

[return to home page](#)

This Week You Need To Know

LaRouche Warned: Bush-Cheney Re-Election Means Perpetual War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

At a conference in Dubai, on Jan. 5-6, Patrick Clawson, speaking on behalf of the Bush-Cheney Administration, announced that Washington is hell-bent on taking out Iran's "nuclear weapons sites." Clawson, the vice president of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP), and a leading Beltway neo-con, was part of an American delegation to a conference sponsored by the Gulf Research Center.

One Arab participant in the event told this news service: "It was not a conference. It was a notification by the Bush people, of their intentions to attack Iran." The source continued, "There were several scenarios for the attack, from a military strike to a political destabilization."

While Clawson's claim to be speaking for the Bush Administration may have contained more than a little hubris, the fact is, in a television interview with Don Imus just hours before the Bush-Cheney Inauguration on Jan. 20, Vice President Dick Cheney made similar threats of military action against Iran, going so far as to cite Israel's bombing of the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981, with a warning: If Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon is not stopped by Washington and Europe, Israel will strike unilaterally and let the rest of the world sort out the mess.

Washington sources confirm that a battle royal is raging behind the scenes within the intelligence community, over the Bush Administration's zeal to bomb Iran and, as some neo-cons fantasize, trigger a "velvet revolution" by Gap-Jeans-clad, Internet-savvy Iranian youth. Even with Cheney stooge Porter Goss installed as the Director, Central Intelligence Agency analysts insist that the United States does not have the ability to take out Iran's purported nuclear weapons program; and a failed bombing and commando attack would trigger a deep anti-American backlash among all sectors of the Iranian population, strengthen the hand of the hard-line clerics, and dash any prospects of a diplomatic solution, through Euro-Russian negotiations, which have already led to a six-to-nine-month freeze in reprocessing of nuclear material...

[Full article, pdf version](#)

Historic Senate Debate Invokes Constitution vs. Bush Dictatorship

On Jan. 26, 13 Senators (12 Democrats and one Independent) voted against the confirmation of Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State—the most votes against a Secretary of State nominee in 180 years. The vote followed nine hours of an debate that began one day earlier, on Jan. 25. *EIR* provides here selections of the Senators' statements in that historic debate from the Congressional Record—a debate which has been all but covered up by the U.S. media.

Senator Edward Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts

I intend to oppose Condoleezza Rice's nomination. There is no doubt that Dr. Rice has impressive credentials. Her life story is very moving, and she has extensive experience in foreign policy. In general, I believe the President should be able to choose his Cabinet officials, but this nomination is different because of the war in Iraq.

Dr. Rice was a key member of the national security team that developed and justified the rationale for war, and it has been a catastrophic failure, a continuing quagmire. In these circumstances, she should not be promoted to Secretary of State. There is a critical question about accountability. Dr. Rice was a principal architect and advocate of the decision to go to war in Iraq at a time when our mission in Afghanistan was not complete and Osama bin Laden was a continuing threat because of our failure to track him down. In the Armed Services Committee before the war, generals advised against the rush to war, but Dr. Rice and others in the administration pressed forward anyway despite the clear warnings.

Dr. Rice was the first in the administration to invoke the terrifying image of a nuclear holocaust to justify the need to go to war in Iraq.... In fact, as we now know, there was significant disagreement in the intelligence community that Iraq had a nuclear weapons program, but Dr. Rice spoke instead about a consensus in the intelligence community that the infamous aluminum tubes were for the development of nuclear weapons....

America is in deep trouble in Iraq today because of our misguided policy, and the quagmire is very real. Nearly 1,400 of our finest men and women in uniform have been killed and more than 10,000 have been wounded. We now know that Saddam had no nuclear weapons, had no weapons of mass destruction of any kind, and that the war has not made America safer from the threat of al-Qaida. Instead, as the National Intelligence Council recently stated, the war has made Iraq a breeding ground for terrorism that previously did not exist.

