

[return to home page](#)

This Week You Need To Know...

THE VERY UGLY TRUTH ABOUT MICHAEL LEDEEN

The 'Universal Fascism' Behind the Cheney Cabal

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The awesome power of a free society committed to a single mission is something [our enemies] cannot imagine.... Our unexpectedly quick and impressive victory in Afghanistan is a prelude to a much broader war, which will in all likelihood transform the Middle East for at least a generation, and reshape the politics of many older countries around the world.

—From Michael Ledeen's book, *War Against the Terror Masters*

On March 10, 2003, in a revealing profile of President George Bush's political Svengali, Karl Rove, the *Washington Post* reported that when the President's man needs advice on the war on terrorism or other national security matters, he turns to one man in particular: Michael Ledeen.

Ledeen told the *Post* that the two men met shortly after Bush's 2000 election. "He said, 'Anytime you have a good idea, tell me.' " Ledeen obliged, passing on faxes to Rove on a regular basis. According to the *Post*, "More than once, Ledeen has seen his ideas, faxed to Rove, become official policy or rhetoric."

Now, as Karl Rove sweats out the possibility of indictment in the Valerie Plame leak investigation, his Ledeen ties may come back to haunt him. And Rove is not alone. Ledeen, according to a wide range of American and Italian sources, has emerged as a central player in the intrigue of the century: the forging of Niger government documents and the use of those shoddy fakes by Vice President Dick Cheney and others, to shove the unjustified and disastrous Iraq War down the throats of the U.S. Congress, the American people, and the United Nations, on the basis of the bogus claim that Saddam Hussein was on the verge of having a nuclear bomb.

In the wake of the Oct. 28 criminal indictment and resignation of Vice President Cheney's chief of staff and alter ego, I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, for his role in the Plame leak, sources report that the Special Counsel probe will now enter an expanded new phase, focussed on more underlying issues of how the United States came into the Iraq War, and the specific role the Niger forgeries hoax played in that process. According to a variety of sources, confidential documents from an Italian parliamentary probe into the Niger hoax, have been recently provided to prosecutor Patrick Fitzgerald. Those documents reportedly name a number of American spooks, including Ledeen, as suspects in the hoax: former CIA "Iran-Contra" figure Duane Clarridge; former CIA Rome station chief Allan Wolfe; and Gen. Wayne Downing (USA-ret.), a longtime mentor of the Iraqi National Congress's leader Ahmed Chalabi....

...full version (pdf)

InDepth Coverage

Links to articles from

Executive Intelligence Review, Vol. 32, No. 43

*Requires Adobe Reader®.

Feature:

THE VERY UGLY TRUTH ABOUT MICHAEL LEDEEN

The 'Universal Fascism' Behind the Cheney Cabal

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The awesome power of a free society committed to a single mission is something [our enemies] cannot imagine. . . . Our unexpectedly quick and impressive victory in Afghanistan is a prelude to a much broader war, which will in all likelihood transform the Middle East for at least a generation, and reshape the politics of many older countries around the world. —*From Michael Ledeen's book, War Against the Terror Masters*

Ledeen's Beloved 'Universal Fascism': Venetian War Against the Nation-State

by Allen and Rachel Douglas

Seeing Michael Ledeen named, in La Repubblica's Oct. 2527 'Nigergate, the Grand Deception' series, as a conduit of the now notorious fake documents used in launching the Iraq War, comes as no surprise. To anyone familiar with the career of neo-conservative propagandist and off-and-on U.S. government official Ledeen, and his campaigning for war with Iraq and, next, Iran, it would have been a shock had he not surfaced in that connection—especially since the venue of the forged documentation on Saddam Hussein's imagined search for yellowcake in Niger was Italy, Ledeen's old stomping ground.

Franklin, Ledeen, and The Pollard II Case

by Michele Steinberg

On Oct. 5, 2005, in Alexandria, Virginia, U.S. Attorney Paul McNulty announced that Defense Department official Larry Franklin had pled guilty to crimes under Federal espionage laws, and that his office would continue to 'press forward in the prosecution of the remaining defendants,' Steven J. Rosen and Keith Weissman, the two spies for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), who are identified as Franklin's co-conspirators.

- **Documentation**

Larry Franklin Admits Guilt in AIPAC Spy Case

by Michele Steinberg

A trove of documents sits in the Federal Court building in Alexandria, Virginia, concerning the multi-count indictments against Lawrence Anthony Franklin, Steven J. Rosen, and Keith Weissman, for the illegal passing of national security secrets of the United States to agents of the government of Israel. These records—which have gone unreported by the American media, include indictments, motions, judge's rulings, and, as of Oct. 5, 2005, the 'Plea Agreement' and 'Statement of Facts' voluntarily agreed to by Larry Franklin, the first to be found guilty in this broad-ranging investigation. Selected excerpts from these Oct. 5 documents appear below, in the first print publication outside of the court records.

The LaRouche Role in Bringing Dick Cheney Down

When then-Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche put out the word, on Sept. 20, 2002, that 'Vice President Dick Cheney's recurring wet dreams of a U.S. worldwide Roman Empire are, in and of themselves, the world's greatest single threat to the continuation of civilization in any part of the

planet today,' and that 'these facts demand that Cheney's prompt resignation be sought, and accepted,' the majority of Democrats and Republicans were shocked.

Economics:

Leadership Failure Continues, White House Stiffs Gulf States

by Richard Freeman and Mary Jane Freeman

The Bush-Cheney Administration rammed bill S. 1858 through Congress in early October, providing a mere \$1 billion in Community Disaster Loans to local governments in the Gulf states region—ravaged and, in many cases, bankrupted by Hurricane Katrina, and needing tens of billions of dollars in aid. The Bush team insisted that this law contain a stipulation prohibiting the Federal government from ever forgiving these loans, if the communities were unable to pay them back. The White House's insistence violated 30 years of practice. A loan forgiveness clause—which permits the Federal government to turn the disaster loan into a free grant if the local government is too cash-strapped to pay it back—had been standard on all disaster loans. Since 1974, some \$227 billion in Community Disaster Loans has been forgiven, including loans to New York City after Sept. 11, 2001.

Bush Chose Slave Labor For Hurricane Work

by Paul Gallagher

Anyone who looks on the White House websites' 'Executive Orders' page, for actions by President George W. Bush on the devastation of the Gulf states by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, will find that there have been none; and only one 'Proclamation,' made on Sept. 8. That proclamation has come under general opprobrium by Congress and other institutions—but not by Halliburton, Bechtel, and other major no-bid contractors of the Cheney/Bush Administration. This is Bush's declaration 'To Suspend Subchapter IV of Chapter 31 of Title 40, United States Code, Within a Limited Geographic Area in Response to the National Emergency Caused by Hurricane Katrina.' It has damaged every effort at reconstruction of the economy and of residents' lives in the hurricane disaster area.

What Is a Hyperinflationary Shock Wave?

Jonathan Tennenbaum explains how the 'upward collapse' of today's hyperinflation is like a sonic boom. In late September, Lyndon LaRouche put out an urgent warning to the international community, on the danger of an impending, hyperinflationary explosion of the world financial system, similar in many ways to the hyperinflation crisis which devastated Weimar Germany in the second half of 1923, but on a much greater scale. Then, as now, the outbreak of hyperinflation took the form of a sudden change, analogous to what physicists call a 'shock wave,' which transformed what had appeared up to that moment as a merely gradual loss of value of the currency, into a totally uncontrollable, self-accelerating process.

Senate's \$8 Billion for Flu Will Vaccine Funds Be In Time for Pandemic?

by Christine Craig and Laurence Hecht

By a vote of 94-3, the Senate passed an \$8 billion appropriation, initiated by Sen. Tom Harkin (D-Iowa), to fight the threatening avian flu pandemic. The measure, passed Oct. 27, must still go before the House. The funding came as an amendment to the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill for 2006, and apparently subsumed funding (mostly for anti-viral drugs) from a previous amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill.

National:

Clinton Proposes Emergency Summit To Save Auto Industry

by Richard Freeman

Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.) has proposed the convening of a national emergency summit to defend the U.S. auto industry, and more broadly the manufacturing base of the country. As the Oct. 8 bankruptcy of the world's largest auto parts producer, Delphi, threatens to bankrupt the entire U.S. auto industry, Clinton wrote an Oct. 20 letter to President George Bush, calling for him to rapidly convene such a summit, and stating, 'Given the fact that there are over 1 million Americans currently employed in the auto industry, we cannot simply allow one of the core elements of our national economic infrastructure to wither away.'

The Beauty of Rosa Parks

by Amelia Boynton Robinson

Amelia Boynton Robinson is widely known as the heroine of the Civil Rights movement, beaten and left for dead at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, friend and colleague to Dr. Martin Luther King, and now friend and collaborator of Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

What a beautiful memory! The memory of a woman, though frail, awoke people throughout America from their complacency, two generations or more ago, in Montgomery, Alabama. History was made when she, Rosa Parks, sat on the bus in Montgomery, Alabama, and refused to give up her seat to a white man, who was standing on a crowded bus.

Interview: Dr. Justin Frank

How Indictments of His Cronies Will Affect President Bush

On Oct. 22, 2005, Jeffrey Steinberg, along with LaRouche Youth Movement panelists Matt Ogden from Boston and Niko Paulson from Seattle, interviewed special guest Dr. Justin Frank on 'The LaRouche Show,' an Internet radio show broadcast every Saturday at 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time, at www.larouchepub.com. Dr. Frank, a practicing psychiatrist, is a professor at the George Washington University Medical Center, and was the author of the book *Bush on the Couch*, characterized by Steinberg as one of the most insightful profiles of the current President of the United States, and also one of the most frightening books to be published on the subject of the U.S. Presidency in many, many years. On Aug. 20, 2004, EIR published a review of Dr. Frank's book, and an interview with him. On Nov. 5, 2004, EIR published a guest commentary by Dr. Frank, and on Feb. 4, 2005, we published another interview with him.

International:

Hurricane in Washington: A New Policy in Berlin Now!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

In Berlin negotiations are taking place over the government program of a Grand Coalition, while in the U.S.A., leading representatives of the neo-conservative cabal in the White House are under heavy fire. The chairwoman of Germany's Civil Rights Movement Solidarity party (Bu"So), Helga Zepp LaRouche, pleads, in this statement, issued Oct. 24, for a new Trans-Atlantic Alliance, which should rest on the values of European culture, and on recognition of the accomplishments of other cultures.

Government Crisis Looms

Japan Faces the Future

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

October 24, 2005

Modern Japan's emergence as a modern nation-state power was brought about largely through its cooperation with the U.S. circles associated with such representatives of U.S. President Abraham Lincoln as the world's leading economist of that time, the same Henry C. Carey who played a crucial role in the great Bismarck reforms in Germany and the development of Russia launched under Czar Alexander III. Unfortunately, Japan changed sides, against the U.S.A., for an alliance with the British monarchy of the Prince of Wales, otherwise known as Edward VII. As a result, the Japan of 1894-1945 made itself the puppet of the agreement reached with the British Empire for the first of Japan's wars, 1894-1905, and the continuing enemy of the U.S.A., especially over the issue of China policy, during the interval 1894-1945.

Kirchner Wins Big in Argentina, Boosts Battle for New Bretton Woods

by Dennis Small

The snarling bully tactics of the international financial oligarchy and their Cheney gang enforcers in Washington backfired in Argentina on Oct. 23, when President Ne'stor Kirchner's political movement, the Victory Front, won a resounding electoral victory in the mid-term Congressional elections. With the Cheney machine crumbling in Washington, and its grip on Ibero-American nations weakening accordingly, the Kirchner victory could help prompt other nations in the region to stand and fight for their sovereignty and development, as Argentina has.

A Discussion With Adm. Falco Accame (ret.)

Terrorism and Italy's Strategy of Tension

by Paolo Raimondi

The recent developments in the United States around the role played by Lewis Libby, Karl Rove, and Vice President Dick Cheney in 'outing' Valerie Plame, the wife of Ambassador Joe Wilson, to punish him for having denounced as false, in early 2002, the claim that Iraq was importing uranium from Niger, are also provoking reverberations in Italy.

- **Moro Assassination Needs More Investigation**

The Italian government has been called on to respond to several parliamentary interrogations on the case of Antonino Arconte, a former military intelligence agent, who claims that he has evidence showing that intelligence circles had foreknowledge of the planned kidnapping of Italian statesman Aldo Moro in 1978.

History:

A PERSIAN TRAGEDY

Mossadeq's Fight for National Sovereignty

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

A tragedy of untold dimensions is threatening in Persia, a tragedy which could unleash a process leading to World War III, and the destruction of civilization as we know it. Neoconservative circles in London and Washington have targetted this key Persian Gulf nation, in the context of their imperialist policy of permanent war. Two main policy options have been openly discussed in the Anglo-American circles vis-a`vis the Islamic Republic: military aggression, either by the United States or proxy Israel, aimed at eliminating the Bushehr nuclear power plant and other sites related to the nation's civilian nuclear program; or, failing that, political destabilization, leading to regime change.

Editorial:

Protection and the Principle of National Sovereignty

Now is the time, leading economist and American statesman Lyndon LaRouche said the week of Oct. 24, for the United States Congress, particularly the Senate, to launch an international initiative in support of the principle of national sovereignty, the which will affirm the right of all sovereign nations to assert the primacy of the welfare of their citizenry, over the 'markets.' That the moment for such action is ripe, is demonstrated not only by the onrushing global financial breakdown, but also by the initial actions in this direction being taken in the United States, Germany, and France.

Latest From LaRouche

Lyndon LaRouche was interviewed for an hour on Oct. 28 on the program "The Right Stuff" on Georgetownradio.com, a student radio station at Georgetown University, in Washington, D.C.

Host: Hey! What's up! How ya doin'! Happy freakin' Friday. This is the right stuff with Mr. Right, with guest host Alexander Bozmoski. I have on the air, on hold right now, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche. Mr. LaRouche....

Okay, Mr. LaRouche, I just wanted to give you the opportunity, now that we have the technical difficulties settled, to just tell us what your plan is, or give an open monologue on whatever you would like to do, and then we'll go from there.

LAROUCHE: Okay! Well, today is the day which should be remembered, Oct. 28th—not the 31st yet, not the time of the Hallowe'en Massacre, but something proximate to it—it should go down in history as "the day that the frogs began to be marched." And Frog #1 is I. Lewis Libby, otherwise known as Scooter Libby, the chief of staff for Vice President Cheney. And as you know, at this hour, there is a press conference being given by the Special Prosecutor Fitzgerald, who probably will also announce that Libby has officially submitted his resignation, at least, that's what I heard from the news media in the short time before now. And this is not the end of it. This is simply the first shot in the case.

The important things mentioned, so far, by the prosecutor's office have been that Cheney's name, of course, has been mentioned, in defining the five-count criminal indictment. But also the name of the office of Bolton, the present UN Ambassador, whose office, in a way I understand, is named as having been the official leak source, for leaking into the system to be leaked outside the system, of the identity of Valerie Plame Wilson as a covert CIA agent.

Now, the issue here is not simply the issue of uncovering a covert agent. That's a violation of law. It's a violation of the Federal criminal law. There are other violations of law in the five-point indictment. But, behind this, is something much bigger: The point is, here, is that what happened, was the operation against Joe Wilson by virtue of going after his wife in this way, was to attempt to intimidate the Central Intelligence Agency itself. Because the Central Intelligence Agency had retained Joe Wilson, a former Ambassador—actually still is technically an ambassador of the United States—had been sent to Niger and other places where he had served as an ambassador, to check out the allegation that Niger, which is a source of uranium yellowcake, had shipped some yellowcake to Iraq, to Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

Q: Now, I just want to interrupt you for a second here. From what I'm gathering, are you suggesting that the Vice President of the United States is somehow involved in revealing Valerie Plame's identity?

