

If U.S. Patriots Defeat the Tory Faction, We Can Stop the Drive to War

The following is an interview with Lyndon LaRouche by Iran's IRIB Radio, broadcast across that country on July 13-15. The interview was conducted by host Mehdi Gerami Fard via telephone.

IRIB Radio: In our previous interview with you [in March 2002], you compared the U.S.'s policies with those of the Roman Empire, and there is a book published recently by Italian theorist Antonio Negri and American researcher Michael Hardt, *Empire*. How do you compare the U.S.'s policies to the Roman Empire's?

LaRouche: Actually, this is more. This is not just the U.S. There's a faction in the United States which came to power after the assassination of Kennedy, President Kennedy, which is called the "utopian faction." Its origins are British, not the U.S. But, of course, there is a faction *in* the United States which is very pro-British monarchy. There is a crowd in the Boston area, in particular, at Harvard University, students of the former professor, William Yandell Elliott, such as Kissinger, Huntington, Brzezinski, and so forth, who are among the best-known exponents of this proposal for a U.S.—or an English-speaking world—new Roman Empire. So, this crowd has been—this was represented in the Nixon Administration, Brzezinski's control over the Carter Administration, and one faction inside the Reagan Administration, the Bush Administration, and elements, of course, such as Al Gore and so forth, within the Clinton Administrations.

So it's a division within the United States, between a patriotic tradition, and what's called the "American Tory tradition." The American Tories, during the post-war period, especially since Eisenhower left office, have been committed to this kind of policy. So in that sense, you can say, that over this period, there has been a long-term trend toward an imitation of the Roman Empire.

IRIB Radio: Some believe that the Bush Administration is following the theories made by Zbigniew Brzezinski in his book, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. Your comments, please?

LaRouche: It's the same thing: Kissinger—the same thing. Kissinger's policies are Brzezinski's policies, and those of the RAND Corporation, those of the Olin Foundation, the

various Mellon foundations and so forth. These all have essentially the same policy. Brzezinski is a lackey, he's a mouthpiece—one of the more prominent mouthpieces—for this kind of policy.

IRIB Radio: Do you believe in a theory that "no matter which administration takes the power in the U.S., it will go ahead to be the only superpower in the world?"

LaRouche: Not necessarily. As I say, there are two tendencies in the United States, from the beginning of the republic. One was a so-called "American patriotic tradition," which is nationalist, that is, it's for a community of nation-states, not an empire. The other faction, which is called the "American Tory tradition," is for this kind of empire.

IRIB Radio: French researcher Thierry Meyssan, in his books *The Pentagate* and *The Horrible Lie: The Pentagon Plane Crash That Never Happened*, proved that the Bush Administration was aware of the Sept. 11 attacks and received warnings but did not act to stop it, and that it was not a plane which crashed into the Pentagon, rather it was a missile. Then, U.S. Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney [D-Ga.] accused the government of ignoring the warnings it received before Sept. 11. Your opinion, please?

LaRouche: First of all, Meyssan's work is a mish-mash. Some things are true, but many things are untrue. His story about the Pentagon is a fraudulent one, which was obviously passed off on him, and he bought it. Many of the things he says are not trustworthy.

Cynthia McKinney was misled, but she's an honest person. I have a great deal of personal respect for her, but she was misinformed. The United States—the Presidency as such—did not have a warning of Sept. 11. There were warnings of other things, not the air crashes into buildings.

The thing was done by a secret group, and it kept it secret, until they did it. It was a highly sophisticated operation and it was done to *force* the Bush Administration to follow the kinds of policies we've seen since, as the policy of so-called war on terrorism, which is actually a perpetual war, to establish a world empire.

IRIB Radio: It seems that the U.S. is trying to change the

borders and geographical lines of the Middle East and Persian Gulf countries, and to have the oil and gas resources under its control through the Balkans. What is your reaction?

LaRouche: This is an old policy. It was actually started—it first came to the surface, in various forms, during the 1960s. It was introduced permanently by Henry Kissinger, in a secret memorandum called National Security Study Memorandum 200, in 1974, at a time when Kissinger was National Security Adviser as well as Secretary of State.