...Before we can repair our broken policy, the administration needs to admit it is broken. Yet in two days of confirmation hearings, Dr. Rice categorically defended the President's decision to invade Iraq, saying the strategic decision to overthrow Saddam Hussein was the right one. She defended the President's decision to ignore the advice of Gen. Eric Shinseki, the Army Chief of Staff, who thought that a large number of troops would be necessary if we went to war. She said: "I do believe that the plan and forces that we went in with were appropriate to the task."

She refused to disavow the shameful acts of torture that have undermined America's credibility in Iraq and the world. When Senator Dodd asked her whether in her personal view, as a matter of basic humanity, the interrogation techniques amounted to torture, she said: "I'm not going to speak to any specific interrogation techniques The determination of whether interrogation techniques are consistent with our international obligations and American law are made by the Justice Department. I don't want to comment on any specific interrogation techniques." This is after Senator Dodd asked about water-boarding and other interrogation techniques....

Yet, as Secretary of State, Dr. Rice will be the chief human rights official for our Government....

The stakes are very high and the challenge is vast. Dr. Rice's failed record on Iraq makes her unqualified for promotion to Secretary of State, and I urge the Senate to oppose her nomination.

Senator Mark Dayton, Democrat of Minnesota

...I rise today to oppose the nomination of National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice for Secretary of State. I do so because she misled me about the situation in Iraq before and after the congressional resolution in October of 2002 authorizing that war, a resolution that I opposed. She misled other Members of Congress about the situation in Iraq,

Members who have said they would have opposed that resolution if they had been told the truth, and she misled the people of Minnesota and Americans everywhere about the situation in Iraq before and after that war began.

It is a war in which 1,372 American soldiers have lost their lives, and over 10,000 have been wounded—many of them maimed for life....

I read in today's Washington Post that the Army is planning to keep its current troop strength in Iraq at 120,000 for at least two more years. I did not learn that information as a Member of Congress. I did not learn it as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee where I regularly attend public hearings, classified meetings, and top secret briefings. I did not learn it from the U.S. military command in Iraq with whom I met in Baghdad last month....

I also learned of official reports documenting horrible abuses of prisoners, innocent civilians as well as enemy combatants, at numerous locations in countries besides the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, which directly contradicts assurances we have been given repeatedly by administration officials in the Senate Armed Services Committee....

I might as well skip all the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings and meetings and top secret briefings and just read the papers....

Sadly, the attitude of too many of my colleagues across the aisle is: Our President, regardless whether he is wrong, wrong, or wrong, they defend him, they protect him, and they allow his top administration officials to get away with lying. Lying to Congress, lying to our committees, and lying to the American people. It is wrong. It is immoral. It is un-American. And it has to stop.

This Congress, this Senate must demand that it stop now....

Senator Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan

I approach this issue as the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee and as a member of the Intelligence Committee. Both committees have devoted a great deal of time over the last two years to issues concerning Iraq, including the Intelligence Committee inquiry into prewar intelligence. These inquiries indicated major problems with the intelligence on Iraq and how it was exaggerated or misused to make the case to the American people of the need to initiate an attack against Iraq. Dr. Rice is a major player in that effort—a frequent and highly visible public voice.

Dr. Rice is not directly responsible for the intelligence failures prior to the Iraq war. The intelligence community's many failures are catalogued in the 500-page report of the Senate Intelligence Committee. But Dr. Rice is responsible for her own distortions and exaggerations of the intelligence which was provided to her.

Here are a few of those exaggerations and distortions. [Elaborates repeated false claims by Administration about Iraq seeking uranium from Africa]

What was the role of Dr. Rice in all of this? I asked her in my questions for the record whether she was aware the intelligence community had doubts about the credibility of the reports, and if not, how she could not know, given all of the activity prior to the President's October 7 [2002] Cincinnati speech, including the memo to her.

