! He's a pathological case! As a matter of fact, as I've described him, if you go back in history, he's a guy somebody picked up as a sort of a wise-guy dirty trick, as an echo of the Emperor Nero. And as you read the history, the detailed history of the Emperor Nero, and you look at the mentality of this President, you find that the two concur, they coincide.

But somebody, and some people, got the bright idea of taking this character, and by means which I wouldn't call exactly legal, got him picked as a President, and stuck him in office. And you see *what he's done*, since being in office. He's done everything, directly as imitations, to some degree of Adolf Hitler, in the sense that similar kinds of things were done, and were done by the Emperor Nero, and a few other creeps in between there!

Jones: Well, yeah! Trying to shut down most of our coal power plants, trying to pass carbon taxes, trying to end free speech, arresting journalists who talk to whistleblowers; charging whistleblowers with the Espionage Act; I had Chris Hedges, a renowned, Pulitzer Prize winning journalist, who's a very respectable, quote, "liberal," and he said Obama is *much worse* than Bush. As we just said, Bush and Obama are puppets.

But whatever oligarchy team is behind him, are raving lunatics, because there is a madness of power. . . . This is a group of lunatics!

LaRouche: Yes, a fair term!

'Go Along To Get Along'

Jones: So, what do you expect them to do, to try to hold onto power? Because you're right. It does look like a lot of the power structure is moving away from Obama. Why is that?

LaRouche: Well, essentially, they know that, but part of it is the way the control works. The control works through a few, very powerful, also financially powerful people, in various parts of the world, who are able to lure other people into going along with this kind of stuff.

For example, we don't have any industries left in the United States today; they were taken away. Taken away in the past dozen years especially. So you know, people feel powerless; many people are going to die of starvation, actually, in the United States, and for other reasons. The situation of our people is hopeless. And yet, it's very difficult to mobilize the people to defend themselves.

Jones: We've got 47 million people, roughly, on food stamps. You've got all these other economic numbers, that show we're really in a depression for four years. You've got crime exploding. But the mainstream media tries to put a cover on it, and say, "Oh we left the recession four years ago"! It's almost a Marie Antoinette "Let them eat cake," while the Obama Administration does everything it can, with Economics 101, to hurt poor people, while posing as their savior!

LaRouche: Well, the problem is, our government has failed us; our political parties have failed us: "Go along to get along!" That's their slogan, and they've been in charge for a long time. The slogan of the Senate, the slogan of the Congress, "Go along to get along!" And the rule that generally rules our Congressional system, our representative system, is that piece of cor-

ruption called "Go along to get along," which is the motto of the Congress! And as long as we allow the Congress to "go along to get along," and thus refuse to challenge their colleagues in the Congress, to cut this crap out, then we get this kind of government!

Jones: Many times, you mention Nero and others, when they have all this power, the people in control, at the very top, start almost flirting with disaster, almost tempting in their indolence, in their spoiled-rottenness. It's like a moth to flame, and they play with destruction, they flirt with it! And then bring it!

LaRouche: That's the case of history. You take what we know of human history, we know that this kind of phenomenon is the source of all corruptions. It's something which becomes a kind of a mass movement of self-corruption, and those things have happened. Whole nations, even empires, have disintegrated under that kind corruption.

We have not yet succeeded, except in a few exceptional times, especially in trying to do that with the North American development of our system. But even our system, then, became corrupted in the same way.



Unsurvivable

A dark, gruesome, but wholly true depiction of the threat of thermonuclear war, its consequences, and Obama's deployment of a major portion of the U.S. thermonuclear capabilities in multiple theaters threatening both Russia and China.

<http://larouchepac.com/unsurvivable>

The Case To Impeach Barack Obama Now

by Nancy Spannaus

Sept. 12—Barack Hussein Obama, currently holding the office of President of the United States, represents a clear and present danger to the People of the United States. His specific violations of our Constitution, in addition to his actions in furtherance of conspiracies to commit further heinous crimes, make him eligible for immediate impeachment and removal from office.

In fact, if these measures are not pursued immediately, the damage to the United States and its citizens, and humanity as a whole, could be irreparable—including through the provocation of nuclear war.

Those who argue that this President's misconduct has not risen to the Constitutional level of "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors," are either delusional, or incorrigibly corrupt. Obama's offenses have already gone far beyond those of President Richard M. Nixon, whose bills of impeachment recounted how he had "acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States."

Prestigious lawyers, including Bruce Fein and Prof. Francis Boyle, have even stepped forward to offer their services in drafting bills of impeachment against Obama.

LaRouchePAC and this magazine have repeatedly put forward an amply documented case for why Obama is eligible for removal, either by impeachment, or—should the case be made that he is too mentally ill to be responsible for his actions and intent—by application of Section 4 of the 25th Amendment to the Constitution, which would remove him from office. Over the course of the two and a half years during which we have made this argument, the list of offenses has grown even longer.

The greatest danger is, of course, that Obama will launch a new war in the Middle East, against either Syria or Iran—an action that, as shown graphically in LaRouchePAC's latest video "[Unsurvivable](#)," would lead in very short order to a confrontation with the world's two other major nuclear superpowers, Russia

and China. One Congressman, Republican Walter Jones of North Carolina, has had the nerve to raise the threat of impeaching *any* President who would take such action, in the form of House Concurrent Resolution 107. That resolution now has ten co-sponsors, including two Democrats.

HCR 107 simply reiterates the relevant section of the U.S. Constitution, which assigns the role of deciding on committing the nation to war to the Congress, *not* the Executive branch.

Recall that the purpose of impeachment is *not* to punish a public official for crimes committed, but to protect the nation, its Constitution, and its people. Yet, if offenses are wanted, Barack Obama has amply provided them. Most notable is his continuing *personal* habit of ordering what can only be called summary executions of alleged enemy combatants, and thousands of innocent civilians, through drone strikes around the world. Recently, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Extra-Judicial Killings made special note of the Obama's Administration's actions in this regard, specifically the practice of follow-up drone strikes on sites where rescue actions for drone victims are underway. Such strikes are blatant war crimes under international law.

It is a matter of utmost urgency that leading political circles, as well as the U.S. citizenry, take the necessary action to get Congress to act. Waiting until "after the election"—as occurred in the case of Richard Nixon—is potentially an act of suicide for the nation.

We hereby provide a draft outline for a formal Bill of Impeachment, which we originally published in the Nov. 7, 2011 *EIR*.¹

Count I VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION THAT CONGRESS HAS THE UNIQUE RESPONSIBILITY

1. For further elaboration of the conspiracy counts, see Nancy Spannaus, "The Case for Impeachment of President Barack Obama," *EIR*, Jan. 15, 2010.

TO DECLARE WAR, AS WELL AS OF THE 1973 WAR POWERS RESOLUTION.

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants to the Congress the power “to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.” Reports on the discussions in the Constitutional Convention reveal that the Founders were particularly concerned that the power to declare war not be lodged exclusively in the Executive, as it was in the British monarchy.

Yet, in violation of this Article, and of the procedure set up under the War Powers Resolution of 1973 for notification of the Congress, and obtaining its subsequent approval, President Obama went ahead with a war against the nation of Libya in March of 2011. While Obama notified the Congress of the action, no vote of approval was ever sought, nor obtained.

Nor did the President’s commitment of military forces in Libya ever conform to conditions set forth in the War Powers Resolution, including self-defense. In fact, the whole operation has been ultimately shown to have been a preemptive aggressive war in pursuit of regime change, which was explicitly condemned as a war crime by the post-World War II Nuremberg Tribunal.

For these high crimes and misdemeanors, and before he applies this “precedent” again, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Count II VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution declares that no person shall “be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

President Obama has flagrantly violated this provision, with the assassination of at least three American citizens, Anwar al-Awlaki, his 16-year-old son Abdul-Rahman, and Samir Khan, without benefit of due process of law. Indeed, the death warrants against these individuals were effectively signed in secret, in a committee which is overseen directly by the President.

It is highly likely that other American citizens have also been summarily executed in like fashion, through the President-sanctioned program of deploying drones against individuals alleged to be “terrorists,” who were hit while in the company of other unknown persons. At least one report has been leaked about U.S.

soldiers in Afghanistan having been killed in such a way.

For these high crimes and misdemeanors, and before more such extrajudicial executions take place, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Count III VIOLATION OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

The Fourth Amendment declares that the “right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

President Obama has violated this provision of the Constitution by continuing, and even expanding, the Bush/Cheney Administration’s program of warrantless interception by the National Security Agency of the electronic communications of millions of Americans.

For this high crime and misdemeanor, Barack Obama should be impeached.

Count IV CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY.

In 1946, the United States subscribed to the definition of Crimes Against Humanity utilized by the Nuremberg Military Tribunal, which read as follows:

“...murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population . . . whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.” This standard was applied to medical care, with the inclusion of “systematic under-nutrition” and “inadequate provision of surgical and medical services.”

President Obama, through his promotion of a health-care “reform” which explicitly calls for cutting the cost of medical care, by either denying services, pricing them in such a way as to reduce their usage, or penalizing “overutilization,” has conspired to carry out mass murder through the denial of medical care to those considered to have “lives not worthy to be lived.” The standard of “knew or should have known,” also coined in the trials of the Nuremberg Tribunal, applies strictly in this case.

In addition to denying care, through non-payment, for certain categories of the population—especially the elderly and poor who are enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid—Obamacare is reducing reimbursements to medical and surgical facilities, as well as to physicians, with the predictable result of denying medical services to a population in need.

For his actions to commit these crimes against humanity, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Count V

CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE THE SEPARATION OF POWERS PROVISION OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION.

Title I, Section 7 of the Constitution mandates that “all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.” Section 8 declares that the Congress “shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

Despite this mandate, President Obama has taken the powers of the Hitlerian “Unitary Executive,” to preempt the powers of the Congress in economic policy, on behalf of imposing fascist austerity measures. The most recent and flagrant example is the so-called Budget Control Act, which sets up a Super-Congress to usurp the powers of the House of Representatives over economic policy, even denying Congress the ability to amend decisions made by a committee of 12 (along with President Obama).

The establishment of the Super-Congress follows the same pattern of usurpation that President Obama pioneered with his proposal for an Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) to dictate the terms for what medical procedures are to be covered, and what they should cost. In the name of “removing decisions from politics,” President Obama would prevent Congress from defending the general welfare, and implement policies like those carried out by Adolf Hitler’s “non-political” panel of experts at Tiergarten-4, the center of the 1939-41 Nazi euthanasia program that resulted in the mass death of the disabled and elderly.

For this high crime, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Count VI

CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT THE UNITED STATES TO AN INTERNATIONAL GENOCIDE POLICY.

Under the principles developed by the U.S.-initiated and -supported Nuremberg Military Tribunal after World War II, genocide was determined to be a crime against humanity. Among the measures determined to lead to genocide was *population* reduction, no matter under what pretext and criteria it was carried out.

President Obama, by wholeheartedly embracing the Green genocide agenda of low-technology and depopulation which was promoted by the British monarchy at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Summit, has conspired with that monarchy and its agents to carry out genocide against large sections of the world’s population. He has simultaneously acted to sabotage the life-saving scientific capacities of the United States, including by cancelling the manned space program, and refusing to fund life-saving satellite remote-sensing programs required in today’s intensified extreme weather events—actions which will inevitably lead to accelerated death rates among the world’s population, within the United States and out.

For this high crime, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Count VII

CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Article III, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution defines treason against the United States as “only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.” President Obama meets that standard, by acting to cede U.S. sovereign powers to institutions loyal to the British Empire, and supranational institutions such as the International Monetary Fund.

As early as April 2009, Obama agreed to IMF demands to expand Special Drawing Rights (SDRs), as a means of strengthening the IMF, and, de facto, weakening the U.S. dollar. Obama has also continued the Bush Administration’s massive looting of taxpayer dollars to be sent into the bottomless pit of the international financial institutions, including, but not limited to the Royal Bank of Scotland, and other Inter-Alpha banks, thus indebting U.S. citizens in support of institutions dedicated to destroying the Constitution of the United States.

For this high crime, bordering on treason, Barack Obama must be impeached.

Israel Trigger Set for World War III

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Sept. 12—President Obama’s abrupt cancellation yesterday of a scheduled meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu later this month in New York City has raised alarm bells that the President has given Israel a de facto green light to launch a preventive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities—a strike that Lyndon LaRouche has warned can trigger thermonuclear World War III.

After week of back-channel negotiations between Washington and Tel Aviv, over Israeli demands for a firm “red line” for a U.S. attack on Iran, should the ongoing P5+1 negotiations fail, the White House suddenly announced yesterday that the President did not have time to meet with Netanyahu on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly session later this month. It had been reported by U.S. and Israeli sources that the two men would be meeting in New York on Sept. 27 to finalize an agreement under which Israel would agree to hold off on a long-threatened attack on Iran, in return for assurances from Obama that, if re-elected, he would take any steps necessary to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

The back-and-forth between Israel and the United States over the timing of military action against Iran came at a point when several other dramatic developments have occurred in the extended Southwest Asia and North Africa region, affecting war and peace:

- Video footage has been circulated internationally over the past 48 hours, showing a brutal mass execution

of Syrian Army soldiers by opposition fighters. The gruesome footage of soldiers, their hands tied behind their backs, slaughtered, and dumped into mass graves, has prompted United Nations human rights officials to warn that the anti-Assad opposition could be facing war-crimes prosecutions for these actions.

These reports are particularly embarrassing to President Obama, following statements by Russian President Vladimir Putin at the recent APEC summit in Vladivostok, Russia, accusing the United States of once again jumping in bed with al-Qaeda and other jihadi terrorist networks, to overthrow Assad. The fact that the damning video footage circulated internationally on the 11th anniversary of the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks served to further underscore the nature of Washington’s continuing willingness to boost radical Sunni Islamist groups to bring down any regime that appears on the Obama-London hit list.

- In purported response to reports of a film made in the U.S., slandering the Prophet Mohammed, angry mobs attacked the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt and the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya on Sept. 11. The U.S. ambassador to Libya was killed in the Benghazi incident, along with three other American diplomats. A new neo-Salafi group, Ansar al-Sharia, has been identified by Libyan sources as behind the killings.

Incredibly, there were no U.S. Marine guards posted at the Benghazi consulate, and Libyan sources confirmed that the Ansar al-Sharia group had penetrated



wordpress.com

Angry mobs attacked the U.S. embassy in Cairo, and the consulate in Benghazi, killing the U.S. ambassador to Libya. Shown: protestors outside the Cairo embassy Sept. 11.

the Benghazi Public Safety Commission, and had inside information on the whereabouts of the U.S. ambassador. The failure to provide American security at the consulate was a particularly egregious mistake, given that the U.S. State Department has issued a recent travel warning against Americans going to Libya. Clearly, there were warning signs of an incident.