Now, Kissinger's argument is—for an English-speaking world empire, Roman-style—his argument is, along with people like Supreme Court Justice Scalia, and so forth, a doctrine called “shareholder value.” Their argument is, under the tradition of John Locke, the English liberal—their argument is that the English-speaking powers, *own*, rightly *own*, the raw materials of the world. And that the people living in parts of Asia or Africa or South and Central America, *have no right* to these natural resources. Therefore, the United States, together with England, *must*, according to Kissinger and others, must make sure that the populations of these parts of the world do not grow, because if the populations grow, they will use up resources which Kissinger has reserved for the United States in the future.

Second, the raw materials of the world—oil, minerals, and so forth—must be controlled by the United States. The people in those countries have no right to those minerals, according to Kissinger and people who think like him. So this is a policy which is—it's *Global 2000*, introduced under Brzezinski, when Brzezinski was controlling the Carter Administration; it is *Global Futures*, it is mostly the environmentalist movement, which was organized by the British monarchy, on this principle: that the people of the world must not be allowed to increase their populations, nor use the natural resources which sit in their areas.

IRIB Radio: So they believe it is not the people of these countries who should control the oil and gas resources, but rather the U.S.?

LaRouche: Not the U.S.: It's an English-speaking cabal; it's Australia, it's New Zealand, it's the United Kingdom, some people in Canada—some people in Canada disagree, of course—and it is this faction, the American Tory faction in the United States. They are united in this policy. It's not a U.S. empire, it's an English-speaking empire. That's the theory.

IRIB Radio: In his policies, Mr. Bush doesn't pay much attention to the economy: The unemployment rate is increasing day after day, there is a sagging economy, and the dollar has lost its value against the euro. Why should there be such a position?

LaRouche: First of all, the President is not the most intelligent citizen of the United States. I think that's well known. I don't think he really knows what he's doing much of the time.

He's a puppet, who's used by people who control him. I don't think he knows what he's doing.

Now, the reality is, that everyone in leading circles, in Europe and in the United States, now knows that the present world monetary and financial system is collapsing. It will collapse. Nothing can prevent it, except a change in the system. Therefore, at this time, many of the military impulses, the aggressive impulses coming from the United States, from the Blair government in Britain, and so forth, these things are impelled by *terror*, knowing that the financial system is about to collapse. For example, we have in England, and in the United States: The biggest source of an imminent financial collapse, is the real estate speculative bubble. Japan's yen may collapse. Many things are going on, which can blow the system out. We can be, in a very short period of time, in a period where the whole international financial system has collapsed. And this is what is driving the rage and fear of the U.S. administration, and many others.

IRIB Radio: You mentioned that the U.S. President is not the most intelligent man in the U.S., and there are some people who control him. Who are these persons?

LaRouche: This is the American Tory faction—people like Kissinger, the Brzezinskis, the RAND Corporation crowd, the Mellon Foundation, people like that. It's these powerful groups, tied to finance, behind the scenes, who control George Bush as their chosen puppet.

IRIB Radio: How do you compare the support of U.S. public opinion for the so-called “war on terrorism,” immediately after Sept. 11 and just now?

LaRouche: This is typical. You have—the American people behave, often, like the citizens of the Roman Empire. They are governed by what they perceive to be popular opinion, which is orchestrated by mass-entertainment media and things like that.

So, at present, my reading is, that, in the United States, there is a phase-change occurring, the population is moving in the direction of a fundamental change, and the economic issue is bringing it to the fore.

IRIB Radio: Considering that the U.S. has withdrawn from the International Criminal Court, the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty, the Kyoto protocol [global warming], and [given] its one-sided militaristic policies, would European countries continue the support of the U.S. administration or not?

LaRouche: Now, the U.S. is right on this one, but for the wrong reason. The Bush Administration is opposed to the Criminal Court, because of the fear that Ariel Sharon could be put on trial, and that's what the pressure is.

But they're right.