In response, Dr. Rice said, "I do not recall reading or receiving the CIA memo," and "I do not recall Intelligence Community concerns about the credibility of reports about Iraq's attempts to obtain uranium from Africa either at the time of the Cincinnati speech or the State of the Union speech."

Frankly, I am surprised and disappointed that the National Security Adviser would not remember an issue of this magnitude. However, it was not only the President who made that allegation, Dr. Rice made it herself in an op-ed in the New York Times on January 23, 2003, five days before the State of the Union speech, and three and-a-half 1/2 months after the same allegation had been removed from the Cincinnati speech at the CIA's request. She wrote that Iraq's declaration to the U.N. "fails to account for or explain Iraq's efforts to get uranium from abroad."

Dr. Rice again engaged in revisionist history about the Iraq military campaign during her nomination hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 18, 2005. Dr. Rice claimed: "This was never going to be easy; it was always going to have ups and downs." Dr. Rice's statement is striking, not because of its substance, but because of how it stands in contrast to what the administration was telling Congress and the American people in the months before the invasion of Iraq....

Voting to confirm Dr. Rice as Secretary of State would be a stamp of approval for her participation in the distortions and exaggerations of intelligence that the administration used before it initiated the war in Iraq, and the hubris which led to the administration's inexcusable failure to plan and prepare for the aftermath of the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, with tragic ongoing consequences.

[Levin appended eight items of documentation to his testimony.]

Senator Evan Bayh, Democrat Of Indiana

I rise to express my opposition to the nomination of Condoleezza Rice and her proposed promotion to that of the position of Secretary of State...

The list of errors is lengthy and profound, and, unfortunately, many could have been avoided if Dr. Rice and others had only listened to the counsel offered from both sides of the aisle. From the beginning of this undertaking, we have had inadequate troop strength to accomplish the mission.... The advice to have greater troop strength was not partisan. Our colleagues, Senator McCain, Senator Hagel, and others, virtually pleaded with the administration to provide for greater security through troop strength on the ground. Those pleas fell on deaf ears.

We have never had a realistic plan for the aftermath of this conflict. The State Department made plans. They were disregarded. The CIA warned of the potential for a growing insurgency. Their concerns were dismissed. Senator Lugar held hearings that were prescient in this regard, pointing out the importance of planning for the aftermath and the inadequacy of the preparation for the aftermath before the war. The results of those hearings were ignored. This is no ordinary incompetence. Men and women are dying as a result of these mistakes. Accountability must be had. We dismissed the Iraqi Army....

Likewise, we disqualified all former Baathists from serving even in lower levels of the bureaucracy in that country. They could have helped us run the nation. They could have helped us to reassure the Sunni community that we wanted to reincorporate them in the future of Iraq. Instead, many of them are fighting us today in Iraq as well.

All of these mistakes have substantially undermined our prospects for success, and tragically so. The chaos that has arisen from the lack of security and stability has fed this insurgency.

... I could not help but recall the words of a member of the Iraqi Electoral Commission, a Turkoman from Kirkuk, who finally looked at me in Baghdad and said: Senator, you do not understand. For too many of my people, when they hear the

word "democracy," they think violence, they think disorder, they think death and economic disintegration.

It does not get much sadder than that. It is heartbreaking that the sacrifices that have been made, the idealism of our troops, America's prospects for success in Iraq, our very standing in the world, have too often been undercut by ineptitude at the highest levels of our own Government.

Senator Robert Byrd, Democrat of West Virginia

Mr. President, in *Federalist* No. 77, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "It will readily be comprehended, that a man who had himself the sole disposition of offices, would be governed much more by his private inclinations and interests, than when he was bound to submit the propriety of his choice to the discussion and determination of a different and independent body, and that body an entire branch of the legislature. The possibility of rejection would be a strong motive to care in proposing."