Israeli Trigger for World War

Last week, Adm. James A. Winnefeld, Jr., the vice chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, spent five days in Israel, reinforcing the message delivered earlier by JCS Chairman Gen. Martin Dempsey: Under no circumstances does the U.S. military support any Israeli attack on Iran. Dempsey's message, delivered repeatedly in recent visits to Israel, and again during an early September visit to London, was the clearest and strongest U.S. threat to Israel to date, not to conduct preventive attacks on Iran.

Dempsey is, according to senior U.S. intelligence sources, aware that any such attack by Israel on Iran—and any U.S. escalation toward direct military involvement against the Assad government in Syria—could trigger a global conflict leading to thermonuclear war. For Dempsey and his Pentagon colleagues, there is no conceivable justification for risking thermonuclear war. In his public remarks in London early this month, Dempsey declared that he does not even want to be informed of a looming Israeli attack on Iran, because he does not want the U.S. to be “complicit” in any such action.

Dempsey's words were intended to deliver a clear

message to President Obama, to the Iranian leadership, and to his Russian counterparts, that the United States appreciates the grave threat of thermonuclear war, and wants no part of it.

Upon his return from London, Dempsey was, according to the U.S. intelligence sources, “scolded” by White House officials for jeopardizing Obama's re-election by using such harsh words to push back against Israeli threats to launch preventive war against Iran.

In addition to his concerns about an Iran attack triggering an out-of-control global conflict, Dempsey is also committed to protecting American forces in the Persian Gulf and Af-

ghanistan, during a most vulnerable time. As U.S. forces draw down in Afghanistan over the next two years, those troops will be more vulnerable to attack as force protection is diminished.

Obama Complicit

For his part, despite widespread media reports to the contrary, President Obama is fully prepared to let Israel launch a strike against Iran. It has been widely reported in the Israeli media that all the President had to do was publicly and forcefully warn Netanyahu not to act alone, and Israel would have had no choice but to abandon plans for a preventive strike. Instead of taking such action, the President's silence has been treated as a “green light” from Washington—regardless of what General Dempsey and other top American military officials have said.

Now, with the abrupt cancellation of the Obama-Netanyahu meeting in New York, the stage may be set for the trigger incident for World War III.

It is for this reason that LaRouche has forcefully demanded President Obama's immediate removal from office for “high crimes and misdemeanors,” including his illegal regime-change war in Libya, culminating in the brutal execution of a captured Muammar Qaddafi. Since Qaddafi's execution in October 2011, the world has been headed in the direction of nuclear Armageddon. Until now, the strong war-avoidance measures by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Russian and Chinese governments, has fended off the larger war. We are now reaching a tipping point.

Russia and China Rebuke Obama

At last week's APEC summit meeting in Vladivostok, top officials from Russia and China made clear that they are prepared to take any measures necessary to block the Obama Administration from proceeding with illegal regime-change operations in Syria and Iran. In Obama's absence, having announced months ago that he would not be attending the APEC summit, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton bore the brunt of Russian and Chinese warnings about the consequences of U.S. military action against Syria or Iran. The Secretary had one-on-one meetings with both Foreign Minister Lavrov and President Putin, and both men used the occasion to sharply warn of the consequences of a replay of Libya in either Syria or Iran.

Clinton had come to Vladivostok following a visit to Beijing, where she was similarly rebuffed by China's Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi, who broke all diplomatic protocol by using the occasion of a joint press conference with Clinton to scold the U.S. for its destabilizing operations against the sovereign government of Syria.

Russia and China have each also announced significant changes in their nuclear war-fighting posture, with Russia putting between \$75-120 billion over the next decade into modernization of its strategic nuclear arsenal. On the eve of the APEC meeting, the Russian military conducted maneuvers—aimed at preventing a regional war from turning into a global strategic conflict—precisely what the British and Obama policies are heading towards.

The al-Qaeda Angle

While Iran currently looms as the major trigger for nuclear power confrontation in the near term, the Syria trigger-point should not be overlooked. The British-controlled Obama Administration, with its British, French, Saudi, and other allies, is currently supporting an insurgency, increasingly dominated by the same al-Qaeda forces which carried out the 9/11 attacks, and are now causing chaos in Libya.

The Benghazi assassination should bring this point home. During the drive to remove Qaddafi, in the Spring and Summer of 2011, U.S. military professionals—including then-Secretary of Defense Bob Gates, and current Virginia Sen. James Webb—warned repeatedly that the U.S. should not commit itself to siding with rebels whose pedigree was uncertain at best. In fact, as documents made available by Wikileaks and other anonymous intelligence sources made clear, the Libyan opposition was riddled with al-Qaeda opera-

tives, particularly in the Benghazi area. Did the U.S. really want to support an anti-Qaddafi force made up of the perpetrators of 9/11?

Indeed, the Obama Administration did. The fact that Obama decided to go ahead with regime-change in Libya, despite these warnings, was a not-insignificant factor in the early retirement of Gates, who had originally said he was leaving the Administration by the end of 2011. In fact, he announced an early departure in the Spring, and left as of July 1—two weeks to the day before the Obama Administration recognized the rebel force as a government-in-the-wings.

As anticipated, the al-Qaeda-terrorist wing of the incoming Libya regime not only has contributed to the virtual anarchy in that country, but has also served as a base for spreading terrorist activity through other sections of Africa, and into Syria, where Libyan “fighters” are a common sight.

But whereas al-Qaeda—a joint intelligence project of the British and the Saudis—can make a murderous mess in Libya, it can create a civil war situation in the much larger, more strategically located Syria, which will draw the world toward the edge of World War III.

A Strategic Defense of Humanity



Were the United States to eject Obama, and reciprocate Russia's offer for an SDE (Strategic Defense of Earth), we would not only avert the danger of thermonuclear war in the short term, but we would eliminate the reason for humanity to ever go to war again. Peace, is not the negation of conflict; it's an active commitment among all peoples to “the common aims of mankind.”

An LPAC video presented by Natalie Lovegren (12 minutes).

<http://www.larouchepac.com/node/20616>

Message to Germany: No to Nuclear War and Eurozone Hyperinflation!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Sept. 7—Germany’s existence is currently threatened by two existential dangers. First, should it come to an Israeli military strike in September/October—an acute possibility, over which there is a fierce battle, both openly and behind the scenes—it threatens World War III, with the deployment of thermonuclear weapons resulting in the annihilation of human species. Second, the ECB’s decision, under the leadership of Goldman Sachs banker Mario Draghi, to pursue “unlimited” government bond buying, would portend—unless Karlsruhe stops this at the last moment¹—an imminent hyperinflation, as in 1923. Only this time, it would not just be in one nation, but across the trans-Atlantic region, and would cause a plunge into social chaos.

A Question of Survival

For Germany, just as in all other states, there will be no escape from these existential threats, as long as we remain in the political geometry determined by NATO, the EU, and the IMF.

The only chance for survival lies in overcoming the systemic global financial crisis, and in the creation of a world order for peace, that renounces war as a means of conflict resolution forever; that is founded on the development of all nations on this planet; and that is committed to the achievement of the common goals of humanity.

The drama of the situation becomes clear in the message that the U.S. chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey brought to interviews and personal meetings in London—in open defiance of the policy of London and the Obama Administration—that the U.S. will not support a military strike by Israel

against Iran. According to media and source reports, Dempsey’s communiqué to the Iranian government about the U.S. position included a request that, in the event of an Iranian retaliation against Israel, that Tehran omit U.S. and allied targets. An outcry against Dempsey in the British-controlled media was the result.

Both Russian President Vladimir Putin and Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov warned, in a most forceful way, that an attack on Iran would be a disaster far beyond the region. How this disaster would look is described in 36-minute LaRouchePAC video titled [“Unsurvivable,”] [<http://larouchepac.com/unsurvivable>] which is now circulating among the institutions in many countries, and may be seen on numerous websites. The video, which is based on the results of numerous scientific studies, describes vividly why the majority of humanity would be wiped out within half an hour by the use of only a fraction of the existing thermonuclear weapons, and the rest of mankind would wretchedly perish in the nuclear winter that would follow.

Sources in the United States and Europe report that the distribution of this video is seen as complementary to the efforts of the American and Russian militaries aimed at preventing the outbreak of a war in the Middle East, which, according to the assessments of all military experts, would result in World War III. Since the first test of a thermonuclear bomb, it has been clear to military men and scientists that the deployment of this weapon would result in the extinction of the human race; this is the meaning behind the term “Mutual Assured Destruction” (MAD), which is still the official doctrine of NATO.

A Thermonuclear Chicken Game

This is also the reason why American, Russian, and other military leaders strive with full commitment

1. The Constitutional Court at Karlsruhe is to rule on Sept. 12, on the injunctions to prevent German contributions to the ESM, pending the ruling on the constitutionality of the Fiscal Pact and the ESM, i.e., the bailout fund.



RegierungOnline/Kugler

*In March of 2008, Chancellor Merkel, addressing the Israeli Knesset, declared that Israel's security is a *raison d'état* for Germany; but Premier Netanyahu's threats of military action against Iran could make Germany complicit in triggering World War III. The two are shown here in Jerusalem in January 2011.*

toward a strategy of war-avoidance, while the political leadership of, especially the United States, Britain, and France, among other nations, play the thermonuclear “chicken game,” and argue for “red lines” for Iran, and purported runaway WMD in Syria (*déjà vu* in Iraq!), which is why selective no-fly zones, humanitarian corridors, and the arming of the rebels are put into play.

President Putin condemned as extremely dangerous and short-sighted the Western policy of collaboration with al-Qaeda fighters in Syria to topple the government of President Assad, and said polemically that then one could also, with the same logic, release all prisoners from Guantanamo, and arm and deploy them into Syria, because they are exactly the same groupings.

The fact of the matter is that the world may be only days or weeks away from thermonuclear annihilation. And Germany is basically in the same position as it was at the time of the Cold War and the opposing military blocs: Our territory is one of the main targets, partly because of the NATO plans to leave 20 B-61 nuclear bombs stationed at the Büchel Air Base in Rhineland Palatinate—a clear rejection of the goal of the Free Democratic Party (FDP) to remove these weapons from German territory—and also a measure

clearly directed against Russia.

In this regard, we must remember the Knesset speech by Chancellor Angela Merkel in 2008, according to which, Israel's security is a *raison d'état* for Germany, a declaration that urgently requires a public debate in light of the Netanyahu government's aggressive plans. Also relevant to the debate about Germany as a target, is that the headquarters for the U.S. missile defense system for Poland and the Czech Republic, described by Russian Chief of Staff Makarov as grounds for the deployment of nuclear weapons in Europe, is located at Ramstein.

We need to distance ourselves clearly from a policy that will lead to the extinction of the entire human civilization! That is, the federal government must stop supporting the

policy of regime-change in Syria and Iran, and must make it clear in practice, that Germany will not participate in any way in a war that is directed in reality against Russia and China, whether in the form of over-flight rights, sanctions, or reconnaissance.

Out of the Euro!

The scandalous decision of the ECB and Goldman Sachs banker and ECB chief Draghi, announced Sept. 6, to buy “unlimited” government bonds of the crisis countries, which would then have to comply with the most brutal conditionalities, driving these countries economically and socially to suicide, is the last straw. This is a policy of hyperinflation in favor of gamblers, and at the expense of the population, which would, in a very short time, be deprived of their life savings, and it can lead only to a terrible social breakdown. This decision of the ECB breached its own charter (which commits it to maintain monetary stability), the EU treaties and the German constitution. It fundamentally violates German interests and the common good.

Given this overall situation, Germany must exit the Eurozone, as it is entitled to do under international law. We must demand the following package:

1. Immediate adoption of a two-tier banking system

2. Termination of the EU treaties from Maastricht to Lisbon
3. The regaining of sovereignty over our own monetary and economic policy
4. Introduction of fixed exchange rates
5. Introduction of a credit system in the tradition of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (Reconstruction Finance Corporation) after 1945
6. Realization of the development program for Southern Europe, the Mediterranean, and Africa, as proposed by the BüSo (<http://www.bueso.de/wirtschaftswunder>).

Most of all, we must liberate our citizens from the slave mentality which is manifested in the oft-quoted phrase, "One can do nothing, anyway!" For this statement is an admission that we are living under the Brussels dictatorship, in an oligarchic system in which the individual has no rights.

The total erosion of democracy and fundamental rights since the Maastricht Treaty and the adoption of the euro is outrageous. Step by step, the members of the Bundestag have given more and more sovereignty to

the supranational dictatorship; and there can be no more talk of any participation of citizens in a representative system. Without public debate, deceived by the government and manipulated by corporate media, a regime-change has taken place, away from an already scarcely democratic parliamentary party system, to a looming financial dictatorship by the ESM and a feudal Brussels bureaucracy, whose decrees are enforced by the party whip at the national level, bypassing legitimate institutions.

There is an alternative! The BüSo has submitted a program for Europe, as part of the expansion of the World Land-Bridge, which can offer the basis for a peaceful order for the 21st Century.

We need to stop trying to solve conflicts through war, and instead we must engage with the Russian initiative for the Strategic Defense of the Earth (SDE), to protect the Earth against missile attacks and threats from outer space, such as asteroids, etc. If we are to survive as a species, we need to finally grow up as mankind and dedicate ourselves to the common aims of mankind.

Seven Necessary Steps for Global Economic Recovery

A 40-minute feature video presenting Lyndon LaRouche's Emergency Program to End the Global Depression

<http://larouchepac.com/node/19282>



5. IMMEDIATE NATIONAL MOBILIZATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NAWAPA PROJECT



6. ENGAGE LATENT LABOR FORCE FOR SUBSIDIARY PROJECTS SUCH AS TRANSPORT AND NUCLEAR



7. EXTEND COOPERATION INTERNATIONALLY TO MEXICO, CANADA, RUSSIA, CHINA AND OTHERS



1. FORCED RESIGNATION OF BARACK OBAMA & IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF GLASS-STEAGALL



3. FOR LACK OF REAL ASSETS REMAINING, ISSUE HAMILTONIAN CREDIT FOR NATIONAL PROJECTS



2. DIVISION OF FICTITIOUS FROM REAL LIABILITIES ACCORDING TO GLASS-STEAGALL STANDARD



4. THE ONLY BAILOUTS WILL BE HONEST BAILOUTS FOR THE BANKRUPT CITIES AND THE STATES

Archbishop Tutu Opens Gate for Prosecuting War Criminal Blair

by EIR Staff

Sept. 12—At the end of August, former Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa, created a major international incident by refusing to appear on a speakers' platform with former British Prime Minister, and war criminal, Tony Blair—the man whom the British oligarchy has tasked as a major controller of President Barack Obama. Tutu's public declaration of why Blair's actions vis-à-vis the 2003 invasion of Iraq were "morally indefensible," were then amplified in a Sept. 2 opinion column in the London *Observer*.