LAROCHE: Well, he's involved in the operation which did reveal her identity, and he was involved in promoting it and covering it up. So, he is in trouble.

Q: Do you think ultimately, he will face consequences and be forced to resign?

LAROCHE: Face consequences, yeah. He already has faced consequences: His credibility is down to about 2% level right now. Today, the resignation of Libby, his chief of staff, and his involvement—. Remember, what's involved here is not just this particular event. What's involved is a use of fraud, the concoction of a complete fraud, the so-called Niger yellowcake fraud or similar yellowcake frauds, to induce the Senate of the United States, to approve a declaration of war which has gotten us into a war, which is about as unpopular as a war can get with our people.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, my name is Alex Bozmoski, I'd like to interrupt you for another second, and first say "hello" and welcome you to the show. And secondly, to point out, that to our listeners, that the five-point indictment that you're speaking of is going to be, that Scooter Libby will be indicted on perjury charges—

Q: [regular host] Obstruction of justice—

AB: I just wanted to clear up that the Niger yellowcake incident has nothing to do with the actual indictment today—

LAROCHE: It has everything to do with. It has everything to do with it. This is a part of a process, which is an ongoing process, and which will say that the United States was induced to go to war, through an *act of fraud*. And that this action, by Libby et al. was an action—

AB: So, Mr. LaRouche, you're implying that if we didn't have Italian forged documents that said that enriched uranium yellowcake in Niger was transported to Iraq, that we would not be in Iraq right now?

LAROCHE: Absolutely. That's the case. Every leading member of the Senate, especially on the Democratic side and others, who were induced to vote for going to war, did so on the basis of Cheney's personally lying—because he knew this—personally lying to members of the Senate, to induce them, as Democrats and others, to vote for the proposal to go to

war. That's what happened.

Q: Now, there was something very interesting in some of the correspondence I've had with your office. In one of the e-mails that I got, I think your staffer mentioned that Judith Miller was a government agent. Can you elaborate on that? Or? How is Judith Miller a government agent?

LAROCHE: Yeah. Well, what you have, often, is, you have people who are government agents, of various kinds of agencies, who are inserted in positions in the press. She was inserted—she has a long career. This is not new to her, she's been a spook for a some time. But she was inserted into the *New York Times*. And she was not too popular with her fellow reporters at the *New York Times*. But, she was inserted there, and some of the actions she took, as in this case, were of that nature. They were of an intell—this is a dirty intelligence operation. It's big. It's gigantic. This is much bigger than Watergate.

Q: Okay. Real quick question: What is the ultimate goal for Vice President Cheney in this, that provoked him to enter into this fraud?

Q:[other host] And furthermore, why does President Bush share none of the blame, with you? Why does it all go to Vice President Cheney? I find that interesting.

LAROCHE: Oh, Bush! Bush, I think Bush has his own kind of blame. I don't think Bush is— [interrupted]

Q: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I read in your website, that Bush is a mental incompetent, so that's why the blame would shift over to Cheney.

LAROCHE: Well, there are two reasons. There are two reasons here. First of all, we're serious. This is not playing a game, here. This is the government of the United States. We're in a world in serious crisis, a serious economic crisis, and other kinds of crises, and you don't play games with the government of the United States. Particularly, you don't play, you know, like football field games.

So therefore, the intention of many of us is, and has been, as I've made very clear, is to have Cheney out immediately. But we have to maintain the continuity and functioning of government: that's what we're really concerned about. Right now, the government is not functioning. It's not functioning, in the case of the Katrina thing; it's not functioning in a lot of other ways. So therefore, we're not going to do something silly. Get Cheney out. Get a new Vice President in, and begin to get the Federal government to function, where the present President is less under the influence of what Cheney represents.

Q: Sir, my question remained, why is Dick Cheney entering into this—

Q: [other host] Yeah, I mean, Bush was the one, you know, who convinced us to go to war.

LAROCHE: Cheney wanted this war—remember, go back to 1990, to Bush 41, the father of the present President. At that time, Cheney was chief of staff—or, head of the Department of Defense: At that time, he was one of the leaders within that Administration who was reluctant at accepting President Bush's decision not to actually occupy Iraq. And the reasons were all given by all the people; that's well known, it's well documented. All right, he maintained that position. The day he came into office as Vice President, in 2001, he was for that, on that day. From that day on, *he wants this war*, because he belongs to a faction which is associated with what's called the neoconservatives, who believe that permanent warfare and permanent regime change, like the Roman Empire's military policy, should be the policy of the United States.

The military, the professional military, except those who are spoon-benders or the like, have been opposed to this. So, there's been a conflict about getting into this kind of unnecessary war, for the purpose of using war as a way of orchestrating world politics, rather than an instrument of defense of our vital interests.

Q: But I don't understand what their motive would be.

LAROCHE: The motive is the spoon-bender motive. The motive is the neoconservative motive [host keeps trying to interrupt]

Q: To just be at war—

LAROCHE: It's their policy. They've had it all over the place. My view is: Such people should never have been allowed in government! This is comparable to Adolf Hitler kind of stuff. This sort of thing should never be allowed to get into a powerful position in our government.

AB: So, you're calling Dick Cheney, right on the air, Adolf Hitler? Essentially.

LAROCHE: No. I'm saying he belongs to the same genre of problem.

Q: Wonderful. Another question. I recall in reading one of your transcripts, and forgive me, I forget which one it was, the LaRouchePAC, Political Action Committee, has taken credit for the anti-neoconservative consensus reached between the moderate Republicans and the Democrats in Congress. Do you take credit for any sort of consensus between the two of these groups?

LAROCHE: There is a very significant role by me personally, and by people associated with me, in this. There's been a big fight. But this went on, this started in the beginning—well, actually it started toward the end of 2000, after the election. And it began to roll up quickly with the Bush Administration, in the beginning of January of 2001, because the economic situation was such and such. And we knew the composition of some of these guys, like Cheney and company, in the new Administration, and we knew the direction these fellows were going to take: They're called neoconservatives. Their ideas are well known, they're documented, there's no secret about it. They're well known internationally. No secret whatsoever. This is their policy: They wanted the war. We got into a war we never should have gotten into. The thing is now a deteriorating mess. And there is *no bottom* under the continuation of the present policy, with this war. There's no end to it.

So, we're now determined to get out. If the war had not been a failure, as it is, a *terrible failure*, then you would not have the heat and pressure, now, that led to the indictment of Libby. And the indictment of Libby is just the beginning of a process.

AB: I just want to remind our listeners real quick, that the reason—because some of you might be confused out there—the reason why me and Anthony aren't jumping in right away and trying to debate the policy issues of neoconservatism and what's going on in Iraq, is that we believe that, because the LaRouche campaign has had such a presence on our Georgetown campus over the past couple weeks, that it is in the benefit of the students to first hear exactly what Mr. LaRouche is talking about, and then, as we progress we'll start to—to try and enter the debate a little more.

Q: And we always do like to present different sides of the issue. And again, I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank you again, for coming on, Mr. LaRouche.

I do have to ask you, though: I read in another one of your recent bulletins, that you heavily criticized the government response to Katrina. Hurricane Katrina, and—can you elaborate on that for our listeners?

LAROCHE: Oh sure. We had what was known to be a Level 5 hurricane coming up the Coast, and likely after visiting Florida, likely to come to the Gulf area in the area of New Orleans. The last time we really dealt with that area, was Betsy. That was back under the Administration of President Johnson. President Johnson was on the scene there, at the time, about two days after Betsy hit, and immediately organized a program, as well as relief efforts. The program was never carried out.

The New Orleans area was, at that time, had been built up with levees and so forth, to a defense capability against the Level 3 storm. And now a Level 5 was coming in. The program, which President Johnson had pushed at the time, has never been implemented. The condition of the area, around New Orleans and around the bay area has deteriorated greatly, ecologically and otherwise, over the intervening period. It has gone down economically, it's an area of gambling casinos and things like that—not much development—and impoverishment increasing.

So, we knew this thing was happening. We knew it on Aug. 2, that we had to prepare for the certainty of something hitting the Gulf, and probably New Orleans. We knew that the New Orleans area only had a Level 3 defense capability for resistance. Therefore, on Aug. 2, with all these agencies reporting on this, we should have gone to action for all the precautionary actions of the type that some people are trying to deal with in Florida now. So, we should have done that: *We did nothing.*

Q: And you don't—you personally don't think this government did everything it could, that this government cares about its citizens—you don't think that this government did everything it could, to help those people in New Orleans? To bring them aid?

LAROCHE: *Absolutely nothing.* They may have done some things *after* the Senate got on the case, and Senate action occurred, to try to get some relief in there. And after the Senator from Louisiana was pressing, and others; then, after the Democrats *and* Republicans *in the Senate* had begun to move on this, *then* at that point, Cheney and Bush came into the picture and made some proposals. But, most of the—

Q: Okay, right. I actually agree, we could have done a lot better in the Gulf. I would like to remind you though, sir, that the probability cone for hurricanes two days in advance is very wide. We've seen hundreds of Class 3, 4, and 5 hurricanes that are passing near the Gulf, that have a probability cone hitting New Orleans, they just never happened. We've known for a long time, that if we had the Disaster One—and Katrina certainly was *not* the Disaster One, all the levees *did not* break, Lake Pontchartrain did not drain completely into the city, and there were sections of the city that escaped water. So it was not the disaster that we—that geologists, and geomethologists [sic], and climatologists have been predicting for a very long time—

LAROCHE: No. That's right.

Q: So. You can't say, that two days, three days before, we should have done something drastically different than we have in the last two or three days before similar hurricanes over the past 30 years.

LAROCHE: No. You're absolutely wrong. Absolutely wrong: Every agency, responsible agency involved in this area—apart from those which were culpable and did nothing—but every responsible agency and forecasting agency, said, "It's coming." The idea of preventing it and saying, "It's not coming," is so high, that you don't do that. When you get anything like this, which threatens a probable hit, and this was a very highly probable hit, every forecasting agency would

disagree with you. The knowledge of a very highly probably Level 5 hit at the New Orleans area was there, it was well known, since Aug. 2.

Q: It's been there 300 years, sir. The same probability has been for—

LAROCHE: It's wrong. No, you're wrong.

Q: It's absolutely not wrong.

LAROCHE: I mean, it's unscientific. It's just not scientifically there. I mean, you get somebody who thinks in statistical forecasts, that's not science. The scientific agencies which are responsible, and have been responsible for forecasting probability, and which have generally been very accurate within the range of what they forecast were the ones that all said, this is something that has to be faced. And there was *no* preparation to face it! This was an act which was impeachable—

Q: I won't argue with you any more. I'll just ask you for a single clarification question: You think that we knew, before Katrina hit, that New Orleans was going to be swamped with a Level 5 hurricane, that day?

LaRouche: That we knew it was going to hit in that period of time.

Q: Okay. So—. That's fine, we can progress, then.

LAROCHE: You need two weeks to 30 days to deal with that.

Q: [other host, trying to interrupt] And, well, I just want—but this is a fundamental question here, and I just want to ask this: Do you believe—because what I'm hearing here, is that you believe that this government is sending us into pointless wars, just for—I guess for leisure? You believe that this government knows that horrible storms are going to hit, and they don't do anything to help their citizens? Do you believe that this government is evil?

LAROCHE: I don't know what you mean by evil. I think there are people in government who are evil. I don't think the government is evil. I think the government is largely stupid and incompetent. And there are many people in the government itself, which we would like to have changed. We would like to have a competent government. I think we could get one in a fairly short time. I just hope we do: because we really need one, right now. But what we've got right now, is, in the Executive branch, under President George Bush, and under the overreaching influence of Dick Cheney, and some other people, we've got a real mess.

This government is incompetent. It's indifferent to people, its philosophy stinks. It is not consistent with our Constitutional intention. And we have many people in the legislature, in the various parts of the Executive branch who are honest, capable people, and would function properly if they had a President who was functional, and they didn't have a Vice President who is less than functional.

Q: Well, let's talk about the less-than-functional Vice President just for a second, and then I'd like to move on. I think Anthony and I want to move on to your economic forecasting, and especially the hyperinflationary [sic] imminent crash. But before that, let's talk about Dick Cheney just for a little while. Because most of your magazine titles and brochure covers seem to have pictures of either Cheney's head in a mushroom cloud—

Q: *Children of Satan*—

Q: Something to the effect of linking Cheney to Satan or a spawn of Satan. And that's certainly more vicious rhetoric than is present in other forms of media. So it would be wonderful for our audience if you could substantiate that. Or,—

LAROUCHE: Sure! It's substantial. We've documented it, in the documents themselves. The evidence is there. The facts accord with the evidence stated.

Q: [nearly inaud] So what?

LAROUCHE: What has been forecast has been happening. I think that the quality of veracity, of these publications is not doubted much internationally, or around Washington, D.C., around the Congress.

Q: What's not doubted? The veracity of Dick Cheney being a child of Satan?

LAROUCHE: I think that's generally understood what that means, exactly as I described it. Exactly. I don't just use words: I'm a scientist. When I use a term, I qualify what I mean by it, and my qualification of that terminology, the way I've gone into depth on this, I think is probably *very* high grade, in terms of veracity.

Q: I—I apol—. You're a scientist. I apol—I, um.

Q: We apologize for not telling our audience. That's actually our lack of foresight. We forgot to introduce your credentials. But, because I don't really know them, you're welcome to share them with the audience.

LAROUCHE: Well, I happen to be the most successful long-range economic forecaster in the past 30 years.

Q: And you're a scientist.

LAROUCHE: When everybody else is wrong on this one. When the opposition has been wrong. So, I think my—the issue of 1971, some of the issues of the middle of the 1970s; my role in, for example, the SDI. One of the things I'm most unpopular for, is, I sold the idea of SDI to President Reagan and his circle, and we worked on it, and I became very unpopular because of that. But that's part of it. I was also the organizer of the Fusion Energy Foundation, which was for a period of time, one of the leading scientific foundations in the United States. I'm involved in this internationally, so there's no question about these credentials. People can find them very easily, if they looked up the website: all the information of relevance is there.

Q: All righty. Alex, did you want to move on, maybe—

Q: No, I want—I want to stick with Dick Cheney, just for a little bit longer, because that's your major push right now. Am I correct? Your major push right now is to get Dick Cheney out of office? That's what all the people—

LAROUCHE: No! Dick Cheney's going to be out of office. That's already settled. What is not settled, is how we fix the mess that we have to fix, in the process of his leaving office.

Q: I don't think that anyone that's listening right now, that's, say, a Georgetown University student not involved—well, actually, none of them are involved in your campaign—so a Georgetown University student, believe that Dick Cheney will imminently be thrust from office. So—. To allow you the opportunity to establish that claim a little more clearly, I would

like you to go into how Dick Cheney is involved in—like in Dick Cheney's neoconservative plot to take our country to war, endlessly, and eventually to provoke a nuclear war with Iran (which is what I gather from your last press release), I would really love the opportunity to hear you—hear you—.

LAROUCHE: I don't need to defend any of that. It's all in the public domain. It's known in the Congress. People in the Congress, and the Senate and so forth are discussing these matters. This is not some far-out wild speculation—

Q: So, when do you think Dick Cheney's going to be thrust from office, and how?

