

The U.S.A. Holds The Key To Solving Eurasia's Conflicts

I ask you to shift your attention somewhat, from looking at the world, to looking at the world through my eyes. And look at the world through my eyes from the position I presently occupy in the United States, and from the circles with which I'm working, not only in our organization in the United States, but also with a large part of the senior circles of specialists in foreign policy, in military affairs, in intelligence, and in key elements of the Congress, among other sources.

At this particular point, it's obvious that if Bush were elected, there is not going to be a civilization. There may be wishful dreams, that somehow the world could survive, and outlive what a Bush Administration means, but that is a delusion, although it makes some people feel temporarily comfortable, until the contrary reality strikes.

Therefore the question that faces us now is, what is the United States going to do? And what does the United States face, as the realities it will understand? And largely because I'm part of it, part of the process of the understanding what the problems are we face over the coming eight years, which would be the expected term of office of the present candidate, Senator Kerry.

Now, you probably know from me, that my thinking is long term. I think that short-term thinking is stupid thinking. But unfortunately we live in a society in which short-term thinking, especially in the past 40 years, has become increasingly popular in Europe and in the United States. People don't like to think beyond next year.

We are living in an immediate-gratification culture or in an immediate-pain culture. We don't understand reality, and as I emphasized in the remarks here earlier this weekend, to me, stupidity is believing in Galileo, or to think the way he thought about things, of trying to treat the orbits of planets as caused by percussion. That is, you whack an object, like a tennis ball, and it follows a trajectory, and this is the general way people think about reality.

Reality is determined, however, quite differently. Reality is determined by assumptions, which most people take for granted; assumptions which take the same form as the definitions, axioms, and postulates of a fake geometry, otherwise known as Euclidean or Cartesian geometry. And, these ideas that are embedded in people through education remain permanent. They accept them as given, as virtually self-evident.

And they try to interpret everything from a sense-perceptual universe, as percussive action, connecting dots. You punch a ball, it goes in a certain direction, and you predict the result, as an immediate consequence of the action.

In reality, as I hope that Jonathan [Tennenbaum] will help to make clearer before the day is out,¹ in the real world, it doesn't work that way. For example, as I use the case of electricity: When we introduced electricity into the rural areas of the United States, beginning with the work by Franklin Roosevelt, we transformed agriculture, technologically, even without significant changes in the practice of agriculture otherwise. We made an environmental change, an axiomatic change, in the nature of the environment, which meant that all productivity, all productive action, now, was more efficient, even though the person who was performing the action was doing the same thing they'd done before. Now, by introducing electrification, we change the circumstances, which determined the *consequences* of his action. And therefore, the development of electricity, and the spread of electrification to rural areas, was the transformation of the agricultural potential of the United States, even though the changes by the farmer were limited. And those changes which *did* occur in the forms of the farmer's actions, were largely a result of the farmer's and agriculture's response, to the changes produced by electrification, and things of that sort.

In the same way, when agriculture was developed, more steel pipe went into agriculture than most people even know about. Agriculture was one of the great consumers of steel. And when the agriculture was shut down, largely, the independent agriculture, one of the chief sources of steel for the U.S. economy was the reprocessing of steel taken from broken-down farms. The farm went bankrupt, the farm was looted, the steel pipe used for water irrigation and so forth was taken out, melted down, and resold as new steel.

So that, it is what we do to the environment of individual action, in changing the principles, *physical principles which govern the effect of action*, which are most important.

This is also true in politics in general. For example: I have quite a record as a long-term forecaster. Back in 1957-58—or actually before then, but at that period, made a report—I did a study. It was done as a management-consulting report, on the forecast for the United States for the coming decade—economic forecast—which resulted in my forecasting two things: First of all, the immediate 1957 recession, which I called on the button, by the month. But, a longer-term forecast, at which I said: If—*if*—and “if” is the most important word in all forecasting, and all intelligence estimates, and all strategic estimates; *if* the United States continues to go in the direction of changes, changes in economic policy, characteristic of the period since the end of the war, especially the

1. Jonathan Tennenbaum's speech on “The Coming Triple Shock of the Physical Economic, Financial, and Cultural Crisis,” was published in last week's *EIR*.



Lyndon H. LaRouche, at the panel on “Strategy of Tension,” greets a supporter. To his left are: Hrant Khachatryan, Michael Liebig, Altay Unaltay, and Konstantin Cherenmykh.

policy trends established under Arthur Burns, as the advisor, then, to President Eisenhower, that by the middle of the 1960s, the United States and the world would enter a new phase, a phase of crises in the Bretton Woods system, which would lead, if they continued, into a general breakdown of the existing form of the Bretton Woods system, by about the end of the 1960s. . . .