Not surprisingly, the U.S. media has given virtually no coverage to this public indictment of the still active and ambitious Blair, or Tutu's simultaneous attack on former President George W. Bush for the same war crime. But the action of the renowned peace activist has reverberated within Great Britain, leading to expanded attacks on Blair in the media, and some hopeful commentary that the Archbishop's attack may be the first step in a long-overdue War Crimes Tribunal for the perpetrators of aggressive war.

Tutu Withdraws

Tutu's announcement that he was withdrawing from the Aug. 30 Discovery Life and Discovery Invest Marketing conference in Johannesburg, an international event bringing together "leaders" from all over the world, came on Aug. 28. In his letter, the former Anglican Archbishop, who received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 for his campaigning against apartheid in South Africa, said that he had withdrawn from the event because he "is of the view that Mr. Blair's decision to support the United States military invasion of Iraq, on the basis of unproven allegations of the existence in Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, was morally indefensible."



Tony Blair's "decision to support the United States military invasion of Iraq, on the basis of unproven allegations of the existence in Iraq of weapons of mass destruction, was morally indefensible," stated Archbishop Tutu.

Tutu's office added: "The Discovery Invest Summit has leadership as its theme. Morality and leadership are indivisible. In this context, it would be inappropriate for the Archbishop to share a platform with Mr. Blair."

Blair responded with a defense of his morally indefensible action, and implicitly added a threat to commit the crime again, this time against Syria and Iran. "We are faced with the same types of decisions now with Syria. Do we intervene or not intervene? With Iran, do we allow them to get nuclear capability? Are we prepared to intervene and stop them?"

Simultaneous with the Archbishop's action, a number of South African organizations announced that they wanted to arrest Blair for war crimes when he arrived in South Africa. Mustafa Darsot, a member of the South African Muslim Network executive committee,

told the *Mail & Guardian* newspaper that, “Mr. Blair is complicit in the murder of thousands of people in Iraq and should be tried for war crimes.”

Why Should Blair Be Tried?

Archbishop Tutu amplified his own reasons for spurning Blair, in a Sept. 2 London *Observer* column. We quote:

“The immorality of the United States and Great Britain’s decision to invade Iraq in 2003, premised on the lie that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, has destabilised and polarised the world to a greater extent than any other conflict in history.

“Instead of recognising that the world we lived in, with increasingly sophisticated communications, transportation and weapons systems necessitated sophisticated leadership that would bring the global family together, the then-leaders of the US and UK fabricated the grounds to behave like playground bullies and drive us further apart. They have driven us to the edge of a precipice where we now stand with the spectre of Syria and Iran before us.

“If leaders may lie, then who should tell the truth? Days before George W Bush and Tony Blair ordered the invasion of Iraq, I called the White House and spoke to Condoleezza Rice, who was then national security adviser, to urge that United Nations weapons inspectors be given more time to confirm or deny the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Should they be able to confirm finding such weapons, I argued, dismantling the threat would have the support of virtually the entire world. Ms Rice demurred, saying there was too much risk and the president would not postpone any longer.

“On what grounds do we decide that Robert Mugabe should go the International Criminal Court, Tony Blair should join the international speakers’ circuit, bin Laden should be assassinated, but Iraq should be invaded, not because it possesses weapons of mass destruction, as Mr Bush’s chief supporter, Mr Blair, confessed last week, but in order to get rid of Saddam Hussein?

“The cost of the decision to rid Iraq of its by-all-accounts despotic and murderous leader has been staggering, beginning in Iraq itself. Last year, an average of 6.5 people died there each day in suicide attacks and vehicle bombs, according to the Iraqi Body Count project. More than 110,000 Iraqis have died in the conflict since 2003 and millions have been displaced. By the end of

last year, nearly 4,500 American soldiers had been killed and more than 32,000 wounded.

“On these grounds alone, in a consistent world, those responsible for this suffering and loss of life should be treading the same path as some of their African and Asian peers who have been made to answer for their actions in the Hague.

“But even greater costs have been exacted beyond the killing fields, in the hardened hearts and minds of members of the human family across the world.

“Has the potential for terrorist attacks decreased? To what extent have we succeeded in bringing the so-called Muslim and Judeo-Christian worlds closer together, in sowing the seeds of understanding and hope?

“Leadership and morality are indivisible. Good leaders are the custodians of morality. The question is not whether Saddam Hussein was good or bad or how many of his people he massacred. The point is that Mr Bush and Mr Blair should not have allowed themselves to stoop to his immoral level.

“If it is acceptable for leaders to take drastic action on the basis of a lie, without an acknowledgement or an apology when they are found out, what should we teach our children?

“My appeal to Mr Blair is not to talk about leadership, but to demonstrate it. You are a member of our family, God’s family. You are made for goodness, for honesty, for morality, for love; so are our brothers and sisters in Iraq, in the US, in Syria, in Israel and Iran. . . .”

The Next Step

Protesters staged a demonstration outside the Convention Center, to support a warrant of arrest to charge Blair for crimes against humanity relating to the invasion of Iraq.

“It is hoped that one or more demonstrators will be able to make a citizen’s arrest on the day and put Tony Blair in jail and extradite him to the Hague for trial,” said Ganief Hendricks, leader of the Muslim political party Al Jama-ah, one of the organizers of the protest.

An arrest warrant was sought against Blair by the Society for the Protection of Our Constitution (SPOC). “We filed a complaint with the SA [South African] Police Service yesterday and a ‘crimes against the state’ docket was opened,” Muhammed Vawda, secretary of SPOC, said Aug. 30.

Security was tight, so no warrant could be served against this war criminal that day.

There Is Still Time To Find a Peaceful Solution to the Syria Crisis

Mohammad Mahfoud, an independent Syrian activist and president of the Danish-Syrian Friendship Society, was interviewed by Tom Gillesberg, chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark on Sept. 3.

Tom Gillesberg: Mohammad Mahfoud, you are the chairman of the Danish-Syrian Friendship Society, but you are also very well-connected, through family and many other things, to many different places in Syria, and follow very closely what is going on there, on a day-to-day basis. So first I would like you to say something about what the situation there is presently, because the media coverage here is very colored by the fact that many countries in Western Europe and the United States are almost at war [with Syria], and therefore do not really cover what is happening on the ground, and instead, is running a disinformation war.

Mohammad Mahfoud: Yes. Our information—the more correct information about Syria—we get from our families and our friends in Syria. They live all the way from the South to the North. We have a lot of members in our organization, who are calling their families and their friends in Syria almost every day. Of course there is something happening in Syria, but not everywhere. The biggest problems are now in some parts of Aleppo.

Gillesberg: In terms of military fighting?

Mahfoud: Yes, military fighting. Aleppo is a very big city. There are about 2-3 million inhabitants. There is fighting in

maybe two or three places, especially in the center of Aleppo, which has very small streets, and many more inhabitants. And of course, it is a very big problem for the military to fight in such places, because it causes a lot of damage for the civilians. The army and the government are very aware of that, and try not to damage the civilians, because as is known, Aleppo is a town which is supporting the President of Syria and the government in Syria. And that's why those we call "the rebels" are using the civilians as a shelter in Aleppo.

And we have, of course, some very small places like Latakia, close to the border with Turkey. Sometimes, there is fighting between the military and what you call the "Free Syrian Army." There are some problems around the border with Iraq. But generally, the situation in Syria is much better than it was before, even if you don't hear this from the media.

Gillesberg: So, basically, the military fighting is actually not all over Syria, but is in very few places, where



Mohammad Mahfoud (left), interviewed by Tom Gillesberg of the Schiller Institute in Denmark.

Schiller Institute in Denmark

you could say that the rebels use the civilian population as hostages?

Mahfoud: Yes, because what you call the “opposition” is fighting a guerilla war. They are not everywhere, but you never know when they will attack, when they will shoot, and they don’t care. They shoot at people, at civilians, or at military forces. They only have to shoot at someone to make trouble, to create damage to the civilians and to the government.

Sanctions Are Hurting the People, Not the Government

Gillesberg: When we spoke earlier, you said that right now it’s actually not the military fighting that’s the biggest problem for Syria, especially for the population, but the sanctions that have been imposed on Syria. Could you explain that for us?

Mahfoud: Yes, when we talk to our families and our friends in Syria, the biggest problem for them right now is that everything has become very, very expensive to buy. For some things you have to pay five or six times the price as before. They need medicine in the hospitals, they need food, fuels. There is a shortage of some foods and fuel and the things people need for everyday life.

And even those of us who live in Denmark or in Germany and other places outside of Syria, we have problems; for instance, to send money to our families in Syria. If I want to send a little bit of money to my family to help them, I can’t. If I have to travel to Syria, to visit my family, I can’t. Because we can’t fly from Copenhagen; we can’t fly from England, from France. There are many places from which you can’t travel to Syria right now.

And of course, those sanctions are not hurting the government. I believe that the government was prepared for those sanctions, and they have what they need; but the people in Syria—the poor, the ordinary people—they pay for those sanctions. And I believe that if the situation stays as it is now, then, in maybe half a year, we are going to have serious problems in Syria because of these sanctions, affecting the ordinary people, not the government.

We know from the Iraq War, that the sanctions through 12 years didn’t affect Saddam Hussein or the



VOA

Some Syrian refugees are invited into Turkey, Jordan, or Lebanon, to play the “refugee card” against President Assad, charged Mahfoud. Shown: a Syrian refugee center on the Turkish border, August 2012.

government, but it was the ordinary people, the Iraqis, who paid a very high price for those sanctions.

Gillesberg: In the media, or from the governments of the West, it has often been said that we will not go to war—at least not right now. Instead, we will choose something peaceful, sanctions, in order to get a change. What you are saying is that in reality those peaceful means are actually a war—but a war directed against the population?

Mahfoud: I believe that if you ask a Syrian, they would prefer that the West was attacking Syria militarily, because they would then maybe kill 20,000, 40,000, or 100,000, but those sanctions are killing 24 million. I don’t believe that the Western countries are punishing the government; I believe that it’s a punishment for the Syrians because they are supporting their President. They want to make them suffer, to get hungry, and then they will agree to the West removing Bashar al-Assad. As long as they support Bashar al-Assad, I believe that the Western countries will keep those sanctions against Syria.

Gillesberg: To collectively punish the population for not making an uproar against their government.

Mahfoud: Exactly.

Refugees: The Propaganda War

Gillesberg: Something similar seems to be the case with regard to refugees. With all this fighting that has been going on, there are a lot of refugees in Syria, not only Syrians [displaced by the war], but also because Syria historically has been one of the places that has

been receiving lots and lots of refugees from many other countries in the region. So a lot of these people are now in trouble. What is the situation? I know there are a lot of refugees internally in Syria that are running away from fighting, but there has also been this buildup of refugee camps in Turkey. Could you say something about that?

Mahfoud: Yes. The real refugees are inside Syria. We have, for example, people in some cities that are receiving refugees from other cities. Their families, their friends—and they are helping each other. Some of the refugees who, for example, go to Turkey, to Jordan or Lebanon, were invited to go there, to use the refugee card against the President, Bashar Al-Assad. Turkey wants to show the world that they have problems with refugees, and something has to be done: Establishing what they call a “no-fly zone.”

They are using the refugees as in propaganda war against the government of Syria. We saw refugees inside Turkey that were fighting to get back to Syria, but the Turks said no. The Turks said, “No, we cannot guarantee your safety in Syria.” They are prisoners now in Turkey.

Gillesberg: They are not allowed to go back home?

Mahfoud: They are not allowed to back to Syria; even if most of them would prefer to go back to Syria, and the government of Syria is willing to help them and hopes that the refugees will come back home to Syria. They know that all the Western countries and the entire world is watching those refugees in Turkey and in Jordan. I believe that the government will do everything to get those refugees back to Syria.

Gillesberg: There have been stories—we know that there are these refugee camps in Turkey, but nobody really knows what is going on there, because they have been cut off. The media, but also politicians, the Red Cross, and other organizations, have not been allowed to come in and check what is going on.

Mahfoud: Yes, we heard from Turkish newspapers that they were talking about almost 400 girls from Syria that were raped in those camps. We saw in a newspaper from Saudi Arabia, that some Saudi Arabians are buying small daughters from the camp in Turkey, and the price was between \$500 and \$800, or something like that. And we believe that the Syrian refugees in Turkey are treated very very badly. They are being kept as prisoners in Turkey.

And the same situation exists in Jordan. We saw that two weeks ago, there was a fight in the refugee

camp in Jordan, and it was the police and security forces from Jordan who were fighting against the refugees. They were very badly treated in Jordan, and most of them would prefer to go back inside Syria again.

Gillesberg: Because a lot of them have also been tricked. They have been promised that if they left, they would get maybe money, or they would be allowed to immigrate to western European countries, the United States.

Mahfoud: And some of them were forced to flee from Syria. Some of them were told, “If you don’t leave the country, we will burn your houses and kill your families,” and so on. There are a lot of things that have forced these people to take refuge in Turkey or Jordan.

The Truth About the Massacres

Gillesberg: The Western media has taken organizations like the Syrian Human Rights Observatory [HRO] in London at their word, and simply blamed all the massacres we have seen in Syria over the past 18 months, on the government. What do you know of the reality on the ground? Because I know even there was, a week ago, a new massacre, right?

Mahfoud: Yes. Most members of this organization are from the Muslim Brotherhood, and they are from the opposition. How can you get the truth from the opposition? We never hear about people who are maybe supporting the government, what their opinion is about the situation in Syria. We always get the news and the information from the opposition from the Syrian HRO, and most of its members are from the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria, which is fighting against the government.

Gillesberg: With weapons?

Mahfoud: Yes, with weapons. And that’s why we don’t believe in these human rights activities, and everything from London.

Gillesberg: But what can you say then about these massacres?

Mahfoud: Yes, massacres have happened in Syria. But most of them are committed by what you call the Free Syrian Army. And they blame the government and the Syrian Army for doing that. Many supporters of the President and of the government were killed in those massacres. How could the military and the Syrian Army kill their own people and their own supporters?