LAROUCHE: He is being—well: Don't look at this mechanistically, especially when you're dealing with human beings, don't try to apply the rules of pool ball games to human beings. And in human beings, there always is will; human systems are not mechanistic, they're dynamic—just as biological systems are dynamic, they're not mechanistic. And therefore, you can not work on the basis of a statistical forecast of an event occurring at a specific time. You can define a line, a boundary condition which will define the way a process will go.

Q: [interrupting inaud] in 2008, we're going to have a new President and Vice President. You know! I mean—

LAROUCHE: We're going to have a new—we almost certainly will have a new Vice President. As a matter of fact, I think John McCain wants the job. But, the President—this is going to be a trickier thing to deal with, as I said. We are not reckless. I'm not reckless. I'm not going to tamper with this government. I'm going to make sure we have a continuity of a functioning government.

Q: So, you're running for President, again?

LAROUCHE: I'm going to—I'm concerned that we have a functioning continuity of our Federal Executive branch! Right now, our problem is, the Executive branch *is not functional!* We need a functional branch.

Q: So, this is—we've heard this before. I need you to understand that our listeners do not read your press releases, so please explain to them how Dick Cheney is trying to provoke a nuclear war with Iran.

LAROUCHE: He said so! He gave the order to STRATCOM, to prepare for a nuclear order. We just had the Congress vote it *down!* The Congress just voted down the use of bunker-buster weapons. He was planning to use bunker-buster weapons in Iran, against targets.

Q: When was this proposed by Dick Cheney to STRATCOM?

LAROUCHE: This has been coming out over the month of late July and August.

Q: Okay. I'm trying to figure out what report you're referring to.

LAROUCHE: It was all over the place. I mean, what you're saying is, that Georgetown students don't get any news at all! And they don't hear anything that's going on in the world—even the *Washington Post*, I think, has indicated some of this material, from time to time. So, I don't see how anybody living in the Washington area has not picked this up!

Q: I'll tell you what Georgetown students do know: Georgetown students do know that the strategic integrated operating plan of STRATCOM and the United States Pentagon, has plans for nuclear engagements with every major country in the

world, in which there is a substantial conflict that could escalate.

LAROUCHE: That's true.

Q: So, to say that we have plans to go to nuclear war with Iran, is not to make any point. Because we have nuclear plans to go to war with everybody. And you know what? That is a good thing, in my estimation, because, if we are faced with some sort of—situation—where we need to draw on STRATCOM to give us a plan for how to deal with something, we have it already internalized.

LAROUCHE: Well. In this case, Cheney was giving the order: Be prepared for action. And Iran is targetted—everybody in the world has known it. I don't know if people on Georgetown weren't informed of this. But this has been debated in the United Nations; it's been debated in every country in the world. And if somehow—you know. I don't believe what you're saying about Georgetown students. I think they do know a little more than you give them credit for!

Q: Well, Georgetown students certainly do know a lot. We know that Joe Wilson has zero credibility. We know that—

LAROUCHE: Oh! You sound like neocons now.

Q: We are, sir.

Q: We're proud neocons.

LAROUCHE: [laughing] Okay! It's all clear.

Q: Well, this is "The Right Stuff," but we do like to get these different viewpoints out here. But, we know that Joe Wilson has no credibility—

LAROUCHE: What do you mean, he has no credibility? He's got a tremendous amount of credibility!

You know what happened? You got to think about this, about your career, because neoconism is about to go out of fashion. Now, of course, the neocon ideology, is a lackey ideology, as it was defined for example by Leo Strauss, Prof. Leo Strauss, who in a sense created this lackey idea, based on the Thrasymachus model.

Q: Sir, we're not—I mean, I would rather not debate the nuances of the neoconservatism, because—[Lyn laughs] well, because, despite what you say, it's actually a very nuanced philosophy, and it does span a large degree of different public policy options. And—

Q: And it's more than just—

LAROUCHE: It does, yes. Right.

Q: And it's more than just using firepower for fun. It's about keeping people safe, and it's about doing it responsibly, and about working with the rest of the world to make it safe.

LAROUCHE: No, the problem here—it's kind of interesting here, in the neocons, because the essential issue here, is—

Q: First, can you just describe neocon in terms of someone I can understand. Are you talking like a democratic realist, like a Charles Krauthammer type of neoconservative? Or—

LAROUCHE: No, no. All these kinds of things, I don't pay much attention to these personal distinctions, because I'm dealing with a process I understand here. And if you want to explain it, I can do it.

Q: No worries. We'll work in your paradigm.

Q: Well—you ready for economics, Alex?

Q: Yeah, I guess we could make the switch.

LAROUCHE: I think this neocon thing goes very closely to economics.

Q: Well, make the connection for us, and then it'll make it easy for us.

LAROUCHE: Well, first of all, the United States is based on the principle, which is called in ancient Greek, *agape*. It's a term associated with Plato's *Republic*; it's the principle of 1 Corinthians 13. It is the idea of the Common Good, of the General Welfare: It is the central and highest principle of the U.S. Federal Constitution, which says the purpose of the nation is to promote the General Welfare of existing and future generations—of all them. That's our policy.

Now, you have a contrary policy, which is the Anglo-Dutch Liberal policy, of which the neoconservative economic philosophy is a variety; which bases itself on people like Bernard Mandeville, John Locke, in English, Quesnay, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, and so forth.

Q: Say that again, sir? Jeremy Bentham is a precursor to neoconservatism?

LAROUCHE: Absolutely. Have you read him?

Q: Yeah, absolutely! I've read most of the authors you're listing, and it seems like a really interesting paradigm that you're trying to build for neoconservatism. And I do think that some of the authors, perhaps, warrant some credit for the movement that has taken so much, so much steam over the past couple decades. But I really want you to just make the connection right now, to economics. And if we're going with Jeremy Bentham here, I'm really having a tough time seeing the connection.

LAROUCHE: Well, the neoconservatives, generally the center of this is the American Enterprise Institute, today. Now, I'm talking about the American Enterprise Institute which is—

Q: Mr. Novak.

LAROUCHE: Essentially a branch of the Mont Pelerin Society, and what I'm describing is the economic philosophy behind the Mont Pelerin Society, which is the followers of Bernard Mandeville; and of people like Mandeville. And this is the idea that society can be run on the basis of an interest, defined by such things as property rights, as opposed to human rights; that this kind of conception is the basis from which the neoconservatives—among other people—work as a group. As opposed to what I represent, which is the American Constitutional tradition, the tradition of the idea that the Common

Good, or the General Welfare, is the *highest form of law*, and that property is inferior in its claims, when it conflicts with human rights.

Q: I'm sorry to cut you off. We're getting a lot of calls from our listeners saying, or requesting that you talk a little louder. We've got you up as loud as you can go. So, just kind of—

LAROCHE: Uh-huh.

Q: There we go. Much better.

Q: Okay, now. I think there's a fundamental question here that you raise. You're attacking property rights here, one of the fundamental rights of us as Americans, the right to know that we have a right to own land, that we have a right to a place that we call home, and there's an increasing assault on these rights. And I don't know how you can associate yourself with that movement.

LAROCHE: Well, this is the movement, of course, of Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Franklin, and Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt—

Q: Do you believe in private property, sir?

LAROCHE: What do you mean by private property?

Q: Property owned by private citizens and not subject to government interference.

LAROCHE: I do not believe that private property is a self-evident right. I believe it is a right provided by society. It is not a right which is independent, but is inferior to and subsumed by society. In other words, if we, in society, decide that the general interest, the General Welfare is served by promoting private property as one of the options working in society, that's it. Therefore, it is—private property is not a primary right, it is a derivative right.

Q: [overtalking] Well, you're living in a heavily guarded mansion in Virginia—

LAROCHE: [continuing] It is not a right under natural law. It is a right under positive law.

Q: Well, sir, you live in a heavily guarded mansion in Virginia. Does the government have a right, or does some outside force have a right—

LAROCHE: I never had a heavily guarded mansion!

Q: Well, does the government have a right to take your property away from you? To take everything—?

Q: [interrupting] If it's in the welfare of the other citizens?

Q: Yes.

LAROCHE: No, no. the government has no right to take anything, except by due process. Due process is a procedure

provided for under our law, as a part of positive law.

Q: All right—this is going nowhere. You said in the beginning of the broadcast, "an impending economic crisis, among other crises." Choose your crisis, let's talk about it. I really enjoy—

LAROUCHE: You can't divide them, they're all together. We're on the verge of a general—not an economic crisis—we already had a crash. We have a crash ongoing now.

Q: You're talking, a complete shutdown of the economic system.

LAROUCHE: Well, nobody's going to shut down the economic system. That's the simplistic Wall Street kind of thinking. Think of it in terms of real economy, physical economy.

Q: Those were your exact words that are in your webcast, right now, sir. You said, that a hyperinflationary [sic]—

LAROUCHE: Yeah, exactly. It's in process. It exists. It's not a hyperinflationary phase. This is typified by the rising prices—

Q: [interrupting] And this was [overtalk] by Richard Nixon in 1971, when he took us off the gold standard?

LAROUCHE: What?

Q: That's what I got from your website.

LAROUCHE: He didn't take us off the gold standard. We never had the gold standard at that time. We had a *gold-reserve* standard. That's not a gold standard.

Q: The gold-reserve standard. This is what sparked this movement, right?

LAROUCHE: What? What sparked it, was my understanding, back from as far back as the 1950s, when I made my first public forecast, then, when I forecast that we were on the verge of the worst recession in the post-war period, beginning in the early part of 1957. It happened.

Q: I just want to get at something here: As I was walking home from accounting class, a couple of weeks ago, when I first talked with one of your supporters, I mentioned the fact that I was a business school student to one of them. And one of your representatives told me that the stuff I'm learning in accounting class and finance class is "just theories." It's not actually real. Do you agree with that statement or were they misguided?

LAROUCHE: Well, I wouldn't use the term "theory." Theory's a very serious thing. I would say it's a concoction, it's a scheme. That what is taught—for example, let's take the paradigm of this: the paradigm of the so-called Business School Syndrome, came from the Wharton School in Pennsylvania and from Harvard Business School up in Boston. This was the immediate post-war period development. And from that, there has been a business-school philosophy, which actually does accord, as economics, with the kind of mentality you run into with neocons. It's what's generally taught as neocon philosophy. Again, it's the Mandeville/Mont Pelerin Society ideology. I think it stinks. It's stupid.

I'm for industry. I'm an agro-industrial economist. I defend our system, the American System, as we developed it in our

country. Roosevelt is an example, Franklin Roosevelt, who took us from the Depression, which Coolidge and Hoover gave us, and made us the most powerful economy the world had ever seen, under depression conditions; it's typical of the way I think.

Q: Right.

LAROUCHE: And we have done very well, even in the post-war period with all our problems, we did very well, up until the middle of the 1960s. And despite all the problems, all the mistakes that were made, in net effect, year after year, the U.S. economy was in net effect improving; people were getting wealthier in physical terms; health care was improving, etc., etc., education was improving.

Q: Until when? [barely audible]

LAROUCHE: After that, coming out of the period of the Indo-China War—

Q: After what? After what?

LAROUCHE: We went the other direction. We have been in a *physical* decline.

Now, what happens now, the worst example of this, of course, is the Enron syndrome. The worst example of business school teaching is Enron. Which is what made the first Bush Administration—and that was stealing!

You have people who think that property rights, as in the case of, say, Delphi, or the case of General Motors; or some of these other cases, that will come up, that people will take large pensions, in exit pensions, knowing they're going into bankruptcy, and deprive their employees of their pension funds!

Q: Sir, I don't—. I apologize for it, but you keep kind of making a trail into detailed points, and I really want our listeners to get a gauge of your overall grand economic idea. And, let me, summing it for them up in my words—and correct me when I'm wrong—you seek a return to the Bretton Woods system; you seek a pull-out of any form of globalization, or inter-country innovation in trade; you want free trade to be blocked by tariffs; and you see that agro-industrial economy should be elevated in precedence above our international trade economy.

LAROUCHE: Well, I think globalization is a form of imperialism. It's the end of the nation-state. I'm for the nation-state. I'm for this Constitutional form of government—

Q: And since the period of globalization has started, and every single aggregate statistical indicator of quality of life rising with the globalization of developing and non-developing—

LAROUCHE: That's a —I don't know where you got that from. That's an absolute fraud. It corresponds to no reality, in this planet. None.

Q: World GDP. Developing-country GDP.

LAROUCHE: Oh, forget GDP! GDP is not wealth—

Q: Sorry, we'll use another indicator. World revenue—

LAROUCHE: No, no. Take the indication. Let's take: Physical indicators. Now, take a map of the United States—

Q: Okay. Poverty rates. The developing-country poverty rate. Second World country poverty rate, and First World country poverty rate, are all decreasing in aggregate—

LAROUCHE: Not true!

Q: Yes. Absolutely true. Absolutely true.

LAROUCHE: Absolutely not true. It's a completely false statement on your part.

Q: [other host] Sir—I just have to say that globalization, free-market economies are bringing more things to more people in more places. It's helping to reduce poverty—and, you know—[Lyn laughs]

LAROUCHE: You actually believe that?!

Q: I for one—[overtalk] technology of the past!

LAROUCHE: I mean, do you believe that?

Q: No, I believe that your economic philosophy's a little arcane, sir. It seems like it's very—it's pre-modernization. It's pre-the era of technology. It's the pre-knowledge revolution [Lyn laughing throughout]

You laugh, and I ask you, to substantiate this.

LAROUCHE: I mean, I don't know where you're getting your facts from!

Q: Sir—let's move on—let's move on a little bit here, sir. [laughs] Okay: Over the years, how many times have you run for President?

Q: Eight.

LAROUCHE: Yeah, sure.

Q: Okay, do you plan to run again in the future?

LAROUCHE: I haven't made any plans to that effect in this time. I've tried to—

Q: Would you like to announce on this show?

LAROUCHE: No! No, I don't plan to do that. I'm—shall we say, a part of the Democratic Party.

Q: Does the Democratic Party accept you as one of their kin?

LAROCHE: Well, some of the leading people in the Congress and elsewhere do—yes.

Q: And, here, for about maybe four minutes, I have a live, real breathing Democrat in the room, and I'll let you have a conversation with him. [Lyn laughs] So, just one second.

Q: Let me, as we make the transition, I want to remind the listeners, that Mr. LaRouche garnered a substantial 22% of the vote in the Democratic primary in Arkansas, which is the largest of all the states, actually did won delegates, but the Democratic Party declined the delegates to Mr. LaRouche, because, and I think I'm quoting, "he wasn't a real Democrat." Now I won't make a normative claim on whether that's true or not, but I will pass it on to Joe, to perhaps discuss the topic a little more thoroughly.

Joe: Thank you, Alex. Hello, Lyndon, can you hear me?

Hello, I'd like to introduce myself briefly. My name is Joe McReynolds [ph], I'm a member of the College Democrats here, and I did end up supporting Howard Dean in the 2004 primary. So I think it can be fairly said that you wouldn't necessarily describe me as a reactionary Democrat. I'm relatively open to new perspectives for the party.

And, I've heard some of your supporters say in the past, that the reason the Democratic Party is not listening to you, is because your ideas are dangerous to them. Do you agree with that?

LAROCHE: No. Not dangerous to the party. By no means. Never happened.

Q: Why do you think it is, that the Democratic Party is so hostile to you and your ideas?