Although Hamilton explains the importance of the role of the Senate in the appointment of officers of the United States, neither he nor the Constitution is specific about what criteria Senators must use to judge the qualifications of a nominee. The Constitution only requires that the Senate give its advice and consent. It is therefore left to Senators to use their own judgment in considering their vote. The factors involved in such judgments may vary among Senators, among nominees, and may even change in response to the needs of the times.

The position of Secretary of State is among the most important offices for which the Constitution requires the advice and the consent of the Senate. It is the Secretary of State who sits at the right hand of the President during meetings of the President's Cabinet. The Secretary of State is all the more important today, considering the enormous diplomatic challenges our country will face in the next four years....

I have stood in the Senate more times than I can count to defend the prerogatives of this institution and the separate but equal—with emphasis on the word "equal"—powers of the three branches of Government.

A unique power of the legislative branch is the Senate's role in providing advice and consent on the matter of nominations. That power is not vested in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, it is not vested in any other committee, nor does it repose in a handful of Senate leaders. It is not a function of pomp and circumstance, and it was never intended by the Framers to be used to burnish the image of a President on Inauguration Day. Yet that is exactly what Senators were being pressured to do last week, to acquiesce mutely to the nomination of one of the most important members on the President's Cabinet without the slightest hiccup of debate or the smallest inconvenience of a rollcall vote....

I have carefully considered Dr. Rice's record as National Security Adviser in the two months that have passed since the President announced her nomination to be Secretary of State, and that record, I am afraid, is one of intimate—intimate— involvement in a number of administration foreign policies which I strongly oppose. These policies have fostered enormous opposition, both at home and abroad, to the White House's view of America's place in the world.

That view of America is one which encourages our Nation to flex its muscles without being bound by any calls for restraint. The most forceful explanation of this idea can be found in the "National Security Strategy of the United States," a report which was issued by the White House in September 2002. Under this strategy, the President lays claim to an expansive power to use our military to strike other nations first, even if we have not been threatened or provoked to do so.

There is no question, of course, that the President of the United States has the inherent authority to repel attacks against our country, but this National Security Strategy is unconstitutional on its face. It takes the checks and balances established in

the Constitution that limit the President's ability to use our military at his pleasure and throws them out the window. This doctrine of preemptive strikes places the sole decision of war and peace in the hands of a President—one man or woman—and undermines the constitutional power of Congress to declare war. The Founding Fathers required that such an important issue of war be debated by the elected representatives of the people, the people out there, in the legislative branch precisely, because no single man could be trusted with such an awesome power as bringing a nation to war by his decision alone. And yet that is exactly what the National Security Strategy proposes. Not only does this pernicious doctrine of preemptive war contradict the Constitution, it barely acknowledges the Constitution's existence. The National Security Strategy makes only one passing reference, one small passing reference, to the Constitution. It states that "America's constitution"—that is "constitution" with a small "c"—"has served us well"—as if the Constitution does not still serve this country well. One might ask if that reference to the Constitution is intended to be a compliment or an obituary.

As National Security Adviser, Dr. Rice was in charge of developing the National Security Strategy. She also spoke out forcefully in favor of the dangerous doctrine of preemptive war....

And what has been the effect of the first use of this reckless doctrine of preemptive war? In a most ironic and deadly twist, the false situation described by the administration before the war, namely, that Iraq was a training ground for terrorists poised to attack the United States, is exactly the situation that our war in Iraq has created.

But it was this unjustified war that created the situation that the President claimed he was trying to prevent. Violent extremists have flooded into Iraq from all corners of the world. Iraqis have taken up arms themselves to fight against the continuing U.S. occupation of their country....

Before Senators cast their votes, we must wonder whether we are casting our lot for more diplomacy or more belligerence, reconciliation, or more confrontation. Which face of this Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde foreign policy will be revealed in the next four years?

....To confirm Dr. Rice to be the next Secretary of State is to say to the American people and to the world that the answers to those questions are no longer important. Her confirmation will almost certainly be viewed as another endorsement of the administration's unconstitutional doctrine of preemptive strikes, its bullying policies of unilateralism, and its callous rejection of our longstanding allies.