Gillesberg: So most of the massacres were actually



UN/David Manyua

Some people were forced to leave Syria, because they were threatened by the Free Syrian Army, Mahfoud explained. "They say, 'If you don't leave Syria, we have to kill your family, or burn your house.'" Shown: shelling of Homs, June 2012.

massacres of people that were supporting the government?

Mahfoud: Yes, most of them, from all of the religions. It is not a problem between Shi'a Muslim and Sunni Muslim. They are killing everyone who is not supporting the rebels.

Gillesberg: There has also been a lot of talk in the media, that now you see all these defections—military leaders defecting; the prime minister defected a month ago; diplomats defecting. So, is this a pattern, that most people now are trying to flee from Assad, because they know that he is going to be overthrown soon? Or is it actually the case, that most of the government and the military is actually standing together to defend Syria, and these defections more are a product of bribes and blackmail and situations like that?

Mahfoud: Yes, but basically all, even the Americans and the opposition from Syria were disappointed that only a few persons left Syria after one and a half years of this problem. The truth is that very very few persons have left Syria. And we know that those people are leaving Syria for money. We know that Qatar is inviting all the officers or people who are working in the government; that huge sums of money [are involved];

that some people are trying to get money from this situation right now.

Or some people maybe were forced to leave Syria, because we know the Free Syrian Army is treating people. They come with some information to some person, and they say, "If you don't leave Syria, we have to kill your family, or burn your house."

So, some people do it for money; others are maybe forced to leave. But the truth is, that very very few persons have left Syria after one and a half years.

The True Opposition

Gillesberg: Prior to this eruption of foreign-funded and armed violence in Syria, during the last year and a half, there was actually an opposition

within Syria, which was demanding reforms from the Assad government, with peaceful means, and they participated in the recent elections and have been pressing for dialogue. Has that voice been totally stifled, or is it still there?

Mahfoud: Well, as you mention, there is some opposition in Syria. We have to differentiate, what we call opposition in Syria. We have the honest opposition in Syria, who live in Syria right now. And they are demanding some reforms from the government and from the President. And the President and the government in Syria have agreed. And we get a new parliamentary election in Syria. And we have two ministers from the opposition right now in the government in Syria.

And this kind of opposition in Syria, they don't recognize the opposition that is living in Istanbul, in Turkey. They disagree on how they will treat the situation in Syria.

Yes, there are still some people that want a peaceful solution for the conflict in Syria. But we in Syria believe that it is not the opposition which is deciding whether they want to go to discuss with the government or to keep fighting. We believe that Turkey and Qatar and Saudi Arabia, and of course, the United States—they are refusing, they are pushing those

people to not agree to discuss or to have a peaceful solution in Syria.

I don't believe that even the rebels in Syria benefit somehow from this situation. They are destroying Syria!

But I believe that they don't make their own decisions, about whether they want to discuss with the government or keep fighting. I believe that it is from the outside, from the United States, and especially, Turkey and Saudi Arabia and Qatar; they are keeping those people fighting in Syria, because they don't want reforms in Syria, they don't want democracy in Syria, they want to destroy Syria.

Gillesberg: So what is the best outcome you can foresee at this point? What would you like to happen right now to get out of this mess?

Mahfoud: I hope that all the world, even the U.S.A., and Russia and China, will put pressure on both sides, the government and the opposition, to have a dialogue, a peaceful solution. And we have a Presidential election in 2014, and of course, we have to get a free democratic election in Syria, and the Syrians will vote. Maybe in-

ternational observers have to ensure that the election will be fair, and of course, the Syrian people will respect the elected President in 2014.

Gillesberg: So you are basically saying that if the Western world, instead of trying to make regime change and having permanent war, would just sit down with Russia in the United Nations Security Council, and actually follow what they agreed on through the United Nations, of having peaceful negotiations, then there would actually be a way out?

Mahfoud: Yes, if the United States, of course, indirectly, through Turkey and Saudi Arabia and Qatar, stops sending weapons to the Free Syrian Army, and if they stop sending money to keep those people in action, I believe that a peaceful solution will be a reality in Syria. Because I believe that most of the people, maybe 90% of all the Syrians, want a peaceful solution. But the problem is that, with all the money and the weapons that are getting into Syria through Turkey and Jordan, it will be impossible to have a peaceful solution.

Gillesberg: Thank you, and we hope that you will succeed in having that future for Syria!

New from **EIR**

The British Empire's Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It


In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche's original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for \$250, and in pdf form for \$150, from the [EIR store](#).

Call **1-800-278-3135** for more information.

EIR
Special Report

The British Empire's Global Showdown, and How To Overcome It



June 2012

Drug Gangs Deployed Against Mali

Drug smuggling networks spanning Africa provide the basis for threats to nations. The case of Mali, Part I.

The war plan that the London-centered international financial empire has been carrying out against the nations of West Africa acquired a significant increase in offensive capability when drug-trafficking networks, under the guise of Islamic jihadists or Salafists, and supposedly linked to a mythical, centralized al-Qaeda, hijacked an attempt by local Tuaregs to declare independence of the North after the Mali Army abandoned its northern outposts following a March 22 coup in the capital, Bamako. By June 26, the jihadist militias had consolidated their control of northern Mali.

The coup was carried out by a group of soldiers with no perspective on running the country; it left Mali leaderless, paralyzed its governing institutions, and paved the way for foreign-directed and better-supplied gangs to establish their control of the North, an area larger than France.

African sources report that Europe and the United States do not consider the takeover of northern Mali to be a security threat to them, since they consider that only kidnapping for ransom and drug running are involved. Therefore, there is no pressure to do anything.

If the establishment of an apparatus to undermine the nations in the region is not considered a priority for Western nations, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that it must be a condoned policy.

So many impediments have been placed in the way of efforts to mobilize a West African peacekeeping force to restore a functioning govern-

ment and institutions in Bamako, as a first step to regaining control of northern Mali, that African sources fear that it may never come to pass.

A U.S. State Department source projects that it will take at least a year. There is a May 2013 deadline for election of a government in Mali that must be met before the Western nations will even consider supporting actions in northern Mali. The putschist elements in the present transitional government will never allow an election, so no force will ever be established, said one African source, unless the Western policy changes.

Before President Obama's unconstitutional war against Libya, it was already known that northern Mali was vulnerable. The attack on Libya sealed its fate.

Prior to the coup, northern Mali had already been a staging ground for drugs, primarily from Ibero-America, to be smuggled across the Sahara to Europe.

A portion of the enormous amount of narco-dollars associated with this drug traffic has corrupted the institutions of many of the nations in West Africa, including Mali, which explains that nation's susceptibility to the coup by lower-ranking officers. This corruption of the leading layers of society, also contributed to the lack of a strong reaction from the population in favor of the government, and against the putschists.

Many of the security issues confronting Africa ultimately derive from the scourge of drug trafficking. In addition to the drugs from Ibero-America,

drugs from Afghanistan and Asia are increasingly coming to eastern Africa and South Africa, as a result of a Russian crackdown on transshipment.

The north of Mali not only remains a staging ground for drug smuggling; it is also being turned into a base for special terrorist operations, like those in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Many observers in Africa have warned against this development, starting with Foreign Minister Mohamed Bazoum of the neighboring nation of Niger, who was in Washington on May 21. He warned there that Niger had intelligence of involvement by Pakistanis in Mali.

This takeover of a large ungoverned area by people engaged in criminal activity, and who have adopted a jihadi type of Islamic identity, using Sharia law to impose their will on people in the region who do not want to cooperate, is providing a base for the same operatives who were funded by Arab Gulf sheikdoms, who organized the assaults on the Libyan government, and who are doing the same now against the government in Syria.

Qatar, the most significant on-the-ground operator in Libya during that crisis, is regularly sending flights to three airstrips in northern Mali. West African sources suspect that money for recruitment, supplies, and arms are being brought in, in a rerun of the operation in Libya, despite Qatar's claims that it is only bringing humanitarian aid.

All of the nations in the region are vulnerable to attack from northern Mali. The primary immediate target is Nigeria: The terrorist group targeting Nigeria with bombings and attacks on Christians and Muslims, Boko Haram, has operatives in a small but extremely dangerous jihadist group, Movement for Oneness and Jihad in West Africa (Mujao), who participated in the takeover of northern Mali.

dougdegroot@larouchepub.com

WORLD WATER WEEK

Two Opposing Worlds Meet: Development or Death

by Hussein Askary

Sept. 9—The Stockholm World Water Week, Aug. 26-31, sponsored by the Swedish state's International Development Cooperation Agency, and such global cartel companies such as Nestle and PepsiCo, but dominated by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the Stockholm Environmental Institute, and similar malthusian propaganda outlets, promised to be orgy in green ideological madness, where African and Asian nations are regarded by Europe and the U.S.A. as an embarrassing burden, and that those nations should be convinced that their misery could only be reduced, but not relieved, by small hand-outs, instead of large-scale industrial and infrastructural development.

In recent years, World Water Week (WWW) has become an exhibition exposing the economic and moral bankruptcy of the trans-Atlantic world, while the rest of the world, Africa especially, is on its way to getting a divorce from it.

The world has changed dramatically since the Copenhagen 2009 Climate Change Summit where nations of Africa and South America, backed by China, India, and South Africa, nearly staged a walkout from the conference. Their message was: Our national sovereignty and right to devel-

opment are still sacred principles. The demise of the British-dominated financial and banking systems since then, has made this bankruptcy even more obvious. This year the Africans came to Stockholm with a different character and attitude, proudly presenting their relatively bold development programs, telling Europe and the United States (still in a friendly tone to avoid political tension): "These are our visions. Take them or leave us alone!"

The only ones who dared to mention the fact of the trans-Atlantic bankruptcy were the LaRouche move-



lucvandemenade.wordpress.com

Ethiopia's Grand Millennium Dam, shown here in an artist's concept, being built on the Blue Nile, near the Sudan border, is the largest hydropower project under construction in Africa. Projects like this one violate the green agenda for malthusian genocide.

ment organizers who, not being invited, stood outside the conference compound, distributing hundreds of pieces of literature and talking to many delegates. Their discussions with the attendees reflected the same phenomena observed inside the conference.

Almost exclusively, all European and American attendees attacked the idea of nuclear power, and any large-scale or continental water projects, as proposed by the LaRouche movement. Sometimes, their reactions became violent, because the presence of the “La-Rouchies” disturbed what they intended to be a controlled environment inside the conference. On the contrary, African and Asian delegates welcomed these large-scale infrastructure ideas, and expressed their support for them.

One aspect which shaped the discussions is the shift in the economic tendency in the world, as in the Pacific region, where China, Russia, India, and their allies have taken a different course for dealing with the economic crisis. Their method is based on the best of those utilized by such great Western leaders as American President Franklin D. Roosevelt, putting emphasis on large-scale infrastructure and science programs. These policies have been abandoned in the West since the murder of President John F. Kennedy, and replaced by the anti-industrial and superstitious green ideology on the one hand, and financial speculation on the other.

The impact of the real economic cooperation between China and Africa was discussed on the sidelines, though not openly. China’s own development programs, such as dam building, were attacked by several Western speakers in the conference (see below).

For the first time, *EIR* was inside the conference, as this reporter was covering the conference as part of the press corps.

Confab Host: Africa Biofuels Scandal

The main sponsor of World Water Week, the Swedish Ministry of International Development Cooperation (IDC), is itself involved in a number of scandals related to depriving African farmers of their land and water for food production, in order to produce biofuels. The scandals around the IDC, which were revealed by a reporter of the Swedish radio program Ekot, are related to the Swedfund, a wholly IDC-funded hedge fund. Ekot focussed on one of the many Swedfund projects which is carried out in Sierra Leone.

The available evidence shows that Swedfund, in collaboration with the biofuel company Addax, has



International Socialist Organization

In the village of Woreh Yeama, Sierra Leone, the Swiss-based company Addax grabbed cropland from farmers for sugar cane production; the water in the area is for irrigating the cane crop, to produce ethanol for automobiles in Europe.

fraudulently stolen productive land from farmers to produce biofuels. This has caused both water shortages and hunger among the farm families.

In the village of Woreh Yeama, for example, the contract made with the farmers, which they did not really understand, states that they will lease their land for 50 years (!) to Addax for \$3.20 per year/acre. The farmers were promised jobs in Addax, and health care and schools for their children. None of this materialized.

The water in the area is used for irrigating the sugar cane to produce ethanol for automobiles in Europe. So, the population is starving and thirsting in Sierra Leone due to the Swedish aid project.

This is your host of the World Water Week!

Biofuels Defended ‘Objectively’

A one-day WWW seminar was arranged to deal with the question of biofuels, water, and food security. Here, the organizers had the following to say about the disgusting use of land and water resources for the production of biofuels:

“Bioenergy and water are inextricably linked. In an already water-stressed world, bioenergy development may in places compete with other water and land uses such as crop cultivation for food production. At the same time, by leveraging the introduction of efficient water management techniques and providing energy for water pumping and cleaning, bioenergy development also provides opportunities to improve water productivity and increase access to water. Proper integra-

tion of bioenergy systems into forestry and agriculture can even reduce some of the impacts of present land use, such as eutrophication and soil erosion. Concerns remain however, that exploitation of water resources in bioenergy projects may undermine sustainable livelihoods in producer countries, and that existing policy frameworks and voluntary sustainability standards are inadequate.”

Thus did the seminar deal with the issue “objectively,” as stated above, while no mention was made of the crimes committed by the state-funded companies and their collaborating “charitable” hedge funds and companies in Sierra Leone and Tanzania.

Solving Problems or Dying Slowly

The most striking phenomenon between, on the one hand, the African and Asian WWW participants, mostly from the Indian Subcontinent and Southwest Asia (as China and Russia, interestingly, were not participating or probably not invited), and their European and American counterparts, is that the former focused, in their presentations, on solving the water-and-food crisis, while the latter focused on the problems themselves, as allegedly caused by population growth, and the aspiration of the developing nations to develop modern economies. The malthusian ideology of *Limits to Growth* of the Club of Rome and the WWF’s anti-human population prejudices, were predominant in the presentations of the European and American delegations.

These trans-Atlantic nations’ speakers focused solely on “environmental” crises, repeating *ad nauseam* such sickening jargon as “ecological foot prints,” “carrying capacity,” “scarcity,” “conflicts over limited resources,” “pollution due to population growth,” “transparency,” “*governance*” of resources (meaning abolishing the responsibility of the sovereign governments to make decisions about their natural resources and economic policies, by handing power down to local inhabitants, international NGOs, and multinational corporations), and similar gobbledygook.