The problem is, you can not have an international, supra-

I'm probably the only figure internationally, who both knows what the situation is and is willing to speak out publicly. Therefore, my job is to speak out publicly, to get these things on the table. By forcing these issues on the table, we may be able to force the discussion and deliberation which stops these things from happening.

national law. You can have, under war-time conditions, you can have war crimes; you can have crimes against humanity, which are like war crimes. Under very special circumstances, you could have international authorities deal with a war-like situation.

But different parts of the world have different axiomatic policies, different conceptions of law, different ideas of legal principle. You can not impose upon them one international law, because they don't agree, in the philosophy of law. They may agree with some things; and therefore, this idea of having a supranational criminal court, I'm opposed to it. I support the use of international law under certain special circumstances, as in the case of war, a defeated nation in war, or in case of crimes against humanity, which is like war. But in general, I do not believe that we can pass over the responsibility of sovereign nation-states, to international bodies. And the problem is, different nations, different cultures, have different fundamental law. We can not impose one law, arbitrarily, on different nations with different conceptions of legal principles.

IRIB Radio: What about Sharon?

LaRouche: Sharon is not, exactly, a very nice person. He's evil, he's a fascist. His whole crowd, this whole Likud crowd—Netanyahu, Shamir, and so forth—this crowd in Israel are absolutely downright evil. They're comparable to the Nazis. They have great ambition.

But they're being used, by the Anglo-Americans, as a hand grenade, a political hand grenade. You throw a hand grenade against the Islamic world, which is what they're doing.

The idea is to cause *chaos*, to facilitate setting up a world empire. In the process, as leading Israelis have said: That if Israel continues this kind of policy, Israel itself will be destroyed by its own actions. And there are those in the United States, who are called Zionists, who generally are gangsters—that's their qualification. And they are, of course, a controlling influence over Israel, particularly over people like Sharon. They are a factor. But they are not the real factor. They are a tool being used by certain English-speaking powers, like a hand grenade being used against an adversary. You throw it, you support it by throwing it, and you expect it to explode in your enemy's camp.

IRIB Radio: What do you think of the possibility of an attack against Iraq or Iran?

LaRouche: There is a faction in the United States, around George Bush—not as a thinker, but as the instrument—who are presently absolutely committed to an attack on Iraq. This is the so-called ideologues.

The military are not against an attack on Iraq, but they are against it at this time, because they think it's insane. They're not against the attack in principle, they're against the attack from a practical, military standpoint. But the lunatics, such as Wolfowitz, Perle, and other lunatics in the Bush circle, these people are actually determined—so is Lieberman in the Democratic Party, and so is McCain in the Republican Party—actually committed to this.

And the danger is, despite the fact that Europe, in general, is opposed to it, the danger is that they might actually do it. *They can not win that kind of war.* They can cause chaos, which is worse than war, but they can't win it. But they may do it anyway. They're insane.

IRIB Radio: What do you mean, they can't win?

LaRouche: Because if you go into that kind of war, as people in Iran will understand from their experience of the Iran-Iraq War, there are certain kinds of war which can not be intrinsically won. Especially religious war: You can never *win* religious war, wars among religions. Because wars among religions do not stop, they go on until they burn out, like a forest fire that burns out. The effect of starting such a war is a wave of destruction which, in the case of Israel—. Look, Israel is sitting among Arabs, they're next-door neighbors. How can you use weapons, effectively, against an enemy who is in your own territory? How can you go into other countries with a limited population, and do the same thing, by doing horrible damage with large-scale weapons? You can not win the war. You can start chaos—and it would be chaos, that would destroy the Israelis, just as chaos destroyed much of Europe.

You had a period of religious war in Europe, from the time of Henry II of England through essentially Richard III of England. You had a period of religious war, led by the Hapsburgs, from about the time of 1511 until 1648, in Europe, which was stopped by the Treaty of Westphalia. We've had experience with religious war. We've also seen the war in

Vietnam, and similar kinds of wars. These kinds of wars should not be started, and can not actually be won. They can destroy, but they create chaos, and ultimately chaos will have effects upon the world at large.

IRIB Radio: What are the ramifications of adopting such a policy by the U.S.?