Senator Barbara Boxer, Democrat of California

I come to the Senate today to report and in form my colleagues on the Secretary of State confirmation hearings held in the Foreign Relations Committee last week.

By now, everyone knows I posed some very direct questions to Dr. Rice about her statements leading up to the Iraqi war and beyond. As National Security Adviser, Dr. Rice gave confidential advice to the President regarding the war in Iraq. She also made the case for the war in Iraq to the American people through hours of television appearances and commentary.

My questions, every one of them, revolved around her own words. As a result of my questions and comments at the hearing, I have been hailed as both a hero and a petty person. I have been called both courageous and partisan. I have been very surprised at this response. Tens of thousands of people signed a petition asking me to hold Dr. Rice accountable for her past statements. The reason I am so surprised at this reaction is that I believe I am doing my job.... I am on the Foreign Relations Committee. This is a very high profile nominee. This is a Secretary of State nomination in a time of war. My constituents want me to be thorough. They want me to exercise the appropriate role of a Senator.

Let's look for a moment at what that role is, how it was defined by our Founding Fathers. Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, which I have sworn to uphold, says "The President: shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for." The Cabinet is covered in Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the U.S. Constitution.

Now, if you read this, it does not say anywhere in here that the President shall nominate and the Senate shall confirm. It says the President "shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate" shall make the appointments. Why is it our Founders believed it was crucial for the Senate to play such a strong role in the selection of these very important and powerful members of the administration and members of the bench? It is because our Founders believed that the executive branch must never be too powerful or too overbearing. In *Federalist* No. 76, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "It will readily be comprehended that a man who had himself the sole disposition of offices would be governed much more by his private inclinations and interests than when he was bound to submit the propriety of his choice to the discussion and determination of a different and independent body."...

In today's vernacular, any President needs a check and balance. That certainly applies today, and it would apply to a Democratic President as much as to a Republican President. Our Founders are clear, and the Constitution is clear. Again, it does not say anywhere in the Constitution that a President, Democratic or Republican, has free rein in the selection of his or her Cabinet. That is exactly what the Founders did not want....

It also doesn't say anywhere in the Constitution that the only reason for a Senator to vote no on a Presidential nominee is because of some personal or legal impediment of that nominee. It leaves the door open. Senators have to ponder each and every one of these nominations....

Let me be clear. I will never be deterred—and I know my colleagues feel the same, I believe, on both sides of the aisle—I will never be deterred from doing a job the Constitution requires of me, or it would be wrong to have taken the oath and raise my right hand to God and swear to uphold the Constitution if I did not take this role seriously.

I make a special comment to the White House Chief of Staff, who called Members of the Senate "petty" for seeking time to speak out on this particular nomination. It is important to know that the White House Chief of Staff does a great job for the President, but he does not run the Senate. I know he finds the constitutional requirement of advice and consent perhaps a nuisance, and others have as well in the White House, be they Republicans or Democrats. It is the system of government we have inherited from our Founders. As we go around the world, hoping to bring freedom and liberty to people, we better make sure we get it right here.

This is very important, whether it is fair and free elections that really work so people do not stand in line for 10 hours and wait until 4 in the morning to vote, that we fix that, and that we, in fact, act as a check and balance in these nominations.

I have been motivated by a lot of people in my life. One of them is Martin Luther King. I wish to share something he said which is not as widely quoted as other things. He said that our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. That is important for everyone to take to heart. Sometimes it is easier to be silent, to just go along, even if in your heart you know there are certain issues that have to be put out on the table. But the fact is, our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.

Why does this nomination matter so much to me and to my constituents and to the tens of thousands who signed a petition that they sent to me? It is because we are looking at a Secretary of State nomination in a time of war, someone who is very loyal to this President. And, of course, the President picked someone loyal to him. I do not fault him for that in any way, shape, or form. But what matters is this war....