LAROCHE: The Democratic Party is not hostile. There are some bankers who are very hostile to me. And they frightened some of my friends in the Democratic Party. But, if you look at what we're doing, especially, I played a key part as a supporter in the Kerry campaign, in September and October of the past year.

Q: You played a key part in the Kerry campaign?

LAROCHE: Sure!

Alex: [in the background] He also worked for Ronald Reagan.

LAROCHE: I worked with Jim Carville.

Q: The Democratic Party, the base is, they're willing to support a wide range of people, but it's been pretty clear from election results that the Democratic Party's base has not been willing to support ex-Communists. And, you would agree that your membership in the revolutionary tendency, and other similar groups over the past years, would you say it's fair to describe you as an ex-Communist?

LAROCHE: No.

Q: Would you say it's fair to describe you as an ex-Trotskyist?

LAROUCHE: A what?

Q: An ex-Trotskyist?

LAROUCHE: Well, I was associated with the Trotskyists, a couple of times, when I was fighting McCarthy, I associated with them, because I was fighting Joe McCarthy. Back in the times, when that was really nasty stuff.

Anthony: I just want to interject, Joe McCarthy, a real American patriot (I'm kidding!).

LAROUCHE: He was a skunk!

Joe: I would have to disagree with Anthony on that one!

LAROUCHE: [laughs] You're not going to get any Democrats to go with that!

Joe: Seriously. Would you say that it's possible that, not just a few bankers, but really a lot of the Democratic leadership and the base, have concluded that some of the more radical things you say—for instance, I—some of the plans you talk about, rejecting the last 40 years of economic shared wisdom between both parties, building a bridge between California and Asia, I've heard was a plan of yours—or perhaps it was Hawaii and Asia?

LAROUCHE: No, no. You've got everything mixed up.

What has happened, I've opposed a lot of the policies the party has adopted since the middle, or particularly the end of the 1960s; or the beginning of the 1970s: These changes, which were a change to a post-industrial society, I said, were a mistake. A fatal mistake. And they have been a fatal mistake.

Now, what's happened is, there's been a change. And the change occurred during the course of the last election campaign, the last Presidential campaign, in which, when Kerry came in as candidate, you may notice there was an important change in the actual policy of the party.

Q: Well, I understand your position on the policies. But, I'm saying, even beyond the policies. To lead a party, one has to not just have policies, but a certain personal characteristic. And I got handed one of your publications once, in a newspaper, and, as a young person—as a full disclosure, I am director of hip-hop for this radio station, and [Lyn laughs] I opened your publication, and it was [Lyn laughing heartily]—it was you, talking about why the only music in New York these days is hip-hop and music that's so bad it can only be called hip-hop, was your words. [overtalk] I still remember. And I have to admit, it was offputting to me, as a young person, and just in general, with a lot of the things you say, being so bombastic and—Howard Dean looks positively milquetoast compared to you!

LAROUCHE: Probably true!

Q: When it comes to the things you say. And, even if, on any given policy you might have some sway—I mean, obviously I would say I disagree with you on quite a few policies—but, even if any given one is a decent policy for the Democratic Party, don't you think that there's a real consensus, not just among bankers, but among others, that you might not have the capacity to lead based on your personal characteristics, not just on any policy?

LAROCHE: No. On my personal characteristics, I'm probably the best leader the United States has. But, the problem you're getting into, which, at your age, actually, you wouldn't know this: But, we underwent a change in the United States, which was under influence of an organization called the Congress for Cultural Freedom. It was headed in the United States for some time by an enemy of mine by the name of Sidney Hook, who hated my guts for various good reasons on both sides.

But, what happened is, you had a doctrine of, a new sense of man, in which leadership was considered "bad." Now, in a healthy society, leadership is not dictatorship; leadership is leadership.

Q: Leadership is about bringing people together, to some degree. Surely you would agree that there's something in leadership about bringing people together.

LAROCHE: No, no, no! That's consensus. Remember, what you're talking about, what you're getting into, is—you're not looking at one problem, a famous historical problem, which everyone should know if they want to study the history of European civilization: The problem of Sophistry. What destroyed Greece was the influence of Sophistry, which led Athens into the Peloponnesian War.

Q: [interrupting] You would call people like Clinton—wait, you would call people like Clinton, you'd call him a Sophist?

LAROCHE: Consensus politics is Sophistry! It's what destroyed—

Q: [Anthony] Well, you know, I might agree with that a little bit. I got mad at Bush for the Harriet Miers nomination. So I mean [both laugh]—so, and I'm glad she was withdrawn. That's been a topic on the show, and I'm sorry we can't get to that today. But, I do want to get to your criminal conviction and imprisonment, in the '80s-early '90s. It seems like you had a little bit of a Tom DeLay/Karl Rove situation yourself.

LAROCHE: Not at all! Not at all.

Q: Fraud charges, conspiracy charges.

LAROCHE: It was all—very simply: In early 1980-81, I had been in a sense responsible, accidentally, for George Bush losing the Republican nomination in 1980, in New Hampshire, and Reagan winning. And during the process, I had —

Q: Can I disagree with that? You were responsible for Ronald Reagan being President?

LAROCHE: No, not exactly. But George Bush thought I was. And he hated my guts for it.

No, I got into a fight with George Bush, because his campaign attacked me, and I attacked him. And my attack on him, ruined his chances of winning the nomination in New Hampshire, and Reagan, who had the qualifications to win the nomination, won it. There was not really an accident there. George Bush went in there with a game which was rigged in his favor. And he came out of New Hampshire, and it was no longer rigged in his favor.

But, in the process, the significance was, this relationship that happened between me and Reagan, was that this led to Reagan's adoption of what he named the SDI. Now, the SDI *really* caused a fight. The fact that the President put it on the air, in March 1983, and the Soviet government turned him down flat, this led to a movement—"Get rid of this

guy!"—namely, me. And from late 1983 on, a campaign was done to rid the Republican Party of those associated with Reagan who had worked with me, and to rid the world of me. And this was an effort, which was joined, publicly, by the Soviet government of Gorbachov.

Gorbachov in 1986 was demanding that as a condition of good relations with the United States, that I be imprisoned. And it was part of that process. That's how it happened.

Q: Sir, do you think—and this is meant in the most polite manner—do you think that it's a little presumptuous perhaps, to—to imply that your influence on the respective governments of the United States and Russia, as great as it is, when you've commanded roughly 1% to 2% of primary votes in less than 15% of the states, is—?

LAROUCHE: What I've said is fact. It happened. I was responsible for the SDI.

Q: [overtalk] When you have a couple thousand people that are on your side—

LAROUCHE: I was responsible for the SDI. It was all over the press at the time. The Soviet government had extensive publications, said what they said. Reacted as they did. And reactions here were the same: And what I said happened, happened.

Q: Well, now—

LAROUCHE: Now, therefore, instead of going by your statistical view, why not go with the events that actually happened?

Q: Okay, now, I did read in one of your publications that you predicted the fall of the Soviet Union on Oct. 12, 1988?

Q: I actually watched that video. They included it in one of their webcasts. I didn't catch like the—but, your way of viewing statistics, I've gotten from this talk is more like saying something is going to happen, but giving no window. And I—

LAROUCHE: No, I give a lot of window. If people have a scientific method, they don't have a problem. But these things are not statistical.

History is not mechanical: Human society is not mechanical. You can not use statistical methods to predict human behavior. Human behavior is dynamic. You can forecast it, as a process; you can not predict, like a—

Q: Okay, *fine*. Let's go over some of your predictions. You've said that you're the most successful economic forecaster in the world. Before we go into the history of your forecasts, like the Soviet Union one, which was fine, because two years before the fall of the Soviet Union, I'm pretty sure any economist in their—

LAROUCHE: No, it was not two years before that, it was actually in 1983.

Q: Oh, see, the video I watched—

LAROUCHE: I repeated that in 1988. And I said, it's coming now.

Q: Your current forecast, for the crash of the European and subsequently the world economy due to hyperinflation, because of "funny-money" as you call it, is going to result, in your words, or paraphrasing you, in the reduction of human population from over 6 billion to under 1 billion within the span of a generation, which you define as 25 years.

LAROUCHE: If it is allowed to happen.

Q: So, you think, that on our current free-market, current globalizing trends in the world, if we do not put a stop to it, imminently, we are subject to a decrease in human population on the order of *5 billion people*.

LAROUCHE: Over a period of a generation or two, yes.

Q: A generation is 25 years, sir. That—

LAROUCHE: Or two.

Q: Or two. Well, that's not what you said in your speech, sir. Because—

LAROUCHE: Because, you always have to think in two generations. Your—

Q: By the time I have grandkids, there will be less than 1 billion people on Earth, if we continue our globalizing trend?

LAROUCHE: Yeah. I don't think we'll do it, though.

Q: So, you think it's some sort of a bubble, because population has increased exponentially alongside globalization in the past. So, we're reaching what you call a boundary condition? Is this correct?

LAROUCHE: We're past the boundary condition. We're going down.

Q: Oh, we're going down. The question is, if we're going down, what indicator do you—I understand this is a dynamic process, so [overtalk] objectifying our economy?

LAROUCHE: I don't think—if you haven't looked at any reports, but not statistics.

Q: I've looked at statistics, sir.

LAROUCHE: You have to look at the figures. You have to start with *physical* economy: *Don't take the faked money figures*. Take the physical economy. Now, take county-by-county of the United States, as we have done in many reports—

Q: [talking throughout] Physical economy. Now—no, I've seen you do this before! And this is perfect, because what you're doing, because what you say: Okay, the United States is losing manufacturing jobs. Okay, the United States is losing coal plants, because they're getting old. Wonderful! The truth is, over the globalization trends the last 50 years, we've seen 70% of the world's manufactured goods transfer from developed countries to developing countries. And this is good, because the developed countries have developed the service sector and the service sector is the primary component of our economy. And this is growing, and it's not physical. And, when you look at—

LAROUCHE: Don't believe it. That's insanity. Don't believe a word of it.

Q: [still talking] When you look at physical indicators, sir, you *completely skew* the economy of the United States! We're *not* a manufacturing economy any more!

LAROUCHE: No, you're making it ideological. You're saying that a globalization is good. Therefore, if you see more globalization—to you—that's good. To me, globalization is death: and you're seeing death. Look at the U.S. economy!

Q: I understand that, sir. I do look at the U.S. economy! I look at the revenue of the U.S. economy, and the GDP, and the income, the housing rates, the income rates. And *everything is getting better over the last 20, 30, 50, 100 years!*

Q: Us college students do read the news, and there was a report, that even in the midst of Katrina, even in the midst of everything, the, the economy has grown—I mean—

Q: It's at 3.7% growth, during Katrina.

LAROUCHE: You're wrong. No, it isn't. Don't believe any of it.

Q: Where do you get your information, sir?

LAROUCHE: I said, we go by physical facts. We go by county-by-county for example, in the United States.

Q: Wonderful. And you measure manufacturing plants, and coal-producing plants, and nuclear plants, and that's great.

LAROUCHE: No, no, we measure everything.

Q: And I saw your presentation, and I think that's a legitimate presentation of the composition of United States counties with regard to *physical capital*. *But*: How do you account for, or do you completely deny the existence of, intellectual capital, innovative capital, service capital, um, human capital, especially?

LAROUCHE: I'll tell you, what you would call those categories, I would generally say, they're nonexistent, they're fictional.

Q: Okay. So, when someone invents something, and sells it, but does not manufacture it themselves, they have created nothing of worth?

LAROUCHE: Well, it depends. What physical effect does it have?

Q: The physical effect is that someone, is that 300,000 people in a developing country enter a new manufacturing sector to develop whatever it is that was invented.

LAROUCHE: No, not at all.

Q: Then how come 70% of the world's manufacturing is done in developing countries that didn't invent the stuff that they're manufacturing?

LAROUCHE: Well, how come the world is in the trouble it's in? Now, look for example: India and China. India and China are the two primary examples of countries which have absorbed the export of U.S. and European production. The condition there, is, India still has 70% of the population of India is in worsening conditions—

Q: We have two seconds, sir.

Q: Yeah, two seconds.

LAROUCHE: And you have a similar problem in China.

Q: I just want to ask you, we're almost out of time, here. You would agree that over the years, you have generated a fair amount of controversy. Is that a fair statement?

LAROUCHE: I don't know if I generated it. Maybe other people generated it. There has been controversy.

Q: For example, one of your quotes that I have here, from "The Politics of Male Impotence," says, "Can we imagine anything more viciously sadistic than the black ghetto mother?" and other quotes like this—quotes against African Americans, Jews—

LAROUCHE: This is taking quotes out of context. They don't mean anything. You know that.

Q: See, but—standing alone, you would repudiate that statement?

LAROUCHE: No! I don't have to repudiate anything! You should take the whole—everything I wrote. Don't take, third-hand, or fourth-hand quotes from somebody out of context.

Q: I'm sure that the listeners at Georgetown University had a very enlightening discussion. [Lyn laughs]

Q: Yeah! We'd like to thank you. Again, if you could have your staff forward me the MP3 of this conversation, I'd appreciate that.

LAROUCHE: Why sure. We'll take care of that. Have fun.

Q: And you've been absolutely great. We've enjoyed the discussion here on "The Right Stuff," with Mr. Right. Thank you, Alex Bozmoski, Joe McReynolds for co-hosting. Thank you, Mr. LaRouche. And we looked forward to, you know, this dialogue and discussion here at Georgetown University.

Thank you very much, sir.

LAROUCHE: Have a good time.

U.S. Economic/Financial News

SEC Subpoenas and Bankruptcy Rumors Hit GM

General Motors stocks and bonds suddenly sank Oct. 27 on fallout from the disastrous Delphi bankruptcy. Reports that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) had issued a number of subpoenas to GM were confirmed by company spokesmen. Rumors of a GM bankruptcy by early 2006 spread around stock and bond markets—denied by CEO Rick Wagoner in a statement to Reuters, and hotly denied by a GM spokeswoman in a Dearborn, Mich. press conference.

The SEC subpoenas appear to be of two types. One set is "routine," questioning GM's "Enron accounting" on the present value of its pension funds' assets. This is important in reality, but routine for companies' pension funds, since the Roaring '90s, and pension law presently does not challenge them on this. These subpoenas, sources said, may get into big losses in a Refco investment by one GM pension fund. But the subpoenas date from earlier this year, and also went to Ford and DaimlerChrysler.

But other, new subpoenas have to do with determining whether GM is obligated for \$11-12 billion in pension obligations of Delphi. This is much more serious for GM, and may be "political," i.e., may involve action by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp. (PBGC), or other parts of the Bush Administration.

Later, on Oct. 27, *Auto Insider* reported that GM spokesmen had confirmed that the new subpoenas deal with any obligation GM may have to fund pension and other retirement benefits costs in connection with Delphi's proceedings under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

Eight Weeks After Katrina: Business Loans to Less Than 2% of Applicants

Shortly after Hurricane Katrina struck Aug. 29, the Small Business Administration put into implementation a disaster loan program to help Katrina's victims, and subsequently, those of Hurricane Rita as well. The SBA can extend a Business Physical Disaster Loan to a business to repair or replace its machinery and equipment, supplies, real estate, etc. It can also make loans to homeowners for repairs.

As a leading feature of the Bush-Cheney Administration's policy to abandon the U.S. Gulf states, precipitating their physical collapse, the SBA, rather than acting in an expedited manner, has extended a bare minimum in loans. According to an Oct. 21 conference call in which *EIR* participated, with Herbert Mitchell, head of the SBA's Office of Disaster Assistance, the SBA, through Oct. 21, had received applications for 142,177 disaster loans, and had approved only 2,295, a miniscule 1.6%. This must be assessed against the background that according to Louisiana Gov. Kathleen Blanco, of Louisiana's 198,000 businesses, a total of 81,000, or 41%, have been shut down or displaced—a catastrophe.