But then, Kennedy was killed, and although Johnson was not a bad fellow, he had rifles pointed at him. . . . So he was scared. He capitulated. He went with the policy that Kennedy had opposed, and that he had opposed, launching the Indo-China War. The right wing had taken over. And they began to destroy the U.S. economy, by going to *precisely* the policies which I had warned against in this 1957-58 report.

And the system, 1967, the British system collapsed, the British pound sterling. Early 1968, the U.S. dollar began to collapse. Nineteen seventy-one, the decision was made, to collapse the international monetary system. It happened.

All these things that were happening, were obvious to me; and they should have been obvious to other people, but they weren't. People assumed that they could project, statistically, from trends the way things were going. They were always wrong. So the key thing you have to do in planning strategy is, don't try to get the “who hit whom” theory of strategy.

History Is Defined by Turning Points

All important events are embedded in the situation, *long before* most people even dream they're possible. Therefore, history is defined by turning points. And, the turning points of history are not always the most conspicuous changes, in terms of their effects. It's a change in behavior. It's like giving

birth, or conception of a child. The woman may be pregnant and may not realize it until some months later. In history, today, an adult is produced after 19 to 25 years, after conception.

All things important are like that—the seeds, a change in the characteristics of society, is introduced as a small development, and it spreads, and is to take effect. And one day, perhaps too late to change things, the consequence of planting that seed has become reality.

That's my experience in politics. That's my experience, why I always am way ahead of the pace, but I'm always right, on this kind of matter. Because most people are looking, trying to explain things in terms of “who hit whom.” The percussive theory of history; the Galileo theory of history. And, what you have to look at is the sometimes subtle changes,

in policy, or practice, or technology, or principles of science, which are introduced, or taken out. And, you think, for the time being: It's all right, things aren't going to change that much. The trends are established. Public opinion is convinced. Therefore, it must be true. Then one day the change comes, and hits you!—as if in the back of the head.

And that's what we're dealing with, in these matters of strategic warfare, these kinds of things. For example: The famous one in 1983, February 1983. About one year after I had begun conducting a back-channel discussion, on behalf of President Reagan, with the Soviet government, on what became known as the SDI, which had been my proposal to the Reagan Administration. At that time, I had a report, from Shershnev, who represented the relevant institution of the Soviet Union, connecting me to Moscow: He said his government, the Andropov government, would reject what I proposed, if offered by the President of the United States, and indicated what the policy of the Soviet Union would be, a policy which we knew later as the Ogarkov Plan. And I said to him, then, to Shershnev—Helga was there at the time, at that famous meeting we had in a hotel in Washington, D.C. I said, “Well, if your government does that, your economy will collapse within about five years.”

So, the decision made, when Andropov rejected that offer, made by Reagan, on March 23, 1983, *sealed the doom of the Soviet Union!* And the Soviet system. Did they think so at that time? No. Did the Americans generally think that way, at that time? No. Did the Europeans think that way, at that time? A few did! Including a few in Germany, some of whom are now dead, who worked with me, on this project.

In 1988, Oct. 12—Columbus Day in the United States—



Presidents Putin and Bush at Camp David, Sept. 27, 2003. “Propitiating Bush is the worst thing that Putin could do for the future of Russia,” said LaRouche.”

is a threat from the United States and Britain! The crisis in Transcaucasia, targetting Central Asia, and Russia, is run by the Anglo-Americans. And the Vice President of the United States, Dick Cheney, is one of the key architects *behind* the actions, which led to what happened in North Ossetia. That’s a fact. It’s known to us, in the United States in my circles, that that’s the case.

It’s known that the response by Putin is not responsible, in the sense it’s not competent in dealing with this kind of problem. Propitiating Bush, is the worst thing that Putin could do for the future of Russia. It’s a *terrible, strategic mistake*, and shows certain weaknesses in the Russian government, the fact that that mistake could occur. The Russian government should be smart enough *not to make that mistake*.

Helga and I went to Berlin, on the 11th; we gave a press conference on the 12th, and said the system is about to come down, and Berlin would probably be designated soon, as the capital of a reunified Germany.

It happened the next year.

Was the United States prepared? No. Was the D.D.R. prepared? *Not at all!* Shows you what kind of a stupid government they had over there! Didn’t know what was happening. Was the world prepared for it? No. I had forecast it. How did it happen? It happened because of the effect of principles which people pretended did not exist, or pretended were inconsequential because of other considerations. And they went ahead.