LaRouche: Enough about the U.S. The Israelis have Iran targetted, as I think everybody knows. The threat is, immediately, that Israel has three German-made submarines which are equipped with cruise missiles. These cruise missiles carry nuclear warheads. Israel is the third nuclear power in the world.

Israel is crazy. Unless it's stopped, it is capable, under people like Sharon and the people behind him, of launching an attack on Iran, as well as on Iraq. This is a danger. It's a danger I think we have to be very much concerned about. I think Europe is concerned about it, others are concerned about it. We've got to stop it. But it *is* a danger.

IRIB Radio: What do you think will happen?

LaRouche: I think we're at a point, where it is very difficult to say what the reaction will be, because you get to certain points in history where you have turbulence, chaos. You don't have a very clear, consistent line.

The United States is now in the process of blowing up, internally, politically. We are on the verge of the collapse of a giant mortgage bubble. We have other financial problems. These financial crises, which are not ignored by the people, the American people generally, are causing a phase-change in politics inside the United States right now. You can not project, no one can predict exactly, what U.S. policy will be, six months from now, or even three months from now, because the intervention of a major financial blowout, internationally, will change politics, worldwide, immediately.

IRIB Radio: What about the new Roman Empire?

LaRouche: It's just a form of insanity. As I often said to people—I was in Italy recently—who, naturally, with their knowledge of the Roman Empire, understand this, immediately: Is that the United States, together with the British monarchy, and the Australians and the New Zealanders and some Canadians, have decided to create a world Roman Empire with a Nazi-like force, which is their military policy. The problem they have is, Rome started its empire when Rome was at the height of its power. These evil idiots have launched an attempt to consolidate a world empire at a time when the Roman Empire is at its end, not at its beginning. So, the very historical circumstances are against them. They can cause chaos; they could never establish a secure empire. It's too late for them.

The danger to civilization is chaos, a homicidal chaos. The danger is a Dark Age. The United States and people in it, can not win this kind of war they're projecting. *They are*

insane. But they can cause chaos. My concern is to try to save humanity from that chaos.

IRIB Radio: What do you think their goal in the region is?

LaRouche: They do intend to seize the oil. They do intend to seize natural resources. They do intend to cause wars among different currents in Islam, and other groups. They intend to do that, and that is an immediate danger, that's an immediate prospect, which we have to recognize and deal with.

IRIB Radio: Some believe that if there are some countries to be attacked, because they are not democratic, it should be Jordan, Saudi Arabia, or Egypt.

LaRouche: These nations are targetted; they know it, I know it, other people know it, Europeans know it. Europeans are cowardly.

My problem, as a political figure, is I'm probably the only figure internationally, who both knows what the situation is and is willing to speak out publicly. Therefore, my job is to speak out publicly, to get these things on the table. By forcing these issues on the table, we may be able to force the discussion and deliberation which stops these things from happening.

IRIB Radio: But they are going ahead.

LaRouche: In a sense, that's happening, but I don't think that's the only story. I think the United States can be changed. Because what you see on the surface now is not the American people, nor is it our tradition. And if we can awaken our tradition, as we have with Franklin Roosevelt and so forth in the past, we can deal with this, and end it. But that's the danger.

IRIB Radio: Some say that the Roman constitution was more valuable than others at that time, and that that was the reason for the creation of the Roman Empire. Is the U.S. Constitution more valuable than others now?

LaRouche: Well, the U.S. Constitution is, but the U.S. Constitution is not observed by the leading circles in the United States. The Roman constitution was not a good constitution; it was an evil one. As a matter of fact, the Roman constitution was the basis for the evil of the Roman Empire, contrary to what some people teach. The United States Constitution, on the contrary, is against what the Roman Empire represents, and against what this crowd today, in Washington today, represents. My attempt is to force the restoration of the application of the Constitution, especially its Preamble, on the present situation. If we could do that, if the Constitution were reactivated, in that situation, we would not have these problems.

IRIB Radio: Thank you, Mr. LaRouche.

LaRouche: My best wishes to you and your associates. I hope we meet sometime soon.