[long elaboration of Boxer's questions and Rice's evasions during committee hearings the previous week.]

At this time I am judging her on her answers to these questions. She dodged so many of them and again resorted to half the story and even got herself in deeper water in some of her responses. So I cannot support this nomination.

Senator Richard Durbin, Democrat of Illinois

...I will tell you that I am also troubled. I am troubled because I followed closely the exchange between Dr. Rice and Senator Boxer during the confirmation hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee. The reason I followed this closely was not only because it was important and it related to the issue of torture but because it involved an amendment which I had drafted. As every American I have met, I was shocked by the information and photographs that came out of Abu Ghraib; troubled by reports from Guantanamo.

As a result, I joined in a bipartisan effort in both the Department of Defense authorization bill, as well as later in the intelligence reform bill, to put a clear restatement of American law to a vote, that the United States is prohibited from engaging in torture, or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It is important to restate this principle and value so there would be no questions asked as to whether the United States had deviated from the legal standard which we had held for over 50 years—a standard first embodied in the Geneva Conventions and then in the Convention on Torture, and in other places in our laws. My anti-torture amendment passed in the Senate, went to conference on the Department of Defense authorization bill, but it was changed slightly from a prohibition to a statement of policy. I didn't care much for the change, but I accepted it because I thought it still preserved the basic goal, which was to restate our country's policy against torture. The part that did not change was my amendment's requirement that the Department of Defense report regularly on any violations of this policy against torture. That was what happened in the Department of Defense bill.

Then came the intelligence reform bill, and I felt it was important that we try again to restate our law of prohibition against torture. It was equally important that the reporting requirements for violations apply not only to the military agencies as we did in the Defense bill, but also apply to the variety of different intelligence agencies covered by the intelligence bill.

I tried with both bipartisan amendments to cover the circumstances of those who would take into detention someone during the course of war in Iraq or Afghanistan or some other place.

This amendment passed and it was sent to conference. I followed the conference closely as a Senate conferee and a member of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

I was surprised and disappointed to learn as I went to conference that a message had come down from the White House—specifically from Dr. Rice and OMB Director Joshua Bolten- -which said they objected to my amendment which condemned torture by any American, including members of the American intelligence community.

I couldn't believe it—they first accepted the underlying policy goals and the reporting requirements of this same amendment for the Department of Defense, and now they were making an exception when it came to intelligence agencies.

I have to tell you that I am very troubled by that. When Senator Boxer asked repeated questions of Dr. Rice on the issue, she received conflicting answers. So I returned to the same question this morning. I asked Dr. Rice point blank: Why did you object to that amendment? She said incorrectly: We had already taken care of that. Your Department of Defense amendment took care of intelligence agencies.

That is not the case. The Department of Defense amendment which I offered, which she should have read and apparently did not read, had reporting requirements for the Department of Defense but not for the intelligence agencies. My intelligence reform bill amendment would have extended these requirements for the intelligence agencies.

I am disappointed by that. It is not just another amendment being offered on the floor....

Secretary-designate Rice steps into her position at a critical juncture. Well over 1,300 American soldiers, marines, sailors, and airmen have died in Iraq. Nearly 150,000 are still over there.

Mr. President, 70,000 people have died in Darfur. Thousands more are still at risk every day. In South Africa, one in three adults are HIV positive. In Botswana the numbers are even higher. Over a billion people live on less than a dollar a day. A billion people in the world cannot write their own names or read a single sentence. We simply cannot afford to get this wrong. We cannot afford to repeat mistakes or to fall short in our commitments. These are matters of profound moral obligation and deepest national security and interest.

Senator Jack Reed, Democrat of Rhode Island

I must confess, after careful deliberation I intend to oppose this nomination....