Their arguments, put simply, are that human beings cannot create new resources. They base everything on the Second Law of Thermodynamics, claiming that everything—including life and human civilization—will, sooner or later, die off, in a heat death. Human beings speed up that process by attempting to alter nature’s order, through their selfish aspiration to have higher living standards, by using their creativity to develop ever-more advanced forms of technology, and thus,

higher and more dense forms of power.

So, the only way to deal with this, the green ideology asserts, is to “slow down” human activity, and condemn life to a slow death instead!

But since human nature rejects such notions, they have to be packaged in glossy pseudo-scientific computer models, or, simply imposed by force on weaker nations, or by denying them the technological means for development.

Having excluded nuclear power, and creation of new water resources through desalination or transfer of water, the only thing left to think about is how to survive in a vicious world with limited resources. For Africa, Asia, and South America, this means to coexist with misery and poverty in a “transparent” way, and by managing the poverty equally and with “good governance.”

This is no mere academic chatter. It is the strategic policy of the U.S. Administration under President Barack Obama, among others. This was revealed in “The Global Water Security” report, issued in February of this year by the U.S. Office of the Director of National Intelligence. It is based on the same premise, i.e., that you can only manage scarcity, not create new resources. “We assume that water management technologies will mature along present rates and that no far reaching improvements will develop and be deployed over the next 30 years,” it stated. It foresees “water wars” and social upheavals as a consequence.

The Trans-Atlantic Non-Vision

A screening of the various papers presented at the conference (Source: “Abstract Volume, World Water Week in Stockholm, August 26-31, 2012, Water and Food Security”), gives a taste of the deadly non-vision from the trans-Atlantic elites. For example:

Two papers presented an attack on China’s development plans, which, in reality, are inspiring other developing countries. One, by Dr. Thomas Henning, Philipps University, Marburg, Germany, is titled “Implications of Yunnan’s Aggressive Hydropower Development on Regional Food Security, Changing Land Utilization and Livelihood.” The second, by Stuart Orr, WWF International, Switzerland, titled, “Dams on the Mekong River: Lost Fish Protein and the Implications for Land and Water Resources,” attacked China and its allies in the Mekong River Basin.

Henning writes: “China is aggressively developing its energy sector in which hydropower plays a crucial role. Within China, Yunnan province has a key role for



NEFCO/Tommi Tynjälä

Two vision-less papers presented at the conference attacked China's development plans, including "Yunnan's aggressive hydropower development." Here, construction of a small-scale hydropower plant in Yunnan Province.

hydropower development, making it even a global key region for hydropower. In about 15 years it will have an installed hydropower capacity of more than 90 GW. It is based either on often controversial large projects (LHP) along major rivers or on smaller projects (SHP), both creating hydroscares. SHP are often considered a priori an environmentally and socially sound renewable energy. But in Yunnan they are falling into one of the richest bio-, geo- and ethnic[ally] diverse regions. There is a notable lack of knowledge studying the cumulative implications of the SHPs, including its consequences on food security, changing land utilization and livelihood for the diverse ethnic groups."

The WWF, which is generally concerned with wildlife, is suddenly worried about the threatened loss of protein intake of human beings in the Mekong River Basin region, from potential changes in fish habitat and migration in the river, were China and its neighbors to proceed on their plans to develop hydropower, modern agriculture, and industries in the Basin.

Orr writes: "Most of the 12 million households in the Lower Mekong Basin would be affected by alteration of fish availability, as fish is the main source of dietary protein. Estimating the water (water footprint) and land area (land footprint) that would inevitably increase in order to replace lost protein from fish catch, is one of the most important challenges in terms of addressing key impacts of the Mekong River basin dams."

Having excluded aquaculture (fish farms), a common practice in northern Europe, as "impossible" in the Mekong River, the WWF is attacking the idea of

allocating new land for modern agriculture and livestock to produce more protein for the population as man increases his "footprint" on nature.

These arguments, like Thomas Malthus's attempt to prove his theory of population as mathematically sound, by excluding from the equation—or computer model for his modern-day followers—technological improvements from the production process that yield increased food production per capita/square kilometer, these quackademics are not falling far from the tree. However, this is no mere academic discussion: If these types of persons are allowed to shape policy in the Western world

that can hinder real development in the developing world, they would be contributing to massive crimes against humanity.

Pessimistic Prognostications

Another case of locking the doors of the theater and shouting fire, is a paper introduced by Dr. Dieter Gerten from the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany, the same institute which was co-founded by such anti-human population ideologues as Prof. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber. While on the face of it, Gerten's paper sounds positive, as it is titled "Water Requirements for Future Global Food Production, Potentials of On-Farm Green-Blue Water Management to Increase Crop Production," all his arguments in the paper go contrary to this objective.

"Climate change, population growth and changing diets will put joint pressure on the world's fresh-water resources via increased demand for the production of crop and livestock products," he writes. Discussing his institute's computer models, which exclude nuclear power, hydropower, and water desalination to produce new freshwater, he adds with pseudo-scientific precision: "This global-scale model study quantifies how much water is required to produce a balanced diet. By comparing the requirements with *available* blue and green water on *present* agricultural land per country, water scarcity can be determined in more detail compared to previous scarcity models" (emphasis added).

The conclusion is that under Gerten's 17 climate models, by 2070-99, water scarcity will increase under

rising atmospheric CO₂ concentration and population growth. “Water scarcity will aggravate in many countries, and that means a number of countries are at risk of losing their capacity to be self-sufficient.”

So, what happened to the positive impulse suggested by the title of his paper? Well, Dr. Gerten states: “But improved on-farm water management can significantly relax this situation: Methods to increase crop water use efficiently, such as reduction in unproductive soil evaporation and harvesting run-off water for use during dry spells, can increase crop production by up to ca. 20% globally.” But then the hammer of death comes down, as he concludes: “However, adverse effects of climate change cannot be fully buffered by such management, and even if maximum efficiency increases were achieved, green-blue water resources will not be sufficient to meet the requirements for producing the specific diet for more than 9 billion people.”

The real conclusion he wants to be drawn from this is that only population reduction, and decreasing the rate of economic development across the globe can “solve” the problem.

That is the message which was delivered from the highly developed Germany and Europe to the Africans who came to Stockholm to see what solutions can be adopted to solve the grave water, food, and poverty crisis!

Other such depressing cases were presented by, for example, the extremely cynical paper of Prof. Jurgen Schmandt from the Houston Advanced Research Central (U.S.A.) and Prof. Gerald North from Texas A&M University, under the title “How Sustainable Are Engineered Rivers in Arid Lands?” They argue that river engineering and dam-building and modern irrigation systems, as the case in the U.S.A. proves, are useless in the face of climate change and sedimentation! They take the case of the Rio Grande River, which they studied as proof that the storage capacity in the river’s reservoirs will decrease by 6% annually, leading to massive environmental damage. Or, without adding new water resources—as the waters that can be generated by such projects as NAWAPA XXI¹—the only thing left is to “conserve” and “shift to less water-consuming crops.”

Even worse than the theory that you must dig a hole and lay down and die slowly, is that these two honored professors intend to travel around the world and spread the word, that river engineering, dam building, and

modern water irrigation systems do not help. It is not clear yet, if Schmandt and North will be joined in their global tour by a preacher from the Fundamentalist Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormons) of Texas, to garnish their scientific work with biblical citations from the Book of Revelations.

The African Perspective

Contrary to this anti-human and satanic view, the Africa Focus Day held on Aug. 28, and attended by several African water ministers, concentrated on solving the problems of food and water, in spite of the fact that Africa by itself does not have the means to accomplish this, and that many of its leaders are still suffering from the control of the British empire’s institutions and agents. However, the presentations and discussions, which this reporter had the opportunity to follow closely, were held in a refreshingly normal human atmosphere.

Africa’s massive problems need massive investments, and need a new way of looking at the question of cooperation between North and South and East and West, different from the now-traditional policies of small handouts of aid. The African representatives, especially the African Minister’s Commission on Water (AMCOW), headed by the Egyptian Water Resources and Irrigation Minister Mohammad Bahaa el-Din Saad (see interview below), presented important and realistic visions for solving Africa’s problems.

Although these plans lack such important elements as the investment in science-driven technologies such as nuclear power, and large-scale transcontinental water projects such as Transaqua for refilling the Lake Chad from the Congo River waters, or transcontinental high-speed-rail networks (see review of PIDA, below), their discussions were completely opposite to those of the doomsday prophets from Europe and the U.S.A.

Whenever such serious issues as nuclear power, railway integration of Africa, creation of new water resources through water transfer, or nuclear desalination to create *new* water resources, were brought up in the discussion inside the conference by this reporter, or by the LaRouche movement activists outside the conference, the answer from the majority of the African and Asian participants was: “Of course!”

In one of the exhibition halls, the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) had a booth proudly presenting plans for hydropower projects, especially on the Blue Nile in Ethiopia, and in Sudan. Dr. Abdulkarim Seid, an expert of the

1. See <http://larouchepac.com/nawapaxxi>.

NBI's Water Resources Planning and Management Projects in Ethiopia, gave this reporter a tour of the dam and water-management projects being built in the region. He focused especially on the Ethiopian Millennium Dam which is being built on the Blue Nile near the border with Sudan.

This dam will produce 6,000 mG of electric power, making it the largest hydropower project under construction in Africa. Together with its auxiliary water management schemes, it will reduce water sedimentation in the downstream dam reservoirs, especially in Sudan. This fact was confirmed by Sudan's Federal Minister for Water Resources Seif Eldin Abdallah, who lamented the fact that Sudanese dam reservoirs are affected significantly by the sedimentation problem emerging from soil erosion in the Ethiopian highlands during the rainy seasons, which extend from August to October. He referenced the case of the massive dredging costs in the canals of Al-Jazeera Agricultural Project in Sudan, one of the most important agricultural zones in Africa, and which is threatened by this problem.

However, Dr. Seid was, like other African participants, focused on the solution. He gave the example of the Roseires Dam on the Blue Nile to increase its reservoir capacity. Contrary to reports about conflicting interests among the Nile Basin states regarding the construction of new dams upstream, Sudanese President Omar Hasan Al-Bashir met with Ethiopian President Meles Zenawi in April, to express Sudan's support for the construction of the Millennium Dam in Ethiopia.

Although many of the papers by African and Asian participants in the seminars mentioned above were plagued with the greenie jargon used by the European and American participants, in an attempt to be accepted by the conference organizers, they were generally solution-oriented. For example, a paper presented by Abby Muriho Onenkan from the Nile Discourse group from Uganda, under the title, "Greening the Nile Basin: The Nexus (water, energy and food), the Key to Cooperation," argued for increasing regional cooperation in the build-



EIRNS
When EIR journalist Hussein Askary (shown here) spoke to conference participants about water development projects, such as nuclear desalination to create new water resources, the response from most of the Africans and Asians was: "Of course!"

ing of modern multi-purpose hydropower projects, as a self-evident fact.

Onenkan wrote: "Through the cooperative arrangements under the Nile Basin Initiative, it has become evident that broad-based water service interventions in energy utilities and irrigation services benefit everyone and play a major role in improving sustainable and dignified livelihoods. Through various designed multi-purpose projects like the joint Multi-Purpose Project, the NBI has clearly indicated that it is better to approach a project with the aim of reaping a myriad of benefits... As water resources become scarce, water will be pumped long distances or be produced through alternative means, such as energy-intensive desalination processes. Modern water management, including establishing monitor-

ing networks and data centers is dependent on reliable access to electricity. To achieve water security, which means the provision of an acceptable quantity and quality of water for health, livelihood, ecosystems and production, energy must be available."

No further comment is necessary.

'No' to the Oligarchy's Four Horsemen!

Africa's and the world's water, food, and energy requirements are clearly threatened, and both the cause and solution of the crisis is a shift in the view of the human race's role in nature and the universe. This also means a shift in the political-economic practices nationally and globally. If we accept the British empire's malthusian religion, then we need not do anything, as we wait for the Four Horsemen of Apocalypse to descend upon us.

Otherwise, as free men and women, belonging to sovereign nations, we should reject this oligarchical notion, and embrace instead, the Promethean, humanist vision, that we, as created in the image of a creative universal soul, are capable of being masters of our fate, not slaves under the whims of nature and the imperialist oligarchs and their hypocritical quackademics.

To translate this vision into policy for nations, regions, and continents, view the policies presented by Lyndon LaRouche and his associates (www.larouchepac.com).

Interview:
Mohammed Bahaa el-Din Saad

Solving Africa's Water Crisis

Bahaa el-Din is the Egyptian Minister for Water Resources and Irrigation. He was interviewed in Stockholm, Sweden, on Aug. 26, by EIR's Arabic language editor Hussein Askary.

EIR: We have the pleasure to meet with His Excellency Mr. Mohammed Bahaa el-Din Saad, the Water and Irrigation Minister of the Republic of Egypt attending the World Water Week in Stockholm, Sweden. First I'd like to welcome you here, in Sweden.

Mohammed Bahaa el-Din Saad: Thank you very much.


EIR: I have two brief questions. One is, what is your vision for solving the water crisis in North Africa and the Middle East, but specifically in Egypt, where you are most active?

Bahaa el-Din: My vision for solving the problem of water crisis is going in two main approaches. One is an internal approach, and the other one, is the external approach. The internal approach includes desalination of water from the sea, and also rationalizing the use of the water and maintaining it from contamination, and reclaiming the water and reuse program. We have been engaged in a huge program in Egypt, where 22 billion cubic meters [bcm] per year, have already been reused three times. Of course, we have some other problems, such as not cultivating crops which already consume much water, such as rice, sugar cane, and banana, and some other crops. We are trying to get the most economic value from water, by the drip irrigation of crops.

We also have to improve and strengthen our relationships with the neighboring countries, not only to maintain our quota from the Nile water, but also to capture the water and consult with Sudan, help Sudan, and

others in the area in the Nile Basin, in order to increase our quota from the Nile water [from the Nile Basin water-sharing international agreements—ed.]. Because Egypt, unfortunately, is located in the very arid belt of North Africa. So we have no rain; the groundwater we have is fossil groundwater, which means if we withdraw any quantity, there's no recharge.

So, the rational use of water—this is the main project we are progressing in, to save water; we also encourage, of course, using technology which enables us to save more.



Nuclear Power for Desalination

EIR: There have been plans by previous Egyptian governments to have nuclear power as a source for the energy to desalinate water. Is that still the case?

Bahaa el-Din: Well, it's still valid. Although the Cabinet changed about one month ago, the option is still valid. And I think there is no other alternative. We have to do it, because our hydropower has been utilized completely, nothing more can be generated. Of course, what we have is thermal power stations which consume fossil energy. Therefore, we have to increase our capacity from renewable energy,

like wind and hydropower. Hydropower, as I said before, is finished, so we have to consider wind power generation, and also atomic power generation, in order to find a cheap source for power to desalinate seawater.