That’s what we’re in now. We are now in a situation—as I said—if *Bush were re-elected, civilization would soon begin to disappear*, and there’s nothing that any other part of the world could do, that is capable of doing, to prevent that from occurring: That is, if this thing goes wrong in the United States, Europe, Eurasia, *have no way that they’re capable of now, of preventing an absolute catastrophe, a dark age*. Therefore, we’re at the point, where that dark age must be prevented, and it must be prevented by the action in the United States of electing the right President, in the short term, and his carrying out the actions, of which the United States is capable, to prevent that thing from happening.

These are the kinds of realities that people try to deny. And they deny this by going into what I call, sometimes, fishbowl games. Now, all these things of irregular warfare are not controlled by the governments that deploy them. They come almost by instinct. For example, the former Soviet government is going to react, almost by instinct, to *what it knows*

But, it’s made the mistake: Why? The same principle: Operating on the basis of assumptions, in which conceited assumptions, people assume, “Oh no, we can handle this. We don’t have to take that into account.” Well, it comes, and it hits them in the back of the head.

Shift the Way We Think

So therefore, my concern here is that we shift our attention, in considering the kinds of reports we’ve had from our panel here today—and other sources—shift the way we think about them. Don’t try to interpret them as a “who is going to hit whom,” in the short term, kind of report. Don’t get involved too much with the detail. Take the details into account, but don’t let the details govern the way you think. You have to apply the right way of thinking, to interpreting the details.

And *most of the details you have to look at* are the ones you’re ignoring.

If you think you’ve got all the facts, and you’re going to interpret those facts, and find out what that means, you’re wrong. It’s the facts that you’re ignoring, in most cases, which are going to hurt you the most.

You have to look at these things as processes, processes that extend over periods of generations. Take the whole post-war period. An event, the death of Franklin Roosevelt, changed world history. If Roosevelt had lived, Truman would not have come to power, and Churchill’s England would not have dominated the world, including the United States.

The Indispensable U.S. Role

Foolish people today think the problems of the world come from the United States. That’s foolishness. They don’t



Prime Minister Tony Blair and President Bush, May 28, 2002. “Foolish people today think the problems of the world come from the United States. That’s foolishness. . . . They come from the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, whose center of power is here in Europe, not in the United States.” Blair’s fascist government typifies the problem.

come from the United States: They come from the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, whose center of power is here in Europe, not in the United States. The problem we have in the United States is, we have an extension of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system, through traditional centers like Wall Street; and through the law firms of Wall Street and Washington, D.C.; and through the financial houses of Wall Street and Washington, D.C., which control our Justice Department, for example; which represent the right wing in our country, which is actually a fascist right wing, together with the fascist British Fabian Society, the fascist government of Tony Blair in Britain—and don’t kid yourself that it’s anything *but* a fascist government—and similar, allied forces in Europe.

That’s where the danger comes from.

So, in looking at this from the standpoint of the United States, where I, in my position, am concerned that the United States take the actions, which *it must take, and is uniquely responsible to take, to save the world from a plunge into hell*, which no one on this planet can prevent, now, unless the United States takes a certain action, first.

My concern is to mobilize Europe, above all, in cooperation with the United States, so that we together, can make the offers to the rest of the world, the changes that have to be made. The first thing we *must* change, if we’re going to survive: We have to *sink the present world monetary-financial system*. It’s going to go bankrupt, and *if you don’t shut down the present system, of central banking—if the European Union policies now in progress continue, forget the human race!* That change has to be made.

The change may seem small, but it’s decisive. Unless the

United States, and Europe, agree, to *shut down* this kind of system—the kind of system that dictates this crazy Hartz IV in Germany, and similar things; unless we agree, we can not create an international, new monetary system, through which this world can get out of this mess. And if we do not create the new monetary system we require, and launch programs of expansion, of the type that the BüSo [Civil Rights Movement Solidarity, the LaRouche party in Germany] did in Saxony—it’s the only sensible thing that happened, in response to the crisis was that, in Saxony. If we do not carry out those kinds of policies, which require the massive creation of credit; which require the suspension, through bankruptcy reorganization, of bankrupt financial institutions, without which it won’t work; if we do not create a new world monetary system, with the characteristics of those which Roosevelt launched in 1944 as the Bretton Woods

system, this world hasn’t got a chance.