Senator Olympia Snowe (R-Me), chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, released a blistering statement Oct. 25, charging, "The SBA's continued failure to process and approve disaster loans in a timely manner for the victims of Hurricane[s] Katrina and Rita is indefensible and inexcusable." She vowed that she will call an oversight hearing on this matter as soon as possible.

Federal Aid Urgently Needed for Louisiana Hospitals

Without Federal aid soon, thousands of public hospital employees will be laid off, and Louisiana's public hospital system threatened, according to a spokesman for the hospitals. "If Federal money cannot be found to somehow keep some, if not all" of the 3,000 hospital employees who had to evacuate "on the payroll, until we can ramp up and resume operations, we will have to begin furloughing employees as early as next month. Furlough means leave without pay, which is a predicate to layoffs," the spokesman said. "Some have been integrated into existing hospitals in the system, but obviously we can't

restore jobs for everybody," according to the spokesman.

The spokesman added that a new problem looms: The two public hospitals in New Orleans, Charity and University, which were all but destroyed—Charity will not be salvageable—provided one-third to one-half of all revenues for the statewide public hospital system, comprising nine hospitals. "As the two hospitals in New Orleans go, we are worried that without some sort of a Congressional appropriation, or some money from Congress forthcoming, the problems with New Orleans are going to have a domino effect throughout the system. This will impact precarious situations that exist at many of these hospitals, and only make it worse."

Hurricanes Cause Jump in Mass Layoffs

The number of mass layoff events hit 2,069 in September, the highest level since November 2001, and the fourth-highest total since record-keeping began in April 1995, according to a report issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics Oct. 25. In the ten "industries" with the most mass-layoff initial claims, 59% of claims were filed in Louisiana and 23% in Mississippi; and in seven of the ten sectors, Louisiana and Mississippi accounted for more than 90% of the claims. For the U.S. as a whole, manufacturing accounted for 20% of all mass layoffs and 24% of initial claims. Here's the BLS breakdown:

| "INDUSTRY" | LAYOFFS | *** | %LA/MS |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-----|--------|
| Elementary and secondary schools | 14,126 | | 91.8 |
| Temporary health services | 11,057 | | 29.0 |
| Gen. medical & surgical hospitals | 9,943 | | 92.6 |
| Casino hotels | 6,404 | | 90.0 |
| Shipbuilding and repairing | 6,168 | | 98.0 |
| Hotels and motels, non-casino | 5,148 | | 87.7 |
| Limited-service restaurants | 4,867 | | 95.9 |
| Full-service restaurants | 4,625 | | 94.8 |
| Supermarkets & grocery stores | 4,325 | | 68.9 |
| Casinos, ex-casino hotels | 4,292 | | 94.2 |

World Economic News

Top U.K. Hedge Fund Probed by Financial Services Authority

GLG Partners and one of its top traders, Phillipe Jabre, are under investigation by the Financial Services Authority, concerning three trades in convertible bonds ("debt which usually converts into shares at a future date" according to the *Daily Telegraph* Oct. 27), issued by Vivendi Universal of France, telecom company Alcatel, and Japanese conglomerate Sumitomo Mitsui Financial Group.

The investigation is believed to center on whether Jabre improperly used insider information to short the companies' shares. The *Telegraph* notes that arbitrage firms like GLG make money by short-selling companies' shares while buying into convertible issues, and that these traders "seek to spot businesses that are in need of capital and likely to issue convertibles." GLG, which manages \$1.8 billion, "is one of the biggest in the sector and has the power to move share prices." Regulators in Spain and France have als

The British Financial Services Administration (FSA) had called in GLG, as one of 30 top hedge funds which were warned that their practices were dangerously close to violating laws against insider trading.

Asian Development Bank Head Attacks Floating Exchange Rates

"Even small exchange-rate misalignments can disturb trade and investment flows and create trade friction," Asian Development Bank President Haruhiko Kuroda said in a Manila (Philippines) speech Oct. 26. Asia has "an enormous disparity in income levels, living standards, and ... is still home to almost two-thirds of the world's poor.... This is simply unacceptable," he said.

Kuroda, however, drew the mistaken conclusion that "Asia's long-term objective should be monetary union with a single currency," the so-called "Asian Currency Unit." He called for "regional economic integration."

Kuroda did note that Europe's surrender of sovereignty and enforcement of austerity has not worked. "Asia could experiment with a model of regional economic integration with minimum political compromises across countries," he added. "Unlike in Europe, there may be much more we can do in Asia. Asia should therefore draw important lessons from Europe, but carve out its own model of economic integration."

Brazil Hoof-and-Mouth Disease Outbreak Threatens Beef Supplies Worldwide

Forty-three nations have now partly or totally suspended imports of Brazilian beef, due to the outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease first reported in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, near the Paraguayan border, it was reported Oct. 20-21. Some countries are refusing imports only from Matto Grosso do Sul, while others won't buy beef from anywhere in Brazil.

In the context of a generalized breakdown of sanitation and health-care infrastructure for human as well as animal populations, the Brazilian outbreak has serious implications for the country and the region. On Oct. 20, the Southern Cone Permanent Veterinarian Committee met in emergency session in Montevideo to discuss how to deal with the new outbreak, against the backdrop of growing concern over an avian flu pandemic.

Brazil has the world's largest cattle herd—190 million head—and exports 23% of all the beef marketed in the world.

United States News Digest

Bush-Cheney Ohio Honcho Indicted for Money Laundering

On Oct. 27, a Federal grand jury issued an indictment against Tom Noe, the former Toledo, Ohio-area coin dealer at the center of a state investment scandal; Noe was charged with laundering money into President Bush's re-election campaign last year. The three-count indictment in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio says that Noe contributed over the legal limit to the Bush campaign by giving money to 24 friends and associates to make contributions under their own names; the other two counts are for conspiracy and filing false statements. "Noe faces the maximum penalty of five years in prison on each count. The conspiracy and false statement counts carry a maximum fine of \$250,000 and the campaign finance violation carries a mandatory fine of between \$136,200 and \$454,000," the *Toledo Blade* reported Oct. 27, adding that the U.S. Attorney's office said the Bush campaign had no part in Noe's alleged crimes.

DeLay Reports Error in Fundraising List

The *New York Times* reported Oct. 27 on a correction in erstwhile House Majority Leader Tom DeLay's annual ethics-in-government filing, concerning \$20,850 in contributions to his legal defense fund in 2000 and 2001 which had not been reported. Additional amounts were reported in the fund's quarterly report, but not in the disclosure report, and some dollar amounts were misreported. Tom DeLay Legal Expense Trust Fund trustee Brent Perry is quoted, "It was not an ethical lapse. It was a bookkeeping lapse. I did not review the reports thoroughly enough."

Perry's Oct. 6 letter to the House Ethics Committee lists these items. The items not reported in the 2000 and 2001 statements include \$5,000 each from John and Katherine McGovern (Houston), Douglas DeVos (Grand Rapids, Mich.), and Richard DeVos (Manalapan, Fla.). Items which were reported by the Fund, but not forwarded to those preparing the disclosure statement in 2000, include \$5,000 each from Reliant Energy, Texans for Lamar Smith (San Antonio), and Duncan for Congress (Knoxville, Tenn.); they total \$17,300. DeLay's letter to the Committee, sent a week after Perry's, says that he discovered discrepancies in the reports in February 2005, notified the Committee, and initiated an audit of the Fund.

Bush Administration Drops Nuclear Bunker-Busters from Budget

Senior intelligence and security personnel from two nuclear development labs commented to the *Washington Times* Oct. 27 that the pullback on the so-called nuclear bunker-buster bombs is a major shift away from the preemptive-nuclear-strike policy of Vice President Dick Cheney. Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) said Oct. 26 that the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration had requested that funding for the development of nuclear bunker busters be pulled from the Energy Department's budget. Over the last year the Congress has refused to fund the relevant research and had asked a National Academy of Sciences panel to produce a report on what the real effects of such tactical nuclear weapons would be. The panel found that the Earth-penetrating nuclear devices would have the same casualties as a surface burst of a nuclear weapon of equal size. These conclusions of the panel stood in direct opposition to what the neo-cons were telling the Congress.

Wilkerson: Detainee Abuse Will Be 'Shameful' for U.S.

The story of detainee abuse by the U.S. military, once it is discovered by historians, "is going to be shameful for my country and for my armed forces," stated Lawrence Wilkerson, former Secretary of State Colin Powell's former Chief of Staff, in a C-SPAN interview Oct. 27. Responding to a question about the public's understanding of America's war in Iraq from books such as those of Bob Woodward and Richard Clarke, Wilkerson called them "instant history," which nonetheless do a service, but that when dispassionate historians look over the information in the future, they will find a different story, and "one of those stories" is detainee abuse. We've seen a few privates and NCOs punished, but few of higher rank, and no civilians; no one in a decision-making position has been punished or held accountable, he said.

To one caller's attack on his alleged failure to appreciate President Bush's bold doctrine of preemption, Wilkerson pointed out that while the doctrine, as such, has been around for a long time, and is the right of any nation-state faced with imminent attack, "I would be very reluctant ... to use force in a massive way, in a preemptive way, in today's world, based on intelligence that comes from the intelligence community, the sources that we have available to us.... We were so grievously in error about [WMD], that I would have great reluctance to strike another nation, to kill people, to perhaps bring us into conflict with that nation, based on intelligence that heretofore has shown me, is anything but trustworthy. So, it would have to be ironclad."

Wilkerson added that he's also concerned that if there's another catastrophic attack, e.g., with a nuclear weapon, 9/11 will pale in comparison. "I fear for what a President will have to do under those circumstances.... I think we have a real good chance for martial law; I think there's a chance we may see our civil liberties abridged in ways we haven't seen since the Civil War, and maybe further."

Bipartisan Senate Majority Demands Full Funding for LIHEAP

A bipartisan majority of the Senate just won't take "no" for an answer, until full-funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), which aids the poor and elderly, is passed. On Oct. 25, Republican Senators Susan Collins (Me) and Arlen Specter (Pa), and Democrats Jack Reed (RI), Robert Byrd (WVa), and Edward M. Kennedy (Mass), announced their support for an amendment increasing LIHEAP emergency funding by \$2.92 billion, so it reaches the full \$5.1 billion authorized in the budget. This will be the third attempt to get the amendment passed, support for which has grown (from 50 to 53 Senators) every time it comes up. The Bush/Cheney Republicans thus far have applied procedural games to require 60 votes for passage. Refusing to accept defeat, the Senators have attached the same amendment just defeated to yet another bill, to force another vote.

Each of the five Senators spoke on the Senate floor about how it is a disgrace that America's poor and elderly face the choice of "heat or eat." Even if the full authorized \$5.1 billion is funded, it is inadequate, as even at that level only one-seventh of the 35 million households poor enough to qualify for assistance will get help, they pointed out. Because Federal funding for LIHEAP has been stagnant for over a decade, the purchasing power of LIHEAP assistance, adjusted for inflation, is now only a little over half of what it was in 1982, Kennedy said.

Insane House Republicans, meanwhile, propose that the \$2 billion currently allocated for LIHEAP be cut by half, to a laughable \$1 billion!

Leahy Issues Call To Withdraw from Iraq War

Senator Patrick Leahy (D-Vt) delivered a call to withdraw from the "handful of political operatives' war" in Iraq, as the death toll of U.S. soldiers there hit 2,000. Speaking on the Senate floor Oct. 25, he said, "Once a new government is in place, I believe the President should consult with Congress on a flexible plan that includes pulling our troops back from the densely populated areas where they are suffering the most casualties, and bring them home."

Leahy added that we "now know" the war plan was "hatched by a handful of political operatives" even before 9/11 ... [and that] history will not judge kindly those who got us into this debacle ... after deceiving the American people."

Also, on the afternoon of Oct. 25, the office of Rep. Jim McGovern (D-Mass) said that he has drafted a bill to be introduced by Oct. 31, to cut off all funding for additional military operations in Iraq, allowing already appropriated funds only to be used for the withdrawal of troops, and for equipping of existing forces.

Bush Is 'Frustrated' and 'Angry'

"Facing the darkest days of his Presidency, President Bush is frustrated, sometimes angry and even bitter," according to Bush associates cited in the Oct. 25 New York *Daily News*. Bush is lashing out at his top aides and junior-level staffers—including Andrew Card, Karl Rove, and even Dick Cheney. Bush has reportedly told associates that Cheney was overly involved in intelligence issues leading up to the Iraq war, which has been seized on by Administration critics. This is the sort of response by Bush forecast by Dr. Justin Frank, author of the book, *Bush on the Couch* (see InDepth for interview with Dr. Frank.)

Arnie's Name Pulled from Ads for His Ballot Initiatives

As an indication of how bad things have gotten for California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger—whose poll numbers are

below those of George Bush—the special election campaign for the fascist ballot initiatives (#74-77), pulled two ads that featured Arnie sitting in a backyard, pumping the initiatives, pleading, "Help me change Sacramento, so we can rebuild California." The campaign is running instead three ads advocating the proposals *without mentioning Schwarzenegger's name*, according to the *Los Angeles Times* Oct. 23. This, even though the George Shultz-marionette Schwarzenegger put the initiatives on the ballot. The special election for the initiatives takes place on Nov. 8.

Ibero-American News Digest

Ecuador Congress to Rumsfeld: Please Invade Us

On Oct. 27, an overwhelming majority of Ecuador's Congress voted to formally request that the Organization of American States (OAS) activate the "collective action" clause of the OAS Democratic Charter, and intervene in Ecuador in alleged "defense of the democratic order." This clause, originally designed by long-time Kissingerian State Department strategist Luigi Einaudi, has been Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's hobbyhorse since 2002, to justify his drive to establish supranational forces to "defend democracy." Just two weeks ago, Rumsfeld called in the Central American Defense Ministers, to work out details for the establishment of such a regional rapid deployment force for Central America.

The pretext cited by Ecuador's Congress for invoking supranational intervention was that President Alfredo Palacio plans to convoke a Constituent Assembly would have the power to throw out the current authorities, Congress included. The Congress charged the plan is unconstitutional. The OAS, headed by Chile's Jose Manuel Insulza, is now studying the Congress's request.

This request is likely to become a hot topic at the upcoming Summit of the Americas, which Argentine President Nestor Kirchner has been fighting to make focus on the real issue: the urgency of a new international financial architecture.

Separatists Threaten To Carve Up Bolivia

Santa Cruz, Bolivia separatists threatened to proclaim themselves an independent nation, if their province is not granted four more seats in Congress before the Dec. 4 general elections. This is exactly the scenario for the break-up of Bolivia into two nations—one owned by the oil interests, the other by the drug-runners—laid out by Dick Cheney's American Enterprise Institute in June 2004. Previously, leaders of the Santa Cruz Civic Committee had claimed they only sought "autonomy," but at a meeting on Oct. 26, Senator Helen Hayes, from Rio Tinto Zinc representative Gonzalo Sanchez de Losada's MNR party, declared their objective to be outright independence. Whether the radicals of the Santa Cruz elite can rally support behind splitting their nation even as their Washington backers are battling to stay out of jail in the U.S., has yet to be seen.