EIR: In the final session, which you chaired, of the African Focus Day and the African Ministers Committee on Water (AMCOW), you said that national missions should be embodied in the African visions.

Bahaa el-Din: No, they should match with that vision.

EIR: Now, there are certain ideas for the integration of the African continent, both with water projects, like the Transaqua—bringing water from the Congo Basin to Chad, to refill Lake Chad; there are also ideas to bring water from either the Congo Basin or the Great Lakes to Egypt. These look like major projects, but they

are important for the integration of the African continent, economically and politically, in solving political problems. There are also railway projects to connect all of Africa, but also to connect Africa with the Mediterranean.

What is your view of these major transcontinental projects?

Bahaa el-Din: Well, I agree with having a network for unity, to find a proper way to establish a railway transportation between African countries. But to transfer water from the Congo Basin to the Nile Basin, it will be very costly and a very great engineering problem, because of the topographics of the area. So the water always came from the high to the low; so how can we take it from the high, to high? This is the problem.

But we have opportunity. As I said before, the quantity of rainfall which already exists on the River Nile Basin for the catchment area is about 1,000 bcm. If the water is managed adequately, by building water infrastructure for example, the amount of water in the Nile River would increase significantly. A large amount of water in the Nile Basin is lost due to evaporation, especially in the swamp areas in the Sud, in South Sudan.

As for Lake Chad, it is very important to look at the real solutions for this problem of the drying of the lake, and whether these solutions include bringing water from the Congo should be studied carefully. But there are other political issues in that region that have to be resolved, in order to start such projects, because all these projects are transnational and regional issues.

The Jonglei Canal

EIR: Is the building of the Jonglei Canal still on the agenda of the Egyptian government?

Bahaa el-Din: Yes, of course. The Jonglei Canal is a strategic project for Egypt's water security. It will benefit Egypt, but also South and North Sudan. We are still speaking about it with the government in South Sudan, and as you may know, 75% of the canal was actually accomplished, and only 25% of it was remaining when the civil war in Sudan broke out in the 1980s. So this will capture 4-5 billion cubic meters in the first stage, and 8 billion cubic meters in the second stage, and this is of benefit for Egypt and Sudan. So the Jonglei Canal project is still alive and we are waiting for the proper time to start working on action to redig the canal and complete it.

Hussein: Very good. Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions.

Interview: Rafiq Hussein

Common Aims for the Mediterranean Nations

Dr. Rafiq Hussein, the Deputy Secretary General of the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) [<http://www.ufmsecretariat.org/en/dr-rafiq-hussein/>], was interviewed on Aug. 26, at the World Water Week conference, in Stockholm, Sweden, by EIR's Arabic-language editor Hussein Askary.

EIR: First of all, what is the Union for the Mediterranean?

Rafiq Hussein:

The Union for the Mediterranean was an idea that was built on a political process, called the Barcelona Process, which started after the Oslo Agreement between the Palestinians and the Israelis, and other Arabs, of course. But everybody thought that this was a process that cannot succeed without an economic or cooperative development and dimension. And therefore, in 2010, a Secretariat for the Union for the Mediterranean was also created, to look specifically at regional cooperation, and regional cooperative projects, that could bring people together from the economic and prosperity point of view, rather than just sticking with the political dialogue that was basically going nowhere at the time.

So therefore, this is what the Union for the Mediterranean does: It works in several sectors, of which environment and water is one, but there's also energy, transport, education, civil affairs, and business development. And the idea is to come up with projects, either national projects with regional impact, or regional projects which, even as regional projects, will create coopera-



www.ufmsecretariat.org

tion between different countries, and are based on the idea of finding what is common between them, and what will bring them prosperity, together, rather than individually.

In environment and water, we have always said that there are, of course, conflicts, political conflicts between countries, but there are also regional enemies, and these regional enemies are pollution, water scarcity, global warming—these are the common enemies that the region should be looking at, and cooperating to defeat. Because if we don't defeat these regional enemies, then there will be no civilization left around the Mediterranean.

EIR: Are there are specific projects you have been studying, or implementing?

Husseini: The first, we have several projects in the pipeline, but we have also a couple of labeled projects, which are endorsed by the 43 countries, the first of which is the Gaza desalination project (see below), which is a very big project, in comparison to other projects, almost a \$450 million project. And the idea was that 43 countries accepted this project as a national project, but with regional impact. Because for 1.6 million Palestinians who live in Gaza, and have no water, the supply of water for them is humanitarian, is developmental, and also political. So this was one of the projects.

The second project we have also labeled, is to study the governance of water in several countries, and to put guidelines for public-private participation. And this project will start with six countries around the region of the Mediterranean, to bring in common guidelines, common ways of how to deal with the private sector in the issue of the governance of water. Because this is an issue that is very important, and nobody is taking much notice of governance; although you can stop the leakage of water, and you can do a lot to improve the physical infrastructures, if you don't improve governance and management of water, then you don't go anywhere.

EIR: Yes. These projects and the Union for the Mediterranean—is there any formal backing from the European Union, or the European Parliament, or is it a totally independent organ?

Husseini: No, it is an inter-governmental agency of 43 countries, of which 27 are in the European Union, and the rest are the countries around the Mediterranean. So basically, our role in the Secretariat is to bring in a project that we think is good for the region,

label it, endorse it by the 43 countries, and then help the promoters, whether it's one country or several countries, in finding the necessary resources and funding for it, whether it's from the EU [European Union], EC [European Commission], or Arab donors, even. So we help them look for money to implement them.

EIR: His Excellency, the Minister for Water from the Palestinian Authority, Mr. Shaddad Attili, yesterday, presented a very dramatic report on the water situation in Gaza. And basically, according also to the UN reports, the Gaza Strip would be unlivable by 2020, which is really a humanitarian crisis. It is a real tragedy, that this is happening right in the Mediterranean, where actually the capability to resolve this problem with a water desalination project is quite manageable, and can be implemented as quickly as possible.

What do you expect the European Union to do, in the face of this real humanitarian and civilizational crisis? Because, as Dr. Attili said yesterday, we cannot wait for the political solutions to come, because people need to drink now, and that's a really strong argument.

Husseini: Yes, of course. I mean, water is life. You can't really say, "Okay, we'll wait. We'll not drink water today, or tomorrow, and wait for a political solution." So people have to drink clean, fresh water. And as he said, it is today a basic human right.¹ So, this is very important.

Of course, it's happening in an area where there's a lot of water around, but freshwater is becoming very scarce, and therefore, Gaza has to find a solution; otherwise Gaza will not be livable in 2020.

Of course, there are other issues: The UN report that you referred to has outlined other issues. But of course, water, in our opinion, is essential, because you can sometimes live without electricity, you can live without some other issues that are very important, or infrastructure, but without water, you cannot survive.

And I think we actually have been able to interest a lot of countries. Of course, the Arab countries have been interested for other reasons, both political as well as developmental. But the European Union is also interested, and we had, yesterday, with us, the European Investment Bank, which is one arm of the European Union.

1. On July 28, 2010, through Resolution 64/292, the UN General Assembly explicitly recognized the human right to water and sanitation, as essential to the realization of all human rights.

The EC is coming onboard. Countries like Sweden, France, other countries, have already committed themselves, so I think we're making the point clear. And the UN, of course, with their report of the day before yesterday, has helped tremendously in pinpointing the problems and the seriousness of the issue.

EIR: It was actually on the Swedish news last evening, that it's being taken seriously. That's very important.

There was this idea that I discussed with you yesterday, of having a Marshall Plan for the Mediterranean, in light of the deep economic crisis, also in the Southern European countries, in Greece, Portugal, Spain; but also we have had the social revolts in Tunis, Egypt, and most of North Africa, due partly to the deep economic crisis in these countries. And we had presented ideas for connecting Southern Europe with the North Africa-Eastern Mediterranean region, with infrastructure projects: Railways, tunnels, bridges, but also implementing large-scale water desalination, energy, and power.² What is your view of these—these

2. See, "There Is Life After the Euro! An Economic Miracle for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean," *EIR*, June 8, 2012.

are mega-projects; these are not small things, but a question of the future of the whole Mediterranean. What do you think about it?

Husseini: Well, although what you're saying is, of course, mega and futuristic, this is what the UfM is all about. It's about bringing the northern Mediterranean and the southern Mediterranean region into a state of prosperity, and togetherness, and cooperation, that they can ensure that both the peoples in the North and the South live together in harmony, security, and peace.

So, what you are saying is actually what the UfM divisions—which are the divisions of energy, transport, environment and water, business development—are actually doing, but they are doing it on a much smaller scale, and without the idea of this Marshall Plan. So, from one point of view, I support this idea—it's a nice idea. But, as I say, it needs also work, to happen, and, in the meanwhile, what we can do, is just fit in some building blocks to the idea. So we're doing what you're asking for, bottom up. And what you're suggesting is something like a top-down approach. But in the end, the two should meet in the middle somewhere.

Released on Thanksgiving 2011, the LPAC-TV documentary "NAWAPA 1964" is the true story of the fight for the North American Water and Power Alliance. Spanning the 1960s and early '70s, it is told through the words of Utah Senator Frank Moss. The 56-minute video, using extensive original film footage and documents, presents the astonishing mobilization for NAWAPA, which came near to being realized, until the assassination of President Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and the 1968 Jacobin reaction, killed it ... until now.

PUEBLO, COLORADO
AUGUST 16, 1962

<http://larouchepac.com/nawapa1964>

Build the Gaza Desal Project Now!

by Hussein Askary and Marcia Merry Baker

Sept. 10—It is urgent that construction begin straightaway on the Gaza Desalination Facility Project, which is ready to go, and can relieve the desperate water crisis for the 1.6 million residents in the Gaza Strip. On average, there are only 70-80 liters of water a day per person in Gaza, when the minimum for health, is 100 liters, according to the UN World Health Organization. The water is saline. Sewage treatment and sanitation are lacking. Two-thirds of the diseases afflicting Gazans are water-related. This is a holocaust in the making.

A new report by the UN Country Team in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (OPT) describes the conditions as unliveable. Released in August, it is titled, “Gaza in 2020—A Liveable Place?”

The Gaza Desal Project designs are ready for implementation; and at the Stockholm World Water Week, details were presented to the 2,500 conferees, by its principal authors, Dr. Shaddad Attili, Palestinian Minister of Water Resources, and Rehby Al-Sheikh, Director of the Palestinian Water Authority (PWA). In June 2011, the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) designated this project as its foremost priority. They stated:

“The ‘labelling’ of this large-scale project, submitted by the [UfM] Secretariat’s Environment & Water Division, in collaboration with the Palestinian Water Authority, by the representatives of all 43 UfM countries, was partly based on a unanimous recommendation from the UfM’s Water Expert Group, and is an ac-



Source: World Water Week.org

Palentinian Water Minister Shaddad Attili: “We do believe, that in the medium term and the long term, water could be used as the means to promote peace in the region....”

knowledgment that the project is capable of delivering concrete benefits for 1.6 million impoverished citizens living on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, not only from humanitarian and health perspectives, but also contributing to job creation and future economic and sustainable development in this highly populated region of the Mediterranean.

“The Project will also contribute to the political stability of the region through the removal of the water scarcity issue from the web of the multiple and complex issues facing the Gaza Strip.”

Develop the Mediterranean Basin

This Gaza desalination facility is a hallmark project, for the current interregnum between the expired world monetary system and era of strategic confrontation, and the new reality waiting to be built, based on peace through development. The gateway is to enforce a radical and rapid policy shift to initiating a worldwide Glass-Steagall system for separating useful banking from speculative financial gaming, and build nation-serving, stable credit systems for funding priority projects for economic advance.

The outlines of what must be done in the greater Mediterranean region are getting wide attention, from the emergency recovery program, released in June 2012, “Economic Miracle in Southern Europe, the Mediterranean Region, and Africa.”¹

The Gaza Strip is a top priority to receive immediate relief, and for inclusion in regionwide development as part of the southeastern Mediterranean and trans-Jordan. Water is critical.

Build ‘Natural’ Water Resources

As it is, the natural resources water base in the Gaza, trans-Jordan, and surrounding desert regions, is entirely inadequate to support the existing population, and has been so for decades. No manner of riparian and aquifer water-sharing agreements can be made—even fairly, which the current ones are not—which will provide adequate supplies. The water isn’t there.

The Jordan River Valley flow, in modern times, was considered by hydrologists as capable of supporting about 5 million people, but as of 20 years ago, more than 11 million were resident in the Jordan Basin. Therefore, today’s situation is untenable. The water available from run-off and underground sources per

1. *EIR*, June 8, 2012.

FIGURE 1

Mountain and Coastal Aquifers



Source: Arc/World, UN Cartographic Section, DCW, Palestinian Environmental Quality Authority

capita, for both domestic use, and for minimum levels of industrial and agricultural activities, is way below what is required.

Dr. Attili said in an interview with *EIR* in 2007, “To address actually the water use in the region, first, the natural water resources should be allocated equitably. The second thing is, to face the demand on the water. The people, the parties in the Basin, have to come into agreement about the use of the water, the re-use of the water, and building the desalination plants, in order to make water available. We do believe, that in the medium term and the long term, water could be used as the means to promote peace in the region. . . .”

In mid-20th Century, plans for projects to provide plentiful, new man-made water supplies, were repeatedly put forward, and as often, repulsed by the prevailing imposition of British-centered financial and political circles, intent on keeping the region down and in turmoil. Look at the record.

1950s. During the Atoms for Peace period after World War II, President Eisenhower sent teams to the Jordan Valley, to map out a mini-TVA approach to max-

imize water development. Detroit Edison Electric Co. sent its top officer Walker Cisler throughout the Mideast, with a table-top scale model of a nuclear power plant, visiting government leaders across the region, from Egypt to Iran.

1970s. Lyndon LaRouche called for an “Oasis Plan” to green the North African and Southwest Asian desert expanse, through nuclear power, systems of canals—especially the Med-Dead Sea Canal—and desalination.

1990s. Soon after the 1993 Oslo Accords, plans were again issued for water development. LaRouche urged, “Put the shovels in the ground!” Just 16 nuclear power plants in the region would create the water equivalent to a second Jordan River.

1994. “The Palestinian Emergency Development Program,” and “The West Bank and Gaza Strip—A Brief Economic Overview,” outlined water projects. The same year, the government of Israel issued, “Development Options for Regional Cooperation,” including water augmentation. Only a handful of water-related projects were ever completed; the entire vision was thwarted.