Recognize the Real Enemy

And therefore, these are the kinds of challenges. What we’re dealing with, with so-called irregular warfare, is what? You’re dealing with an obvious intention. What is the intention? We’ve dealt with it before. The intention is, by people who represented the ultramontane system, of Venice, and Venice’s alliance with the Norman chivalry, which was called the ultramontane system, from the end of about 1000 A.D., until the 15th-Century Renaissance. *That system*, which is the British Empire’s continuation, in a modern disguise; the Dutch bankers, the British bankers, their imitations throughout Europe, are a continuation of the Venetian financier oligarchy. The military forces that are being used in *aid* of the bankers; the military forces control of governments; other irregular warfare forces are being used by this agency, which is a modern continuation of that Venetian system.

Therefore, what we have to do is recognize, that we have to destroy the enemy. The enemy is not persons as such; the enemy is not states as such. The enemy is a force in society, whose expression is, the British Empire! And the British Empire dominates the world today! People think, other things dominate—they don’t! Because as long as you believe in money; as long as you believe that money has an independent authority; if you believe that money has a moral content, then you’re a victim of the system, and you’re *a part* of the system, which is causing our destruction.

We have to go back to the idea of physical values, of production of physical values, of improving the environment.



The Pentagon after the terrorist attack of 9/11. LaRouche forecast, months before, that due to the onrushing depression, the synarchist forces—the same circles that put Hitler into power in 1933—would pull off a “Reichstag fire” provocation, as the pretext for implementing police-state conditions inside the United States. “It happened!”

Get those windmills down, and let some nuclear power stations in! If we don't go to physical values, and free ourselves from subjugation to the wisdom of the economists, the wisdom of the accountants; if we don't get back to physical values; if we don't get back to high-tech, that is, to scientific progress; if we don't get back to increasing the percentile of the population, which is trained in science; if we don't get back to insisting on something equivalent to the Humboldt reforms in education, which were taken away in Germany: If we don't do those kinds of things, we're going nowhere on this planet.

And the things that destroy these values, the things that take away our high-technology plants, that take away our improved agriculture, our improved industries, which take away our obligation to develop the undeveloped sections of the world, for the benefit of their people: If we don't change to that kind of system, and say that money is merely a tool which we use to facilitate circulation of goods; if we don't get back to a *state* system, a system based on *sovereign nation-states*; if we don't give the absolute power in monetary affairs, to sovereign nation-states; if we don't emphasize that approximately 50% of the total activity of an economy must be according to the *American System*—not the British system, the so-called capitalist system, but the American System—heavy investment in basic economic infrastructure and development—and the rest devoted to promotion of something equivalent of what we call the *Mittelstand* in Germany, the high-technology-driven, the morally driven firm, which is trying to create something good, make it grow, for the benefit of the society around it, not something to make a profit from. Not to

make a loss, but something to grow for that benefit.

This is where the problems lie.

We fail, we are blind to reality. We focus upon false values. We put our confidence in false values. And therefore, things that sneak up on us, that we ignore, kill us and destroy us. That's all there is to irregular warfare! It's simple! If you realize that the power that's being exerted against us is banker power, you have no problem in understanding terrorism. Who's running terrorism? Who ran 9/11? The bankers!

I did a forecast, for example, just to conclude this: I gave a forecast, before Bush was actually installed as President. I gave it as a webcast forecast, as part of a series of commentaries, on this process after Nov. 7, 2000. I said: Since we're already going into a depression, and since Bush is stupid: Number one, the depression is going to accelerate—as it did. Second: Since we're

faced with a situation in the world, like that which was faced by the time they put Hitler into power, on Jan. 30, 1933, in Germany, somebody is going to do pretty soon, what Goering did for Hitler: Set fire to the Reichstag! Which was done by Hermann Göring. And we had a Hermann Göring, in the woodwork in the United States, who organized what happened to the Twin Towers in New York City, on Sept. 11, 2001. And that was used *exactly* the way I said it would be used: to attempt to create dictatorial, police-state conditions inside the United States, and lead us into adventures, as Hitler led Germany into adventures. *It happened!*

Now, stopping the war in Iraq was an important attempt, but that wasn't the most important thing. Some people thought stopping the war in Iraq was the most important issue. It was not! That was the immediate effect. I was proceeding from a higher purpose. Yes, try to stop the war, trying to prevent it. But I didn't gamble on stopping the war. I concentrated on laying the seeds for the *destruction* of the agency that had brought about the war! And, I ran an election campaign, with that in mind. And, when the time came, I supported Kerry, as a putative, electable candidate, in order to stop this, to *uproot this evil*, which is embedded in what? In the *British Empire!* In the Venetian-style, international, *Anglo-Dutch Liberal system*, which is worshipped in Europe! Which is treated as a virtual *god* in Europe!