Covering this crisis on Oct. 28, Chile's *La Tercera* raised the specter of regional intervention should the State collapse in Bolivia, and the country become "a perfect base for guerrilla groups," threatening its neighbors.

LaRouche Laughs at Those Who Think Mexican Presidential Race Is Locked In

Mexico nominates representatives of defeated U.S. causes as their batch of Presidential candidates for the 2006 Presidential election. Local pundits insist that the contending candidates for the three major parties—the PAN, the PRI, and the PRD—are now locked in place. Lyndon LaRouche's comment Oct. 26 was: "Ha, ha, ha! These guys are going to go. Mexico again is accepting second-hand politicians, leftovers from the departed Bush-Cheney Administration."

Those in Mexico who talk about "going with the majority in the U.S.," LaRouche added, are not in the real world, and are not to be treated as serious, intellectually. They like to pretend that they've got a friend in the U.S., and all that kind of stuff, but the Bush-Cheney gang is history.

The developments which supposedly have sewn everything up:

* The candidate of the ruling National Action Party (PAN), appears to be Felipe Calderon, an old-line, second-generation Synarchist, after he won such a strong victory in the party's third primary Oct. 23, that his chief opponent withdrew from the race. Calderon is a real neo-con piece of work, supporting a flat tax, a radical labor reform to do everything from eliminating the eight-hour work day, to effectively legalizing child labor disguised as an "apprentice" program, and "fusing" the state oil company Pemex with the international oil cartels. Jorge Castaneda, Wall Street's fair-haired boy, has been campaigning for Calderon for the past month, telling Wall Street heavyweights at a private dinner in Washington, D.C., organized by George Shultz's JP Morgan, on Sept. 23, that Calderon is the man to defeat "populism" in Mexico, once and for all.

* Roberto Madrazo expects to have the PRI candidacy locked up shortly, after the Fox government and former President Carlos Salinas—Bush, Sr.'s corrupt buddy who ushered in NAFTA—teamed up to threaten his chief opponent, former Mexico state Gov. Arturo Montiel, telling him that if he ran, he and his family would face a massive tax and illicit income investigation. Montiel quit the race on Oct. 20.

* Within the PRD, the Oct. 23 call for the PRD to unite around the candidacy of Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador by Lazaro Cardenas, the Governor of the state of Michoacan and son of Cuauhtemoc Cardenas (and grandson of FDR's friend General Cardenas), is being hailed in the media as a sign that Lopez Obrador opponent Cuauhtemoc Cardenas has also decided to join the bandwagon—although that is not a done deal, yet.

So the "word" in Mexico is that all three candidates, each of whom has Salinas/Cheney agents heavily within their camp, are now "locked in"—which is pretty amusing, given how quickly the Bush/Cheney Titanic is sinking.

Mexican Farmers to Peruvians: Free Trade a 'Nightmare'

Leaders of Mexico's National Peasant Federation (CNC) warned a visiting delegation of Peruvians, including Agriculture Minister Manuel Manrique Ugarte, to think twice before they consider accepting a free-trade agreement with the U.S., as is now being discussed, *La Jornada* reported Oct. 10. Eleven years after the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed, Mexican agriculture is destroyed—the nation has lost 41% of its food production self-sufficiency; 2 million peasants have been forced to abandon their lands. "Look at the Mexican peasantry as if you were looking in a mirror, because ... all [NAFTA] has left us is misery, unemployment, and migration" to the U.S., the CNC leaders warned.

NAFTA was supposed to increase Mexican exports and attract foreign investment, said CNC technical advisor Diodoro Carrasco Altamirano. But the result has been "chilling," as seen in the case of the Sonora wheat producers, who have been devastated. Congressman Cruz Lopez Aguilar, president of the Lower House's Agriculture Committee, underscored that NAFTA is "the dream that was never realized, turned into your worst nightmare."

Fox Gov't Caught Trying To Privatize Customs Service

Without consulting Congress, on Oct. 11, the official Mexican government daily published a quiet announcement that they were accepting bids for private interests to participate in Mexico's Customs Service. When they got wind of this, Senators and Congressmen from the opposition PRD and PRI parties denounced this wild plan as unconstitutional, and a threat to

national sovereignty and security, and are demanding Treasury Minister Francisco Gil Diaz be hauled before Congress, to testify. Gil Diaz is now busy lying that only Customs' electronic data management would be privatized.

Anonymous officials of the Customs Service charged that the Swiss Societe General de Surveillance (SGS) is set to get the contract, in a statement warning that "giving the bid to that company would be like the Mexican Central Bank granting to a credit institution of the Cayman Islands, world center of money-laundering, the regulation of remittances from Mexican citizens living in the U.S."

The Mexican government appears to be on a desperate privatization bid. Presidential adviser Eduardo Sojo told Bloomberg Oct. 14, that, by the end of the Fox regime, the government intends to sign contracts worth \$3.7 billion for private interests to build and manage hospitals and schools and upgrade toll-free roads, using the British "public-private partnership" model. Sojo bragged that this would be the biggest initiative yet in Ibero-America to use the British model, where private companies invest in infrastructure and provide public services in exchange for a fee paid by the government.

Brazil Gun Ban Goes Down to Defeat

The plebiscite to ban gun sales in Brazil went down to stinging defeat on Oct. 23, with nearly two-thirds, or 64%, voting "no." The ban failed in all 26 states and the Federal district of Brasilia. When the campaign began, supporters of the ban expected to win up to 80% of the vote, but the opposition turned this around by simply asking the question: "Do you feel safe, and do you think the government can protect you?" They also suggested that a "no" vote would be a vote against the government of beleaguered President Lula da Silva.

Lyndon LaRouche had warned in early October that "Those who are proposing to take guns away from the population in Brazil, are going to bring on a civil war. You have entire areas of Brazil, including the *favelas* in the big cities, which are terra incognita, armed camps. If they continue on this, if they disarm the poor, they will unleash asymmetric civil war," and this will play right into the scenario of permanent warfare being promoted across South America by Dick Cheney, the Moonies, Banco Santander, Prince Philip's WWF, and so forth, LaRouche stated. (See "Will Ibero-America Get It Right This Time?" EIR, Oct. 14, 2005.)

Western European News Digest

Grand Coalition Could Still Fail To Materialize

The obsession of leading German politicians in the country's two major opposing parties—the CDU-CSU of Angela Merkel and the SPD of Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder—to make "budget consolidation" the number one priority on the agenda of the incoming government of a "Grand Coalition" between the two parties, has provoked friction in both camps. Those who are insisting that job creation be a priority, still have gotten no hint of what the new government wants to do about it. There are several crisis indicators in the ongoing inter-party talks about the formation of a coalition government.

First, Edmund Stoiber, designated Minister of Economics, has leaked to the media that he might still decide to stay on as Governor of Bavaria and not join the cabinet. Then, outgoing Chancellor Schroeder, who is on the inter-party talks team, said last night in a speech before the American Chamber of Commerce in Berlin, that he was just coming from "inharmonious" talks, where the music was "heavy metal rather than Bach," because of the "many considerable differences in views that still exist" among the SPD, CDU, and CSU. Schroeder said that more effort had to be invested, to have the coalition ready by late November, adding that he was generally optimistic it would work, in the end.

Designated Chancellor Merkel, however, said after the same talks to which Schroeder had referred, that the coalition was

still not secure, that "it might also fail," and that an enormous effort still had to be invested to make the Grand Coalition happen and make her Chancellor on Nov. 22.

Tory David Cameron Has Solid Neocon Credentials

British neocons have pushed "Young Toff" David Cameron towards leadership of the Tory Party, out of fear that Kenneth Clark might otherwise take over the party, wrote commentator Neil Clark in the London *Guardian* Oct. 24. Cameron is being retooled as a "Tory moderate," but in reality he is a total neocon, Clark wrote.

On domestic policy, Cameron has supported the (totally discredited) flat tax and more generally supports "a classic Thatcherite economic agenda of tax cuts and deregulation." On foreign policy, Cameron is "an unreconstructed hawk." The masterminds of the Cameron campaign have been Tory MPs George Osborne (supporter of the flat tax), Michael Gove, and Ed Vaizey. Gove wrote the article, "The Very British Roots of Neoconservatism," published in Irwin Stelzer's "Neocon Reader," which endorses Tony Blair as a true neocon on the model of Lord Palmerston, George Canning, and Winston Churchill.

Gove and Vaizey are both big supporters of the U.K. branch of the "Henry [Scoop] Jackson Society," which will be formally launched in London in November. Cameron, like Osborne, supported the Iraq war from the beginning.

Henry Jackson Society To Launch British Branch

The British branch of the Henry Jackson Society will be formally launched at the houses of Parliament on Nov. 22. The "Statement of Principles" of the British Jackson groupies is pure Neocon Thought: They endorse "modern liberal democracies" as the example for the entire world, and support a "'forward strategy' to assist those countries that are not yet liberal and democratic to become so. This would involve the full spectrum of our 'carrot' capacities, be they diplomatic, economic, cultural or political, but also, when necessary, those 'sticks' of the military domain."

This statement comes right out of the long-term fight in the British Empire between the "forward school" lunatics epitomized by Lord Curzon, who pushed Britain into every military adventure possible, and the moderates who tried to curb these adventures, which often ended up in disaster, such as Afghanistan in 1841.

Otherwise, the "Principles" say that the supposed success of the "Western policies of strength and human rights" in bringing down the "Soviet dictatorship" are due greatly to Jackson. In the post-Cold War era, the West has "to engage, robustly and sometimes preventatively."

Jackson Society "International Patrons" are the usual crew: William Kristol, Richard Perle, James Woolsey, Robert Kagan, Bruce P. Jackson of the Project for Transitional Democracies, Gen. Jack Sheehan, Vytautas Landsbergis, and Joshua Muravchik.

British signers include MPs Michael Ancram, Michael Gove, Edward Vaizey, and David Willetts; *Times* assistant editor Gerard Baker; Col. Tim Collins (who recently told the *Telegraph* that Iraq was descending into open civil war); Paul Cornish of the Royal Institute of International Affairs; and former MI6 head Sir Richard Dearlove.

Polish Elections Signal Rejection of Neoliberal Economics

The second round of the Polish Presidential elections was won with an overwhelming majority by national conservative candidate Lech Kaczynski from the PiS (Party of Law and Solidarity), who got more than 55% of the electoral vote. The

vote was a clear rejection of neoliberal economic policies; it is a vote in defense of the social sovereign nation-state; it is "Euroskeptical" and will have an impact on the future debate within the EU.

Political observers in Poland told *EIR* that a question remains as to the new President's foreign policy orientation. As to his domestic policy, a political observer in Poland told *EIR* that Kaczynski, in a recent Presidential candidate debate on Polish TVN, made reference to the dissertation which he had written about labor law, in which he referred to the excellent insurance system which was developed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in the U.S., and the social laws developed under Chancellor Otto von Bismarck in Germany. Donald Tusk, from the liberal PO, had answered that he was glad, since this showed that Kaczynski would not be as anti-German as portrayed.

Wall of Silence on 'Cheneygate' Breaks in European Press

After building for a week, the explosion occurred on Oct. 25, after the *New York Times* broke the story identifying Vice President Dick Cheney as the source of the leak of the identity of Valerie Plame as a CIA officer.

The nature of the coverage suggests how strongly most European countries want Cheney to be driven from office. Leading examples follow by country: - Germany -

* *Die Welt* has the headline with a photo of Cheney: "Bush advisor Rove about to be indicted. Libby accused of perjury and treason; speculation that Cheney will resign."

Suddeutsche Zeitung has the most extensive coverage of all German papers, and writes that "all roads are leading to the Office of Dick Cheney."

* A report in the *Suedwest-Radio* implying that Cheney will be indicted this morning, was broadcast hourly, all day long.

* The *Sueddeutsche Zeitung Junge Welt* daily wrote that the "noose is tightening in the office of the Vice President."

* The *Wiesbadener Kurier* spoke of the "new Watergate."

* The *Frankfurter Allgemeine* daily and the online page of *Spiegel* carried longer items on the issue, with many details, although they played down the implications for Cheney. - Switzerland -

* The Swiss daily *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* carries the headline "Bush's Vice President in center of leak investigation."

* The U.K.: Jonathan Freedland wrote in the *Guardian* that the issue is one "in which we all have a stake. Now America has its own David Kelly affair." The entire Bush Administration is at "a moment of exceptional weakness.... But it's more important than that. Now there is a chance to discredit not just Bush's Presidency, but the ideology which led to the disastrous adventure in Iraq." - Spain -

* Under the headline "New revelations put Cheney in the center of the spy scandal," the Spanish daily *El Pais* for the first time carries an almost full-page article on the evolving Cheneygate.

Labor-Industry Lobby Backs Nuclear Power Plants in Germany

In a cautiously worded statement issued Oct. 26, the two labor unions Ver.di (services) and IGBCE (mining, energy) and the four leading power-producing firms E.ON, EnBW, RWE, and Vattenfall, state that to secure power supplies for the future, "no source of energy should be excluded," which refers to nuclear power.

The statement says that the aim of reducing pollution can only be reached, if existing nuclear reactors are not replaced by plants operating with gas, oil, or coal. Existing nuclear power plants should be licensed, as long as safety standards are met, which implies (although not stated explicitly) that power plants should be operated as long as technically possible—not for a maximum of 30 years, as the SPD/Green Party government's nuclear exit decision says; such plants could run for 40, 50, even 60 years.

Russia and the CIS News Digest

Eurasian Diplomacy in Moscow

Indian External Affairs Minister Natwar Singh began a four-day visit to Moscow on Oct. 25. He attended the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) heads-of-government meeting and the bilateral Indo-Russian inter-Governmental Commission (IRIGC) on economic, technological and other cooperation. Singh led a large delegation from the Commerce, Economic Affairs, Science & Technology, and Energy Ministries.

President Vladimir Putin hosted the SCO meeting on Oct. 26. India, with Iran and Pakistan, is now an official observer member of the SCO.

In connection with the SCO meeting, there was heightened discussion about the possible formation of a military alliance centered on the SCO. Russian analyst Andranik Migrania told Interfax, "This is quite feasible. In the current situation in the region, its states are experiencing a certain amount of discomfort at the presence of the United States. ... The U.S. demands unconditional loyalty and the observance of its interests, in exchange for assistance in maintaining stability in the region, and if anything happens, starts talking about regime change, like in Iraq." Migranian added that the SCO, on its own, "has sufficient potential to assume the role of regional stabilizer." A military alliance, said Migranian, "will be assigned the task of supplanting the U.S. and NATO, i.e., limiting the zone under their control." He thought the process of forming such an entity "could be completed in five to ten years," but "if the U.S. behaves the way it is currently behaving, this process may proceed much faster."

In one of his regular bulletins, Heritage Foundation analyst Ariel Cohen on Oct. 22 cited a source close to the White House, who said that Vice President Dick Cheney personally ordered a number of steps to signal extreme displeasure to Putin over recent military exercises between China and Russia. According to Cohen, "Cheney's team also pushed for an immediate policy review to formulate a response that could enable to United States to regain the strategic initiative in the region."

Putin: Invite Iran into Caspian Security Force

At an Oct. 24 Russian government meeting, President Vladimir Putin instructed Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov to negotiate with all the Caspian Sea littoral nations, on the formation of a Caspian regional security and peacekeeping force, RIA Novosti reported. An Iran.ru dispatch, monitored by RFE/RL Newsline, said that Lavrov met that same day with Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki. Lavrov said afterwards that, "issues concerning the Iranian nuclear program" should continue to be handled through the IAEA, while Russia would pursue a resolution to disputes about that program, that "provides the legal right of Iran to access the peaceful use of nuclear energy and, on the other hand, eliminates any doubts as to [its] peaceful nature." U.S. National Security Advisor Stephen Hadley was in town for talks

with Lavrov and Putin, also on Oct. 24.