2000. That Summer, water again was relevant to discussions for the Camp David Accords. A policy paper was made available to President

Clinton and delegations, calling for large-scale water desalination titled, “Solving the Problem of Fresh Water Scarcity in Israel, Jordan, Gaza and the West Bank.” It was issued in 1999 by the Washington, D.C.-based Center for Middle East Peace and Economic Cooperation. The maps showed desalination sites on the Mediterranean in Israel at Ashkelon; in Jordan at Hisban; and on the Mediterranean on the Gaza coast. But no action for Gaza ensued. The 1993 Accords took no action on water at all.

Gaza Desalination Project

The Gaza Project is described in a Fact Sheet by the Secretariat of the Union for the Mediterranean titled, “Gaza Desalination Project; The Largest Single Facility To Be Built in Gaza.” It begins by summarizing the current plight, and then gives essential specifics of the proposed new facility.

“The availability of ‘fresh’ water in Palestine is amongst the lowest in the world. In the Gaza Strip, the only available water source is groundwater from the deteriorating Coastal Aquifer **Figure 1** underlying the Gaza

Strip, as well as Israel and Egypt. The sustainable yield of the aquifer in the Gaza Strip is only 55 million cubic meters (mcm)/year, however, the 1.7 million Palestinians in Gaza consume in excess of 170 mcm/year from the aquifer—thus taking approximately three times as much as the aquifer can sustainably recharge each year.

“The over pumping of groundwater has led to the damage of the trans-boundary aquifer due in part to a large increase in groundwater salinity following from seawater intrusion into the aquifer from the Mediterranean. Levels of salinity found in the aquifer under Gaza have risen continuously over the last two decades, and are now far in excess of the World Health Organization standards for drinking water. According to the World Bank, the situation has become so dire that ‘only 5-10% of the aquifer is now yielding drinking quality water (World Bank Report, 20 April 2009 Pg. VI).’”

The desalination facility is, most likely, to use seawater reverse osmosis, to produce 55 mcm per year, for the first phase; and the site will provide, at a later phase, for a capacity of 110 mcm.

A new electricity plant is vital to the project, not merely because of the power requirements for any large-scale desalination plant, but because of the severe electricity shortage in the Gaza. There is only one power plant in Gaza, producing 100 MW. (In addition, Gaza gets 120 MW from Israel, and 22 MW imported from Egypt, which, under ideal circumstances, adds up to 242 MW, still far below peak demand, which is above 350 MW. Outages are frequent and long).

There are four components for the project, to be implemented in parallel:

- The desalination facility itself
- Water storage in reservoirs, water transmission and distribution systems
- Systems for administering non-revenue water; and for efficient revenue collection for water supplied
- Power supply dedicated to the seawater reverse osmosis facility

The Palestinian Water Authority has secured a site for the desalination complex, of 80,000 sq.m. of land, adjacent to the Mediterranean Sea, near Dar El Balah.

A Trust Fund mechanism has been set up. The total investment cost is estimated at \$455 million.

A timeline has been worked out. Once the pledges have come in, as of the end of 2012, then in 2013, the implementation designs will be made final. In 2014, a project manager will be appointed, and the tendering processes for the contract work will ensue. The actual

start of the project will be in the second half of 2014. Following that, the project duration and completion is expected to take up to three years (2014, '15 '16).

The critical requirement is the will of international leadership to undertake this desperately overdue project, in the overall drive now underway to usher in a new era of credit and planetary-scale improvements.

Without Water, Unliveability

The already unliveable conditions in Gaza are reported in detail in a new 20-page report released in August by the UN Country Team in the OPT. The Gaza Strip has a population of 1.64 million, but lacks the water, power, health care, food, and shelter to support its people.

Half of Gaza's population are children, and two-thirds are refugees. The area is 365 km³, so the density at present is 4,505 people per km³, one of the highest in the world. If infrastructure is not rapidly built, a health holocaust is guaranteed. In terms of water and sanitation, the report states:

“Today, 90% of the [coastal] aquifer is not safe for drinking without treatment. Availability of clean water is thus limited for most Gazans with average consumption of 70 to 80 litres per person per day (depending on the season), below the global WHO standard of 100 litres per person per day.

“The aquifer could become unusable as early as 2016, with the damage irreversible by 2020. . . .

“Meanwhile the Palestinian Water Authority expects demand for fresh water to grow to 260 MCM per year by 2020, an increase of some 60% over current levels of abstraction from the aquifer.

“The situation with regard to treatment of waste water or sewage is no less problematic, with huge investment in treatment facilities and associated infrastructure desperately needed to cope with the existing demand, let alone for the future. At present, only 25% of waste water, or 30,000 CM per day, is able to be treated and re-infiltrated for use in green areas and some forms of agriculture. Some 90,000 CM of raw or partly treated sewage has to be released daily into the nearby Mediterranean Sea and environs (almost 33 MCM per year), creating pollution, public health hazards, and problems for the fishing industry.”

Dr. Attili said in the press conference in Stockholm, following the presentation of the Gaza Desalination Plant, that the Palestinian Authority has already secured 50% of the US\$500 million required for the project from Arab countries. He expressed however, bitterly,

his hope that his tour in Europe following the conference, and the UN report on Gaza, would move the European countries to speed up their contributions.

It is a tragedy for our civilization that such a relatively small project, but so vital to save the lives of Palestinian children, is being blocked by the insane small-mindedness of the European leaders, and the total indifference of the American leadership, to the suffering of the Palestinian people, which is aggravated by the Israeli blockade. Whether this project is built soon or not will be a test of whether the trans-Atlantic world is not both morally and economically bankrupt.

PIDA: A Tony Blair, Deadly Pretense

by Hussein Askary and
Marcia Merry Baker

Sept. 10—At the Africa sessions of the World Water Week in Stockholm in August, a particular document was in circulation—“Program for Infrastructure Development in Africa” (PIDA), which is, by pedigree and intent, only a pretense for economic advancement. In practice, it is a rationalization for looting lives and resources across the continent.

PIDA is a continuation of the NEPAD initiative (New Partnership for Africa’s Development), cooked up in the test-tubes of the British Foreign office/U.K. Department for International Development, at the time of the Tony Blair government (1997-2007). NEPAD was launched in 2001, in order to “talk the talk” of aid and growth, while blocking essential nation-serving infrastructure, and instead imposing neo-colonialist schemes of public-private partnerships between globalist mega-corporations and targeted African peoples and areas, for cheap, neo-British Empire financial gains and control. In 2004, Blair set up the Commission for Africa; and in 2007, the Africa Progress Panel. After he left office, he formed the Africa Governance Initiative, to intervene on the continent, against forces for real development.

The new 20-page PIDA document, sub-titled, “Interconnecting, Integrating and Transforming a Continent,” was produced with funding from, among other

sources, the U.K. Department for International Development, and the NEPAD Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility Special Fund. The principal author-agencies include the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency, the African Union Commission, the Economic Commission for Africa, and the African Union Commission.

NEPAD “partnerships” to date have included such neo-plantation arrangements as mega-companies exporting baby vegetables from Kenya to Europe by air-freight; or fruit from West Africa to the United States. For example, PepsiCo has a deal in Ethiopia, to obtain chick peas for humus, including making and donating a small amount for charity, to look good. Cargill, Nestles, and other famous names are all entrenched. The minerals-exporting deals in Africa are infamous.

What the PIDA updated report emphasizes, is that these companies need more electricity, better ports, improved roads, etc. for their operations. Therefore, more infrastructure must be built—including by PPPs—public-private partnerships, on a region-by-region basis—for what the companies want to do. This is all couched, of course, in terms of “making Africa competitive” in world trade, and lessening poverty for Africans.

The PIDA report dissimulates that, “Public-private partnerships (PPPs) are no longer a novel concept, and motivated governments can make PPPs a successful, sustainable and visible part of regional infrastructure development.”


Pretense of Water Improvements

The gist of the PIDA report is to present a few projects proposed and underway in four areas—energy, transportation, water and communications—and call this a “programme.” For each of these areas, a continental map is given, and a chart, which lists individual projects—their status, cost, nation, and region.

Look at water in specific. **Figure 1** reproduces the report’s map titled, “PIDA’s Transboundary Water Impact.” It names the major river basins, as indicated; identifies four dam projects, three aquifer study-projects, and two other study-programs, in the Okavango Basin, and Lesotho Highlands. In a chart, the nine map features shown are listed, with estimated cost. This, then, is called a water “programme.”

In reality, this is no program at all. True, there are merits for the individual projects shown, e.g., the Goumbassy Dam to regulate the Senegal River, or for devis-

FIGURE 1
PIDA's Transboundary Water Impact



Source: ArcWorld, UN Cartographic Section, DCW, Palestinian Environmental Quality Authority

ing the best use of the Nubian Aquifer, but these particulars don't add up to "transforming a continent." They aren't supposed to. They are a ruse.

What is truly required instead, is the top-down "Big Project" approach. A portion of the vast Congo River Basin flow, can be diverted northward to replenish the Chad Basin. Proposed in the 1970s, this is called the "TransAqua" project. In addition, some of the eastern Basin flow can be diverted northward in a parallel to the Nile River, proposed as the the "Africa Pass" project, by Egyptian engineer Aiman Rsheed in 2012.¹

In coastal Sudan, Egypt, and North Africa, nuclear-powered desalination can provide the scale of freshwater needed for centuries ahead. This was envisioned in

1. See Hussein Askary, "Africa Pass: Afro-Mediterranean Revolutionary Project," *EIR*, June 8, 2012.

the 1950s Atoms for Peace program, but was obstructed by London.

This "Big Project" approach was shown to be dramatically successful in the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Colorado River Basin, and Columbia River Basin development in North America under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is the only realistic perspective. An integral part of it is the science-driver aspect—for example, the training, and R&D impact of advanced nuclear power, and large-scale desalting of seawater.

But the PIDA report perspective, apart from its piecemeal programmatic nothingness, and its British-Empire legacy, is most glaringly ludicrous, because its premises are based on fantasy, namely that the world monetary and trade context is stable, which it is not. The worldwide monetary system crash is now dramatically manifest in the Eurozone

breakdown, hyperinflating commodities and crashing markets, world food shortages, and the revelations of criminal activities of all kinds by the big-name banking houses—drug-money laundering, Libor-rigging, fraudulent collateralization, etc. The "markets" are both fraudulent and blowing out.

The urgent mobilization is now in motion to sweep away this debacle, by reinstating the Glass-Steagall principle of separating sound banking from speculation, and making way for nation-serving credit and projects.

Yet the PIDA Foreward opens with the sophisticated statement that its "continental initiative, based on regional projects and programmes, will help address the infrastructure deficit that severely hampers Africa's competitiveness in the world markets." Once again, an imperialist fraud.

IN MEMORIAM

Gail Billington: A Magnolia Made of Specialty Steel

by Dennis Small

Sept. 7—There is a common thread running through many of the messages sent in memory of Gail Billington. That she was a seemingly slight and frail person, but that inside she was endowed with steel—you might say specialty steel—that allowed her to move souls and mountains, in her lifelong commitment to economic and political justice for all mankind, through her leading role in the LaRouche movement.

She and Mike did that together, as a team, for their nearly 30 years of married life, during 10 of which Mike was in prison—or rather, multiple prisons—and during the last 10 of which, they jointly battled the disease that first imprisoned, and then finally felled her, one week ago, on Sept. 1, 2012. Their life together was not easy—but it was good. And Gail maintained an indomitable sense of humor and a laughing twinkle in her eye to the very end.

A message to Mike from Robbie and Elisa Barwick, of the LaRouche movement in Australia, captures that Gail:

“I well remember a dramatic intervention Gail made at an ICLC conference while you were in prison, when she challenged people to adopt a mission for their lives. Gail related her devastation at your incarceration, and her realization that it was incumbent upon her to take the lead in your shared mission to spread Lyndon LaRouche’s ideas of peace through economic development throughout the nations of Asia. To me, Gail always had a slight quaver in her voice, but to use that voice to show such strength of leader-



EIRNS

Gail, in a press interview in Paris, January 1990. Mike kept this photo on the wall in his prison cell.

ship was a powerful act of courage I'll never forget.”

I will read from a few other messages about Gail at the end of my remarks.

As for me, I've known Gail for 43 years, ever since we met at Swarthmore College in the Fall of 1969. Inmates of that institution, as Gail was fond of pointing out with scientific precision, and with her invincible smile, were properly known as Swarth-morons.

Gail, who was born on Aug. 30, 1951, in Magnolia, Ark., was a revolutionary, even in her college days. She had a privileged upbringing, not in the sense of earthly riches, but because as a youth, her family had lived in Libya and Venezuela (where she experienced at least one coup d'état), and she grew to know and love other cultures, and to hate the poverty and degradation that the majority of the world's population has been forced to endure. And she knew the unique role that her United States had to play in changing that.

She learned a lot from those countries—including the Libyan National Anthem, which, at a moment's notice, Gail would begin to sing with gusto, livening up many of our recent midday intelligence meetings. In fact, Gail had many expressions of such internationalism. For example, a knowledgeable linguist, and occasional cellist, Jean-Sebastian Tremblay, wrote to Mike: “Nobody I ever met had such pleasure at imitating the French-Canadian accent, as she did.”

When the Alexandria railroad trial began in late 1988, Mike and Gail, and Gretchen and I, shared a rented apartment in Alexandria, Va. Our long-standing friendship was sorely tested by the fact that they chose to bring their cats with them to that apartment; but somehow that friendship survived. Gail teased me about that mercilessly, for decades—as did Mike.

After serving out his Federal sentence, Mike was tried again by the Commonwealth of Virginia, for the same crimes which he had *not* committed in the first place. They are nothing if not consistent: If they are going to hit you with double jeopardy, they at least do it for the same crime that you didn't commit the first time.

After a year out of jail, Mike was re-incarcerated. Later, Gail told Gretchen and me—as she probably did others here—that driving Mike back to jail that day was the hardest thing she had ever done in her life. I'm reminded of what John F. Kennedy said about why we had to go to the Moon.

Gail, in adversity, became one of the best ambassadors that the LaRouche movement has ever had—and for a reason. Like Helga, and others, Gail took up the

banner of her husband's unjust incarceration, not only as a personal cause, but as a universal political battle. And she changed every single person, and nation, that she met in the process. Not because it was easy, but because it was hard.