Fortunately, in my country, under the right President, with our Constitution, it is not a god. And, it is for that reason, and that part of our character, which even generations of corruption do not eliminate from the culture of the people of the

United States: that with the right President of the United States, and with what *can be* the majority in the Congress, what represents the hard core of our Federal government professionals, we can rally, as we did around Franklin Roosevelt; we can put the present international financial-monetary system into bankruptcy reorganization. We will *sink* the IMF in its present form! We will *bankrupt* the present system. We will *free* people, from the present system. We will *stop* the cutting of standards of living. We will *stop* the cutting of pensions. We will create growth—American methods, American System methods.

We can do that. And I think that if we don't do that, everything else in the world, while it may be useful otherwise, will turn out to be something of a waste of time.

What you're dealing with now, in security problems, the Anglo-Dutch Liberals, otherwise known as fascists—they're Liberals on Sunday, and fascists on Monday—they will move, as they plan. Not only to take out Iran—they'll take out Iran, either with nuclear weapons, or otherwise. They'll take out Syria. Not because it's a smart thing to do, but because it's *in their instinct*, to do it. They will start a war with China. They will attack Russia. They are determined to destroy Russia! Bush may not know what he's doing, but they are determined, those behind him, are determined to destroy Russia, absolutely. They are determined to *eliminate* the existence of the nation-state in Europe! That's what the European Union project is all about: Eliminate the nation state! And turn us into a dark age. That's their intention.

It's not an intention, because they understand what they're

doing—some people do. But, it's an intention, because it is embedded in the characteristics of the institutions which are deployed.

What we're dealing with, with what we call irregular warfare, or invisible warfare, or whatnot, is nothing, but techniques which are there. And they're used, by instinct, not by understanding. And the reason we consider them mysterious, is because we refuse to see what the hand of the enemy is. If you admit, that every Anglo-Dutch Liberal is ideologically your enemy, and you recognize that it is he, who deploys these kinds of actions, then there's no longer a mystery as to why things happen.

There are very few mysteries that are true mysteries, in this kind of life today. What we call mysteries, what we call secret, what we call covert, is not what is really hidden. It's what our own blindness prevents us from seeing.

If you understand the enemy, the identity of the enemy; if you understand his objectives; if you understand what it is he wants to destroy, then you recognize the problem.

If you wish to pretend that these are nice nation-states; and these are European or other traditions; that this is the way things should be; that things do happen that way: If you believe that, you're a fool. And you say, "This is mysterious."

For me, it's not mysterious. I know the enemy. How many people are willing to say, "Anglo-Dutch Liberalism is our enemy"? And to trace all of our problems to the effects of the actions of Anglo-Dutch Liberalism. That's our problem.

It's not that we can't see, but that we prefer to be blind.

Austria's Dr. Hans Klecatsky Welcomes LaRouche's Role

Prof. Dr. Hans Klecatsky, former Justice Minister of the Republic of Austria, and professor emeritus of the Institute for Public Law at the University of Innsbruck, sent this message of greeting to the Schiller Institute conference.

For quite some time, I've been following with great interest, the work of your international organization, and I am very, especially impressed by the courageous way that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche has set himself openly against the disastrous policies of the neo-conservative forces. When I hear the daily horror news coming out of Iraq, and see at the same time, the threatening gestures against other states, like Iran or North Korea, then I shudder in horror. And I can only hope that Mr. LaRouche succeeds in influencing Presidential candidate John Kerry's campaign, that he succeeds in such a way that Kerry recaptures the basic value

of traditional domestic, foreign and economic policy. And thereby wing the coming elections. A re-election of George W. Bush and Dick Cheney means a serious threat to the peaceful future of Europe, the whole world, and naturally, for the U.S. itself.

One of the merits of the international LaRouche organization, is that it is beginning to succeed in making this understood in Europe.

The high price that Mr. LaRouche has paid for his engagement, is very well known to me. I, myself, am among those jurists and statesmen from all over the world, who warned of the dangerous consequences of the abuse of justice, in the so-called "LaRouche case." The sad examples from Guantanamo Bay, from the Abu Ghraib prison, or the general undermining of the principles of law under the banner of the war on terrorism, demonstrate just how precise and relevant our warnings were, at the time.

I therefore want, once again, to assure you of my support for the meritorious activity of your organization, and to wish especially Mr. LaRouche, strength and good health.