Khristenko, Gazprom Push U.S. Sales and Investment

Russian Minister of Industry and Energy Victor Khristenko met with President George W. Bush in Washington Oct. 24, during a trip on which he was accompanied by Alexander Medvedev, deputy chairman of Gazprom, the Russian natural gas giant. Khristenko was pushing Russian gas sales to the United States, as well as the private pipeline and export terminal at Murmansk, designed to get Russian crude oil to the U.S. market.

At the same time, Khristenko and Medvedev pushed for Russia to get into the U.S. energy market in other ways. Medvedev told the *Houston Chronicle* that Gazprom would like to own liquefied natural gas (LNG) pipelines and terminals inside the United States, in exchange for which Gazprom would "let Western energy companies participate in the development of the Shtokman field under the Barents Sea." Khristenko said at an Oct. 26 press conference that he had told Bush that Russia companies like Severstal, Norilsk Nickel and LUKoil have invested over \$1 billion in the United States so far this year, and would like to push that trend farther.

Mittal Steel Buys Giant Ukrainian Company

Global steel companies continue to gobble up formerly state-owned steel mills, seeking cheap labor costs. In the latest such takeover, Mittal Steel Company paid \$4.8 billion for Ukraine's Kryvorizhstal in a televised auction, adding 10 million tons of capacity and bringing its steel-making capacity to 80 million metric tons. With the new plant comes one billion tons of iron-ore reserves, making Mittal the world's fourth-largest iron-ore mining company, behind BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto and CVRD. A year ago, Mittal bought the International Steel Group (ISG), the collection of bankrupt U.S. steel companies (Bethlehem, Weirton, LTV, Acme), for \$4.3 billion. The Kryvorizhstal sale was the second privatization of the Ukrainian plant, initially sold to Ukrainian owners for only one-sixth of the price Mittal has paid. That transaction was cancelled, as having involved corruption, when Victor Yushchenko came to power last year.

Southwest Asia News Digest

Lebanon's Siniora Defuses Confrontation with Palestinians

The French and British (likely under pressure from the U.S. Ambassador to the UN, neo-con nut John Bolton) are circulating a draft UN resolution pushing for open-ended sanctions against Syria, using Lebanon as a pretext (see report below). On Oct. 27, Lebanese Prime Minister Fouad Siniora acted to stop a major confrontation, which had begun two days earlier, involving seven of the Palestinian camps on the Lebanese border with Syria, which had been surrounded by Lebanese Army soldiers and tanks.

At a cabinet meeting Oct. 28, Siniora called off the military deployment and stated emphatically, "We won't be led into a confrontation with the Palestinians.... We insist on conducting an internal dialogue with the Palestinian factions with regard to implementing UN [resolution] 1559 and, soon, I will personally head the committee that will negotiate this issue with the Palestinians." There are about 400,000 Palestinians in Lebanon.

On Oct. 25, it was reported that a Lebanese civilian surveyor had been killed by Palestinian gunmen, along the Syrian border, triggering a military deployment. On Oct. 27, six Lebanese soldiers were detained by the forces of the camp run by the radical Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), headed by Ahmed Jibril, who has been based in Damascus for years. The situation was escalating, when Jibril went on Lebanon New TV, the evening of Oct. 27, and said that the Palestinians were not looking for a confrontation, and that the PFLP had released the six soldiers after having

interrogated them. He also denied that the PFLP had killed the surveyor.

Also on Oct. 27, after the Lebanese cabinet meeting, Information Minister Ghazi Aridi reiterated that disarmament of militias, including the Palestinians and Hizbollah, will be settled through national dialogue. "The UN has their own point of view and we have ours," Aridi said.

Diplomatic Push To Stop Cheney War Against Syria

On Oct. 26, Saad Hariri, the son of slain Lebanese leader, former Prime Minister Rafik Hariri, intervened in the international arena, to voice his opposition to sanctions against Syria, which have been proposed by the U.S., France, and Britain, in a draft resolution to the UN Security Council. The resolution surfaced on Oct. 25, just after the Security Council heard from Detlev Mehlis, who heads the investigation into Hariri's murder.

The Mehlis report alleges the knowledge of some Syrian officials about the assassination and a lack of cooperation by the Syrian government in the investigation; both allegations have been strongly denied by the Syrian government. Syrian President Bashar Assad has already sent a letter to the Security Council stating that his government would prosecute any Syrians involved in the assassination to the full extent of Syrian law.

The Security Council has postponed any action until Oct. 31, when a meeting at the Ministerial level takes place.

Saad Hariri praised the Mehlis investigation, and while stating his unshakeable commitment to finding the killers of his father, and bringing them to justice, he added, "We are friends with Syria, and friends with the Syrian people. There is a long historical friendship between Lebanon and Syria, and we wish to preserve it." Hariri held meetings on Oct. 25 in London, with British Foreign Secretary Jack Straw, and with French President Jacques Chirac in Paris on Oct. 26, asking them to support his desire to have those who are accused of murdering his father Rafik, to be tried by an international tribunal. According to many press reports in Lebanon, Chirac agreed to support this measure.

Saad Hariri's opposition to sanctions, puts him at odds with the Bush Administration, which, under the control of serial warmonger Vice President Dick Cheney, wants nothing less than "regime change" in Syria, i.e., the overthrow of President Assad. But, Cheney has to first clear the hurdle of the UN.

For the international community, the draft resolution against Syria, and the arm-twisting coming from the U.S. and its "allies" has the rotten stench of the U.S. maneuvers of October 2002, when the Bush Administration was trying to use the UN as a fig leaf for a preemptive attack on Iraq. As Yogi Berra would say, "It's *deja vu*, all over again."

However, this time around, some of the major political forces that opposed the Iraq war, but did not stand up to the Cheney lies in 2002 and 2003, have come out actively opposing sanctions, and are reaching out to Damascus to ensure its full cooperation with the United Nations investigation.

In a statement from Moscow Oct. 26, Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Mikhail Kalmynin told reporters that Russia "will do everything necessary to stop attempts to introduce sanctions against Syria." Russia, which has veto power as one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, also has firmly asserted that Syria must cooperate fully. In addition, the Arab League rejected sanctions. - The Cheney Factor-

The motivation for the sanctions and pressure on Syria on the part of the Bush Administration is not driven by pure concern over justice in the case of Hariri's murder. It has more to do with saving the political neck of Dick Cheney, whose National Security Advisor Scooter Libby was indicted on Oct. 28 for perjury and obstruction of justice in the Federal

investigation of the leaking of the name of covert CIA agent, Valerie Plame Wilson (see InDepth).

So frantic is Cheney, that he has been placing panicked calls to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon (including one in the middle of the night), to urge him to take military action against Iran. Well-placed Israeli sources reported to *EIRNS* that Cheney told Sharon that the U.S. would back him up, because "the American people won't go for impeachment during a war." The sources added that Sharon isn't interested in using Israel to fight a Cheney war. Cheney desires regime change in Syria.

But despite this pressure, in Israel, it is acknowledged that there are no legal grounds to go after Syria for the Hariri assassination. On Oct. 23, *Ha'aretz* reporter, Zvi Barel wrote, "The details in the Detlev Mehlis probe ... are not sufficient to issue an 'indictment' against Syria or against senior figures in the Syrian and Lebanese governments," and that is the reason that Mehlis requested, and received, an extension of the investigation. Barel adds that some UNSC member states hope that in the next two months, Syria will cooperate with the investigation, fully. The reason that Mehlis was forced to present the report immediately, lies in Washington, not at the UN, Barel says, because the Bush Administration is desperate for some further anti-Syria ammunition.

But even though the Mehlis investigation cannot prove that Syria's leaders ran the Hariri assassination, a new war danger has been set into motion under the auspices of UNSC Resolution 1559, which not only demanded the withdrawal of Syria from Lebanon, but the disarming of every militia group inside Lebanon. For the last several weeks, the Lebanese Army has been engaged in a face-off against Palestinian refugee camps near the Syrian border. On Oct. 26, UN envoy Terje Roed-Larsen reported to the UNSC that there are a "variety of reports" showing that Syrian arms are flowing into the Palestinian camps.

One high-level Lebanese Christian leader expressed grave concern over the renewed buildup of Lebanese-Palestinian tensions. This was, he said, where the 1975 civil war, which he calls the "Thirty Years War," began.

Defense Attorneys in AIPAC-Franklin Case Seek To Question Israelis

The defense attorneys for former employees of the America Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), Keith Weissman and Steve Rosen, have requested permission to question three Israeli diplomats in the case, according to the *Jerusalem Post* Oct. 25. The three include Naor Gilon and Rafi Barak, who were at the Israeli Embassy in Washington and had been in contact with Larry Franklin (see InDepth), who has been indicted for passing on secret documents. Who the third Israeli is, is not yet known.

While the government of Israel is saying it will not provide these witnesses, the Federal prosecutor in the case is also said to seek the questioning of the three Israelis, but has yet to make a formal request. The trial is scheduled to begin on Jan. 3, 2006 in the U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Va.

Israelis Revive Targetted Assassinations, Kicking Off Revenge and Counter-Revenge

On Oct. 27, an Israeli helicopter gunship rocket attack killed seven Palestinians, including two militants and a 15-year-old boy, in the Gaza Strip, *Ha'aretz* reported Oct. 28. The attack was Israel's revenge for a suicide bomb attack in Israel the previous day, which killed five Israelis. The Palestinian suicide bombing attack, in turn, was in retaliation for an Israeli targetted assassination of a leader of Islamic Jihad, carried out in the Occupied West Bank earlier in the week.

In addition, the Israeli Defense Forces have launched a major operation against Islamic Jihad in the northern part of the West Bank, which Israel has cut off from the south. The Israeli operation will continue for three months, reported the

Israeli press.

Now, according to *Ha'aretz* Oct. 28, Hamas has announced that the "calm," which Egypt and other Arab nations had played a major role in negotiating, is over, while Islamic Jihad promised revenge attacks.

The situation pleases Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, because he may now use it to call off the planned meeting in November with Palestinian President Abu Mazen, that Washington is pushing—even though it is known to be nothing but a photo-op for the besieged Bush Administration. Sharon is now insisting that the Palestinian Authority must "stop terror."

Israeli sources told *EIR* that only pressure from the United States will bring "sanity" into a situation which is going out of control. These sources said that the only reason that Sharon finally carried out the withdrawal from the Gaza Strip, was because pressure from Washington had forced him, kicking and screaming all the way, to carry it out.

In fact, no such intervention can be expected from Washington, unless the "permanent war" champion Dick Cheney is replaced.

Asia News Digest

U.S. Complicit in Afghan Opium-Linked Deaths

Since 2001, some 400,000 deaths globally can be linked to U.S./Coalition-licit Afghan opium production. A report titled "U.S. Coalition-Linked Global Drug Deaths" has been sent to virtually all Federal Australian Parliamentarians and numerous state parliamentarians, the Arab TV station *Al Jazeera* said Oct. 26. The report was prepared by Dr. Gideon Polya, an academic based in Melbourne.

According to *Al Jazeera*, under the Coalition, by 2004, the Afghan opium-poppy acreage had jumped to 67% of the world total, and Afghan production was 86% of the world total. The U.S. and its Coalition allies (notably the U.K. and Australia) have a clear complicity in the rapid restoration of the Afghan opium industry, which had almost been eradicated by the Taliban. The report claims the objective of the Afghan opium industry is to dominate the world opium and heroin markets.

The report concluded that the "war on terror" involved gross violations of the UN Charter, Geneva Conventions, and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

China Promises Help To Crush Indian Maoists

Speaking to the Indian media on Oct. 26, Chinese envoy to India Sun Yuxi said if there is any assistance India expects from China in ridding India of homegrown Maoists, "We will try to do our best." He said Beijing does not even know why the Maoist guerrillas in India call themselves followers of the man who led the communists to victory in China in 1949. "We are also wondering why they call themselves Maoists. We do not like that. We do not like that at home. We do not have any connection with them at home...."

Ambassador Sun said that it is likely that many of the Maoists possess Chinese weapons, as reported in the Indian media over the years. He explained that China had supplied a lot of weapons to the anti-Soviet Mujahideen guerrillas in Afghanistan during the 1980s, in cooperation with Pakistan and the United States. "A lot of them were lost in the black market, and they spread everywhere. Even some Chinese terrorists were trained in Afghanistan. They went back with the Chinese weapons and they waged terrorist activities inside China. So, we are very sorry to see that. If there is anything that

we can help to stop them [Indian Maoists], we would do it."

Indonesian Banks for Sale Cheap

The Oct. 31 issue of *Business Week* gloats over the fact that Indonesia is facing bankruptcy, especially due to the oil price spike, and must finish the sell-off of its private banking sector to the synarchists. *Business Week* begins by asking: "Want to buy a stake in an Indonesian bank? You're in luck. Over the next few weeks financial officials in Jakarta say they will move swiftly to sell off the government's majority shares in three of the country's largest banks, all nationalized in the late 1990s." This refers, of course, to the aftermath of the 1997-98 destruction of the Indonesian economy by the hedge-fund speculators, and the conditions imposed by the IMF, which demanded that the Indonesian government cough up \$44 billion to bail out the banking system, nearly all of which went to paying off dollar-denominated debts. The re-privatization will go almost entirely to foreigners, netting the government about \$4 billion, which will not even pay one year's deficit—about \$5 billion, due mainly to the oil price. *Business Week* adds: "The government's motive for the sell-off is simple. It desperately needs the money."

Nearly every major Indonesian bank is already majority foreign- owned. The three now on the block will remain 51% government-owned—for now.

Rift Between China and Japan Over Koizumi Shrine Visit

Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Wu Dawei Said it's "very difficult" for China's head of state, President Jiang Zemin, to meet Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi, even in a third country, at global summits, as the nations have done in recent years, due to Koizumi's recent repeat visit to the Yasukuni Shrine, around which are buried some of Japan's principal war criminals from the Second World War, including Tojo. China, of course, was one of the chief victims of Japanese imperialist attack in World War II.

Wu said it was unlikely that a summit would be held on the sidelines of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum in South Korea next month or the East Asia Summit in Malaysia in December. This would be the first such breach between the leaders of the two nations since the annual group summits began.

Meanwhile, South Korean President Roh Moo-hyun is now "unlikely" to visit Japan as scheduled in December and may cancel his other summit with Koizumi, set for the East Asia Summit, Korean Foreign Minister Ban Ki-moon told Japanese Foreign Minister Nobutaka Machimura in Tokyo Oct. 27. Koizumi's Oct. 17 visit to the war shrine "trampled on the feelings of the Korean people," Ban said. "A visit to Yasukuni Shrine is unthinkable if [Japan has] the right perception of history." China has already cancelled the China-Japan leaders' summit for December.

LaRouche Economic Proposals Quoted by Korean Website

Under the headline "Don't Ask About the Dollar," with the kicker "Asian Governments must have the courage to stand up in public and say that a new global system is urgently necessary," South Korea's new "Peacemaking" Internet magazine cites Lyndon LaRouche's Oct. 5 advice to a Korean finance ministry official, in their English and Korean-language editions. Excerpts follow:

"Do not ask 'What shall we do about the dollar?'" LaRouche said Oct. 5. Asian governments must understand: There is "no 'business as usual.' You can't defend your currency, or ... dollar assets, using the usual technical methods." This appears under a photo of Alan Greenspan with Koizumi in Tokyo Oct. 17.