During this period, Gail not only traveled internationally, especially in Asia, but she also wrote extensively in defense of nations being subjected to the British Empire's economic and political genocide—from the Philippines, to Malaysia, to Cambodia, Myanmar, and more. For many of them, she was their savior angel, as can be seen in her extraordinary *EIR* interviews with Malaysia's Prime Minister Mahathir—the man who called George Soros a moron—and Cambodia's Prime Minister Hun Sen.

Gail's research, admittedly, benefitted from others' work. As Mike wrote in his book: “When asked to make a brief statement to an NCLC conference in 1998 concerning my work in prison, I explained that my wife had discovered a source of cheap prison labor, such that every time I called her, she loaded me up with new assignments, so that I barely had time to stand for count!”

It is perhaps best to judge Gail's work, and the soul that produced it, by its continuing impact.

International Messages

Allow me to read excerpts from just a few of the endless messages Mike has received:

“Dear Mike: My condolences on the passing away of Gail. Gail's demise is a loss not only to you, but to all who believe in truth and justice in the perception of the affairs of the world. Gail did much to correct the wrong image of Malaysia created by the controlled Western Press, especially during the financial crisis of East Asia. I pray to God that He will grant Gail rest in peace.

“Signed,

“Dr. Mahatir bin Mohamad,

“Former Prime Minister of Malaysia.”

From Cambodia, Ambassador to the U.S. Hem Heng:

“Gail was a great person who enlightened the hearts of many. She is a fighter, a very patient and perseverant lady. Her entire life is built on her love for justice and her belief for the truth. She is a true believer in the U.S. tradition of scientific supremacy, progress, and development, led by President Franklin Roosevelt during World War II. Her advocacy for Cambodian war refugees, and her fight against the injustice of the Khmer Rouge, is a vivid

legacy of her love for humanity, peace and eternal justice. She is a great lady who gains our heart.”

The Ambassador to the U.S. from Myanmar sent Mike a similar letter.

From the *Philippines*, Butch Valdes, leader of the Philippines LaRouche Society:

“We are eternally grateful to her for re-connecting us to Lyn and the whole LaRouche movement. We certainly miss her, but are consoled by the fact that her good soul indeed smiles, knowing that her life here was spent doing exactly what God had intended for her to do. Godspeed, Gail Billington.”

From France, Jacques Cheminade (former French Presidential candidate, and leader of the LaRouche movement):

“I have particularly in mind those first moments in the 1974 French [intelligence] file, where I met Gail for the first time. And if she was more silent than others, she inspired also a deeper sense of respect. It has been one of the reasons why I joined the organization: She was a person who *meant it*, without pulling any kind of show. Then Odile and I met the dogs and the cats, and we went together to see you in jail.”

From the United States, Debbie Freeman:

“During the fight for exoneration, Gail and I did a number of meetings together. Despite the fact that the horror that the two of you suffered through certainly would have made a compelling story, Gail was always completely focused on the bigger picture, and never played the role of victim. Oh, she certainly didn’t mince words when it came to your case, but it was clear to anyone she met with, and any group she addressed, that she was not coming to them as ‘a wife,’ but as a political leader. She was always articulate, but her effectiveness wasn’t simply because of the clarity of her presentation. It was Gail’s grace and quiet strength in the face of it all, that invariably blew people away.”

From Australia, LaRouche movement leader Gabby Peut:

“On my first trip to the United States for an ICLC conference, I got to stay with Gail. I was introduced to this very quiet, unassuming and tiny person (so I thought; looks can be deceiving), who took me under her wing and introduced me to Verdi. Gail would not only sing, but elaborated each and every part of the story of the opera (*Il Trovatore*), which we would play non-stop when we

were going back and forth to the conference.”

Gabby then referenced Gail’s memorable intervention from the floor at that conference, which so many of us recall:

“It was incredibly powerful when she took center stage at the conference, and called upon each and every one of us to share that mission. It was her unwavering commitment and passion, coming from this seemingly ‘tiny’ person, that moved souls and mountains, that became a crucial foundation for the building of an ICLC organization on the continent of Australia.”

The last message, with which I will close, expresses the heart of the matter. It comes from Dr. Su Jingxiang, a leading Chinese scholar, and frequent author of articles about LaRouche. He wrote:

Gail Writes About Southeast Asia

In addition to her travels to many nations around the world, Gail Billington wrote numerous articles for EIR and other LaRouche publications about the nations of Southeast Asia, whose peoples and cultures she loved so much. She also interviewed world leaders, such as former Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia and Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen. Here are links and references to a few of those articles.

- Speech to an ICLC/Schiller Institute Conference, Jan. 18, 1998: “Shattered Assumptions, The New Colonialism in Southeast Asia Under the IMF: LaRouche and Mahathir Were Right.”
- Michael Billington and Gail Billington, “London Sells a Killer ‘Tiger’ Tonic to Southeast Asia,” [EIR](#), Feb. 7, 1997.
- Interview: Datuk Seri Dr. Mahathir bin Mohamad, Malaysian Prime Minister: “We Had To Decide Things for Ourselves,” [EIR](#), Feb. 19, 1999.
- Interview: Samdech Hun Sen. “Cambodian Prime Minister Seeks Reconciliation Through Reconstruction,” [EIR](#) Feb. 12, 1999.
- Gail G. Billington, “Indochina 25 Years Later: Leaving Colonialism Behind,” [EIR](#), May 26, 2000.

“An ancient Chinese sage said: ‘Everyone will eventually leave this world. The difference is the value of the life. Some people are heavier than the mountains, and some lighter than feathers. Gail was a courageous advocate of truth and justice, and the value of her life is heavier than the mountains. Her fight is not complete, but her spirit will remain active forever. We love her, and miss her dearly.’”

LaRouche: On the Death Of Gail Billington

Lyndon LaRouche made these remarks about the death of Gail Billington, to a meeting of his close associates on Saturday, Sept. 1, 2012.

I have this sad news to announce: Gail Billington passed away this morning. And naturally, with us, in the circumstances of our organization and its history, it's very difficult to respond to these kinds of events, because of old friends in combat over long years. This is not the kind of matter that lends itself to explanation. It's something that we know, that we have experienced as an organization, and it's very much with us, right now. The loss of a member, of an old member, one who conducted a brave struggle against a very evil kind of disease, is something which is very difficult for us, even for me, to speak about under these circumstances. The fact of it is obvious, and I can state the fact, but the sense of loss, is not something that can be easily explained away....

What we as an organization are doing, is crucial for humanity. It is not something that we're doing in competing for other people for relative importance. What we're doing, and what I'm doing, is of unique importance to the human species at this time, when we're under threat of thermonuclear war. And fortunately, and unfortunately, both, I've been enabled at various points in my lifetime, to intervene on this kind of issue.

We have sometimes succeeded. Sometimes we've almost succeeded, which is the worst of all. Because when you almost succeed in doing something for humanity that humanity needs, it's not you that's suffering. You're feeling a kind of mixture of a sense of shame and failure: Why

couldn't we have done something to prevent this from happening? And it's the same kind of emotion that intersects, for me and for others in this room who knew Gail: There's that sense of loss; why did it have to happen? Why did it have to happen at this time? Why didn't she get a chance to know that we'd accomplished something which we hope we will have accomplished?

It's difficult. You can not really explain these matters. You can come to an understanding of them, and it never comes to an actual explanation. It can't; it's beyond that.

And I find it shaking, not in any other way, except the sense of her loss of life, when we were on the verge of trying to share life with her, as with others, in achievement and hope that she would experience that achievement of our efforts. And she's been denied that, and that's what makes the whole thing so difficult to try to begin to even explain. It's an emotion that you can not begin to explain; it's just one that hits you....

Popular opinion has taken over, and popular opinion is stupidity. It comes in the form of ceasing to be concerned with the discovery of things which are just beyond your reach—insights, which are just beyond your reach—and making them familiar, and usable. Mankind has got to, at this time, change the self-conception of mankind. That's really what we have to do. But this, the shock of having to face this, will force us to recognize that responsibility.

And it's thoughts like that, that become very important to me when something happens, as happened with



Courtesy of Michael Billington

Gail, at home, and at peace.

Gail today. You have to think in those terms: that you can not grasp efficiently the fact that she died the way she did—you can not grasp that. You put it aside, you come up with explanations, you do this kind of stuff—it doesn't satisfy you at all! You have to find a deeper

meaning to this whole process, a deeper meaning to the death of someone who was valuable. To encase something from that, as part of your vocabulary.

And then, they're not dead. They're not dead, because they live on, in the effect on you.

The Angel of Freedom

by Margaret Billington Greenspan

This letter, written by Mike Billington's sister Margaret to her brother and his wife Gail on the eve of Mike's return to prison in 1992, captures the spirit which Mike and Gail shared with their political associates, and which, as a couple, they represented for many people around the world.

Florestan is the hero in Beethoven's opera "Fidelio," which portrays his wife Leonora as she puts her life at risk to try to rescue her husband from an unjust, cruel imprisonment in a brutal dungeon, where he is now near death. In his aria, sung in a dark dungeon, he wrestles with despair, but, with a vision of his wife Leonora before him, then triumphantly asserts his faith that he has served God and justice. Soon afterward, Leonora appears to rescue him.

Dearest Mike and Gail,

You are so much more than a family to me! What could I say in words that could compare to Florestan's aria! How profound is the faith of Beethoven's Florestan. In the most desperate despair imaginable to man, he cries out from the depth of his soul, "God's

will is just!" Then, as in a prayer, he contemplates his dedication to truth, his humiliation, and his sweet consolation that his duty was done. And then—a sudden leap, a transformation—an angel appears!

What is an angel? An angel is the spirit of God

coming to you in a real form, a physical result of deep spiritual contemplation of love of God, of truth, and of doing one's duty—which I think must include the sacrifice of self and acceptance of earthly humiliation. The angel is the metaphor for the mind's creative spark, born of true love of God and his divine justice.

Is there anything more physically powerful than Florestan's outpouring of joy at the presence of his angel Leonora?

And is not the angel Leonora the physical embodiment of God's perfect love, leading not only Florestan, but subsequently all the people to freedom—the heavenly realm—through her equal devotion to duty and her perfect love for Florestan?

She appears to him, not as he is thinking about her, or despairing of his fate, but in his deepest devotion to God.

So I think that our angels don't come to us unless we truly love God's justice more than our own selves! And your equal sacrifices are a beautiful example of that divine love. So I am very happy that you both are angels for each other!

You are both angels to me.




Courtesy of Michael Billington

Mike's sister, Margaret Billington Greenspan, and Gail visit Mike in Nottoway prison, July 1995.



Courtesy of Michael Billington

The Goerner family in the 1950s. Gail is seated on her father's left.



EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Gail addresses the ICLC/Schiller Institute Martin Luther King Day conference on "The New Colonialism: LaRouche and Mahathir Were Right," Jan. 18, 1998.




EIRNS/Stuart Lewis

Left: Mike is released from the Loudoun County jail, following the Oct. 6, 1986 "panty raid" on the LaRouche offices in Leesburg, Va.



*Gail interviews
Cambodian Prime
Minister Hun Sen at the
PM's residence in
Phnom Penh, Jan. 18,
1999.*

Cambodian National TV/Ngin Sophea



*Gail and a colleague meet
with Dr. Mahathir bin
Mohamad, Prime Minister
of Malaysia (left), at his
residence Kuala Lumpur,
Jan. 22, 1999.*

Kassim of Bernama



*Gail and Mike with Dr. Su
Jing Xiang, Director of the
Center for Globalization
Studies, China Institutes for
Contemporary International
Relations, Beijing in 2007.*

Courtesy of Michael Billington

A Pyrrhic Victory?

The long-awaited decision by the German Constitutional Court on the constitutionality of the European Stability Mechanism and the Fiscal Pact, issued Sept. 12, gave the proponents of the European financial dictatorship virtually everything they wanted. But one may well ask: Is this another Pyrrhic victory for the oligarchy?

While one must allow for some complexities in the legal ruling, to be clarified over time, consider the immediate implications of this decision. On the one hand, the court has approved, with various technical caveats, the next giant step toward the elimination of all sovereignty and economic sanity in Europe, by allowing the policy of hyperinflation, combined with murderous austerity to go ahead. On the other, as Lyndon LaRouche noted on the eve of the decision, it is precisely that policy which portends a near-term hyperinflationary explosion in the trans-Atlantic financial system, emphatically including the United States. Oops! A victory turned into a smashing defeat.

On the other hand, the content of what is permitted is stark.

Start with the Fiscal Pact. This treaty, now approved by most Eurozone nations, imposes on all signatory countries a strict “balanced budget rule,” a purely monetarist deficit ceiling of 0.5% of GDP, and, in the event of “deviations” from the objectives, “a correction mechanism shall be triggered automatically.” With that, the EU Commission will de facto be able to dictate what and how many cuts in spending must be made. And on top of that, individual states are not allowed to opt out of the treaty!

The second treaty, which was the major bone of contention in the German court case, establishes what is called the European Stability Mechanism (ESM), also known as the “permanent bank bailout mechanism.” The powers

awarded to the ESM are truly dictatorial.

Article 9.3 states that member countries “hereby irrevocably and unconditionally undertake to pay on demand any capital call made on them by the Managing Director,” and that “such demand [is] to be paid within seven days of receipt.”

Article 10 empowers the Board of Governors to “decide to change the authorised capital stock,” i.e., demand more money from national governments, without consulting them.

Article 21 makes the creation of eurobonds, i.e., the pooling of debt, possible.

Article 32.2 gives the ESM “full legal capacity to . . . be a party to legal proceedings,” presumably against debtors, and Article 32.3 grants the ESM full legal immunity: “The ESM, its property, funding and assets, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall enjoy immunity from every form of judicial process. . . .”

Equally outrageous is Article 35: “the Managing Director and other staff members shall be immune from legal proceedings with respect to acts performed by them in their official capacity and shall enjoy inviolability in respect to their official papers and documents.”


Thus, with the ESM in effect, the existence of sovereign nation-states in Europe virtually disappears, into a supranational bankers’ dictatorship. The few fig leaves remaining—such as the demand that parliaments be consulted, and the like—are just that, fig leaves.

Most expect that the Federal Reserve, now meeting in D.C., will join in the new hyperinflationary orgy, in hopes of rescuing Obama’s re-election bid. Will that ploy blow up in their faces, as worthless paper floods the world? Will sane forces, especially in the U.S., finally be moved to take action, starting with Glass-Steagall?

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.



I would like to subscribe to **EIR Online**

(e-mail address must be provided.)

- \$360 for one year
 - \$180 for six months
 - \$120 for four months
 - \$90 for three months
 - \$60 for two months
- Send information on receiving **EIR** by mail.

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail address _____

—EIR Online can be reached at:

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: **fulfillment@larouchepub.com**

Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____