"Money markets have been in a drunken party for two decades, but the party is over," LaRouche said. "The 'usual monetary and foreign exchange methods' are what the drunks discussed at the party. But, it's over," he stated. "The derivatives markets are bankrupt.... Ignore what monetary economists say; forget explanations based on 'money.'"

America will undergo the same kind of collapse as the Soviet Union, very soon, if we don't force it to change policy, LaRouche said. "We're going into the worst crash in all modern history, worse than 1929, because we repeated the 1929 crash, in 1987," LaRouche said. "Since 1987 ... we have been spending our way with imaginary money and now the U.S.A. is totally bankrupt. Every major bank in the world, essentially, in Europe and the Americas, is bankrupt right now.

"We are facing a worse hyperinflation of the dollar than the German mark had in Weimar Germany of the 1920s. This is based on the huge dollar-volume speculation in derivatives by hedge funds and others, which is causing further speculation in oil, copper, and other raw materials across the world. It will echo in every part of the global economy."

"We could save the system," LaRouche said, "but only the way Franklin D. Roosevelt did in 1932. The only way to solve the U.S. dollar crisis, is not to discuss the dollar, deficits, or money—but to get to the root of the problem. We must fix the long-term disaster in the underlying physical economy and infrastructure of the USA—which is falling apart.

"We must have bankruptcy reorganization and re-regulation to accomplish a *reverse shift* of the 'post-industrial' paradigm. We must put the Federal Reserve System into bankruptcy reorganization by the government, and force the private banks to keep their doors open and rebuild.

"Asian governments should call for an international conference to create a New Bretton Woods system. In addition, we must have a clear, publicly stated shift away from the 'post-industrial paradigm,'" he said.

America's allies in Korea, Japan and China have the right to ask for this. Without a major "New Deal" in the USA, the dollar will head down soon—leaving Japan, China, and Korea to pay all the bills.

"No 'Asian Currency Unit,' no regional system will work," LaRouche also insisted—as shown by the collapse of the Euro. The European Union and the Euro are already a terrible failure, because you can't solve a global problem, on a local basis."

Africa News Digest

Food Emergencies in Sub-Saharan Nations

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the UN issued its second Africa Report for 2005 on Sept. 28, "Food Supply Situation and Crop Prospects in Sub-Saharan Africa," which stated that 24 sub-Saharan African countries face food emergencies. The situation is worst in southern Africa, where about 12 million people need immediate emergency food assistance in the countries of Zimbabwe, Malawi, Swaziland, Lesotho, Mozambique, and Zambia.

In Malawi, about 40% of the population—4.6 million—face food shortages, while in Zimbabwe the number of people at risk is estimated to be more than 3 million, or 25% of the population.

Regions of eastern Africa (Sudan and Somalia), central Africa (Burundi, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo), and western Africa (Niger, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone) are all in need of assistance as well, according to the report.

Will Bush Administration Lift Sanctions Against Sudan?

The U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, Jendayi Frazer, after meeting Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, told reporters in Khartoum Oct. 22 that Bashir had urged Washington to lift the embargo against Sudan. The Sudanese official news agency quoted Frazer as saying the Bush Administration would consider lifting the embargo, "especially economic sanctions," according to *Sudan Tribune* Oct. 22. It should not be overlooked that, if U.S. companies are to get access to at least some of Sudan's oil, the U.S. has to lift economic sanctions.

Uganda Not Cooperating with Probe of Garang's Death

Sudan's National Probe Committee (NPC)—charged with investigating the crash of the Ugandan helicopter carrying Vice President John Garang—says that Uganda is not cooperating in the investigation. In a statement to the Khartoum daily *Al-Ray al-Amm*, NPC rapporteur Siraj Eddin Hamid said that important parts of the helicopter had disappeared from the crash site. Among the missing parts are "a part which clarifies whether the plane had a device for maps or not and which also determines the altitude at which the incident took place," in the paraphrase of the *Sudan Tribune* Oct. 26. He said that all parts of the helicopter had been photographed when the site was first visited, including those that are now missing.

The missing parts appear to be important for verifying the Ugandan government's claims about the craft.

Ugandan MP Blamed Museveni for Garang's Death

Ugandan Member of Parliament Aggrey Awori, of the opposition People's Progress Party, said, in connection with the helicopter crash that killed Sudanese Vice President Garang, that Uganda's Civil Aviation Authority regulations forbade rotor aircraft from taking off after 5 p.m. for a trip of more than an hour, but, "They took off after hours, definitely," for a trip lasting many hours. Awori's remarks were reported by Voice of America Aug. 9. Awori said that Ugandan President Yoweri Museveni should have advised his guest to stay in Kampala. He also said that, for a head of state, the weather forecast should have been up to date, and that "It was a bad combination of flying at night and bad weather [a combination which a pilot would not normally undertake]." Awori said he had earlier suggested replacing the executive helicopter, which was eight years old. He said parliamentary bodies to which he belongs would be investigating, including the Committee on Presidential and Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Defense and Internal Affairs.

The government, however, denied responsibility for the crash and claimed the craft had been recently upgraded and provided with new altimeters, weather radar, and equipment to identify terrain features and an audio warning when approaching mountains, according to the Voice of America story.

Did Museveni Arrange Garang's Death for Bush Administration?

Grands-Lacs Confidentiel, a nationalist newsletter from DR Congo, claimed that Ugandan President Museveni arranged Garang's death on behalf of Washington, in a story titled, "Mission Accomplished: Museveni Signs the Death Warrant of John Garang," in its Sept. 5 issue. It claimed that Washington discreetly sent high-level negotiators to Khartoum to secure access to Sudanese oil, and Khartoum asked for Garang's head in exchange. As a faithful tool of Washington, Museveni did the dirty work, the newsletter claims. While *Grands-Lacs Confidentiel* claims to have gotten its information from a Ugandan army officer, internal evidence suggests that most of the picture is the newsletter's own conception.

Historian: Bouteflika Gov't Has Destroyed Judicial Independence

Algerian historian Daho Djerbal, in a commentary in the *Arab Reform Bulletin* of October 2005, reports that Algerian

President Abdel-Aziz Bouteflika has crushed the independence of the judiciary since his re-election in 2004. He writes, "Under the pretext of reforming the judiciary, judges who were unenthusiastic about the Presidential initiative [the referendum for the so-called Charter for Peace and National Reconciliation] have been forced to retire from office or disbarred. The Council of State, the Supreme Court, and the Constitutional Court have been emptied of those defending judicial independence in the face of executive power. Similarly, those in civil society and the political arena who voice opposition have been silenced." Djerbal states that the Charter tramples on the broad principles of justice and on the Algerian penal code.

Since 2000, writes Djerbal, Bouteflika's government "has been able to secure its hegemonic position with the support of the West," and "a new oligarchy seems to be setting up under the cover of noisy ceremonies that glorify 'civil peace and reconciliation.'"

Djerbal is professor of history at the University of Algiers and director of the *Algerian Journal of Social Criticism* (NAQD, www.revue-naqd.net).

This Week in History

November 1 - 7, 1734

Daniel Boone: Leading American Settlements Westward from the Ohio to the Missouri

In 1784, taking advantage of the brief pause in Indian raids on Kentucky, an early chronicler of the West named John Filson asked Daniel Boone to tell him the story of his exciting life. The result, published as Boone's "Autobiography," made Daniel Boone famous both in the new United States and in Europe. But the legends that grew out of the book pictured Boone as a solitary explorer and hunter who never saw a town, turning his back on civilization and fleeing before its spreading tide. In reality, Boone was dedicated to helping his fellow man, and played an important role in bringing settlers and republican government to the lands beyond the eastern mountains.

Daniel Boone was born on Nov. 2, 1734, on what was then the Pennsylvania frontier, near the present site of Reading. His family were Quakers, and, in addition to farming, his father followed the trades of weaver and blacksmith, which he also taught to Daniel. Even as a boy, Daniel hunted for his family and brought the pelts to Philadelphia to exchange for the necessities of life. Although there were no schools in his area, Daniel's older brother married a well-educated woman who taught Daniel reading, writing, and arithmetic. He then continued to read on his own, and taught himself surveying.

In 1750, Daniel's parents moved the family to the Yadkin Valley in western North Carolina. In that year, the French were moving down from Canada to bury lead plates in the Ohio Valley, claiming it for France. A series of French Forts were built from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi, and when Virginia's governor sent George Washington to challenge these advances, one of the French Indian agents sent a Indian brave on an unsuccessful mission to assassinate the young messenger.

An American attempt to plant a settlement near the future Pittsburgh, and thus open the way to American settlement of the Ohio Valley, led to a military battle where George Washington was defeated by a superior French force. This conflict in the wilderness forced the British government to send Gen. Edward Braddock, in 1755, to evict the French from Fort Duquesne at the forks of the Ohio. That year, Daniel Boone joined a unit of 100 North Carolina frontiersmen and acted as their wagoner and blacksmith as they travelled north to take part in Braddock's expedition. There, Boone made the acquaintance of young George Washington as well as Daniel Morgan, another wagoner who was to become a general

during the American Revolution. During the terrible massacre of Braddock's defeat, Boone and Morgan were able to escape by cutting the traces of their teams and mounting one of their horses.

During that expedition, Boone also met John Finley, who had earlier explored Kentucky to the Falls of the Ohio, the location of present-day Louisville. Finley told Boone about the fertile soil and abundant game, and Boone became eager to see it. At various times, Kentucky had been claimed by the Shawnee, the Iroquois, and the Cherokee, but it remained as a wilderness, crossed by Indian trails used for hunting or for attacking enemy tribes. But to the Americans, Kentucky was an important flank; it was positioned so that American settlers there could attack the Indian villages of the Ohio Valley if the French, or later the British, hurled their Indian allies against the colonies.

After Braddock's defeat Boone returned to the Yadkin Valley, married, and started a family. But in 1759, the Cherokees raided the valley and the Boones were scattered. Daniel and his family went to Culpeper County in Virginia, and Daniel made frequent trips to Fredericksburg, the town where George Washington's mother and younger brothers and sisters lived, and which Washington often visited. When the Boones returned to the Yadkin, Daniel was more than ever determined to reach Kentucky.

In 1767, Boone and his party of frontiersmen explored the southern part of the Big Sandy River and reached eastern Kentucky. At the same time, George Washington was making the first surveys on the northern parts of the Little and Big Sandy Rivers. The next year, when John Finley accompanied Boone through the Cumberland Gap to Kentucky, Washington was surveying tracts along the Ohio River and the Great Kanawha, planning for a large settlement on lands which had been granted to him and other soldiers for their service during the French & Indian War.

After several hunting and surveying trips to Kentucky, during which he often read Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* aloud to his companions, Boone became the right-hand man to Richard Henderson, a respected North Carolina judge. On the basis of Boone's descriptions of Kentucky, Henderson founded the Transylvania Company, which aimed to establish a new American colony in the wilderness. Henderson bought land from the Cherokee nation, and Boone led a party of thirty backwoodsmen to mark the path to the Kentucky River, where the capital of the new colony would be established. The new town was named Boonesborough, and Boone used his surveying skills to lay out the town in two-acre lots.

Daniel and his brother were two of the 18 delegates who voted at the convention called to establish a form of government and elect officers. The compact provided for "perfect religious freedom and general toleration," and set up a judicial system and the regulations for a militia. But shortly afterward the American Revolution began, and all proprietary colonies were declared invalid. Kentucky became a county of Virginia on December 31, 1776. A good beginning had been made, however; over 900 entries had been registered in the land office at Boonesborough. And 230 acres of corn had been raised, a stock of horses, hogs and poultry had been introduced, and apple and peach trees had already been planted in Kentucky.

The British realized the danger American possession of Kentucky posed to their Indian allies, and to the British forts on the Great Lakes and in the Ohio Valley. They incited the Indians to attack the American settlers, and provided them with leaders from among the French Canadian agents who had previously led the Indians for the French. The Kentucky settlers consolidated into a few fortified towns, and resisted savage attacks all through the Revolution. In 1777, Boone and his salt-making party were captured by the Shawnee and taken to Ohio. He was adopted by Chief Blackfish and then taken to Detroit to British Gen. Henry Hamilton, dubbed "The Hairbuyer" by the Americans because he paid for American scalps.

Boone pretended to favor the British, but at a moment when the Indians were distracted by a huge flight of wild turkeys, he made his escape and travelled 160 miles in four days to organize the defense of Boonesborough. After beating off the Shawnee attack, Boone returned across the mountains to retrieve his family, who had left because they thought him dead. On the return trip he brought many new settlers, among whom was Abraham Lincoln, the grandfather of the future President. The Boones and Lincolns had been close friends and neighbors in Pennsylvania, and the two families had often

intermarried.

Boone then moved his family to Fayette County in Kentucky, where he was elected lieutenant colonel of the militia, under Col. John Todd, of the family of Mary Todd Lincoln. In April of 1781, Boone was sent to Richmond as one of the first representatives of Kentucky's Fayette County in the Virginia State Legislature. When Col. Banastre Tarleton of the British Army made a lightning raid on Charlottesville, Boone and other legislators were captured. They were taken to the camp of General Cornwallis, but released after a few days of captivity.

After the Revolution, Boone moved his family to Maysville on the Ohio River. There, he made surveys and ran a small store where he sold goods useful for the newly arriving settlers. The citizens of Maysville also elected him to the Virginia legislature, where he worked tirelessly to obtain military supplies for the frontier, which was still being attacked by Indians deployed out of British-occupied Detroit. But during the years 1785-1798, Boone gradually lost all his claims to land in Kentucky, due to problems in how they were registered.

As a result, in 1788, he moved his family to the junction of the Great Kanawha and Ohio Rivers, now in West Virginia, and the very place where George Washington and his fellow veterans had planned for a settlement. Again, the citizens elected him to the Virginia legislature, and he also served as a deputy surveyor and lieutenant colonel of the Kanawha County Militia. But in 1796, Boone's son Daniel Morgan, named after his old friend in the Braddock expedition, moved to eastern Missouri to take advantage of Spanish offers of land for settlers. Three years later, Daniel Boone and his wife and younger children followed him to the Femme Osage valley, six miles from the Missouri River and 45 miles by water from St. Louis.

The governor appointed Boone a Syndic for the Femme Osage region, which meant he was a magistrate with the powers of a sheriff and judge. He held this post until the Louisiana Purchase ceded the area to the United States. In 1804 Meriwether Lewis and William Clark visited Boone before embarking on their expedition, gathering valuable information about the lands to the west, which Boone had not been able to resist exploring.

Daniel Boone also made long hunting and scouting trips into Kansas, and in 1814, at the age of 80, he and a small party reached the Yellowstone River. Another member of his family did succeed in Boone's ultimate quest, but Boone knew that he himself could not travel that far, so he had to be content with seeking all the information he could about California. His son Daniel Morgan became the first settler in Kansas, and one of his grandsons was an early settler of Colorado. Boone's relative Kit Carson upheld Daniel's dream by reaching California and Oregon as the scout for John C. Fremont's western expedition.

Due to problems in registering his land deeds, Daniel Boone almost lost his Missouri land. But in replying to his petition, and the supporting petition of the Kentucky Legislature, the U.S. Congress, in 1810, confirmed Daniel Boone's Spanish grant with words of praise for "the man who has opened the way to millions of his fellow men."

All rights reserved © 2005 EIRNS

[top of page](#)

[home page](#)