One of the aspects that is troubling to me is the fact that Dr. Rice has maintained that Iraq is the central arena in the war on terror, when, in fact, this is a global, international threat to the United States and that, in fact, it appears that Iraq was not the global center, the central arena in this war on terror. She applied a doctrine of preemption which is applicable to terrorist cells, but I believe she applied it incorrectly in the case of Iraq—at least the administration did, and she was the principal architect or one of the principal architects of that policy....

The President, in my view, is basically replicating his inner circle now in the broader context of the Cabinet. This raises an issue that was identified by John Prados, a senior fellow at the National Security Archive at George Washington University. What he said is: The administration is setting itself up for a very closed process of creating foreign policy. It's going to eliminate consideration of wider points of view.

In effect, we are in danger of creating an echo chamber of foreign policy in which one loud voice carries because it reverberates without check. That, I think, would be a very dangerous situation.

InDepth Coverage

.
Links to articles from [*Executive Intelligence Review*](#)

[**Requires Adobe Reader®.*](#)

Feature:

FUNDAMENTALISM IN AMERICA

'All Praises Due to Satan, The Ruler of the World'

by Harley Schlanger

The following is adapted from a presentation to a LaRouche Youth Movement cadre school in Seattle, Washington, on Dec. 4, 2004.

Opening: A chorus is singing the first verse of '*Amazing Grace*':

Amazing grace!

How sweet the sound

That saved a wretch like me!

I once was lost,

But now am found;

Was blind, but now I see.

Reverend Edwards: Our sermon today will be on a verse from Deuteronomy 32:35, 'Their foot shall slide in due time.'...

This sermon—with the exception of the references to former Democratic Party Presidential candidate John Kerry— was delivered by Jonathan Edwards, during the revival movement he spawned in the 1730s. Known as the Great Awakening, it was an operation against the efforts of the network which included Benjamin Franklin, to create a new republic on the American continent.

Why Did Author of '*Amazing Grace*' Attack Handel's '*Messiah*'?

by Marcia Merry Baker

[T]he intense criticism of Handel's *Messiah* by John Newton (1725-1807), the author of the words to '*Amazing Grace*,' which became the icon pop hymn of the 20th Century, is a useful historical study, as a clinical exhibit of the nature and role of fundamentalism. In 1785, memorial performances of *Messiah* were held in Britain to mark the 100th anniversary of the composer's birth in Halle, despite Handel's alignment with those supporting what became the independent United States. In opposition to Handel's legacy, John Newton, a Church of England rector, and a firebrand preacher associated with the Clapham Sect in London, denounced *Messiah*. Newton gave a series of 50 sermons, 1785-86, to warn parishoners against the likes of Handel.

Interview: Dr. Justin Frank

'God Complex' Helps Bush Deal With Anxiety

Dr. Frank is the author of *Bush on the Couch: Inside the Mind of the President* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2004), and a practicing psychoanalyst in Washington, D.C. He is on the faculty of the George Washington University Medical School. EIR's review of his book, and an earlier interview with him, appeared in our issue of Aug. 20, 2004. B interviewed him on Jan. 20, 2005, following the President's Inaugural speech.

Investigation:

Italy's Black Prince: Terror War Against the Nation-State

by Allen Douglas

The Black Prince and the Sea Devils: The Story of Valerio Borghese and the Elite Units of the Decima Mas

by Jack Greene and Alessandro Massignani

Cambridge, Mass.: Da Capo Press, 2004 284 pages, hardcover, \$27.50

The career of the Roman 'Black Prince,' Junio Valerio Borghese, gruesomely illustrates how virtually all modern 'international terrorism' and all assassinations of heads of state and government such as President John F. Kennedy, former Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro, or the numerous attempts on France's President Charles de Gaulle, derive from the postwar Nazi International, sponsored by the AngloAmerican-led Synarchy and its intelligence services.

Economics:

Private Pensions Crisis Warns, 'Don't Privatize Social Security!'

by Anita Gallagher

With George W. Bush's 'top priority' to put Wall Street's hands on Social Security contributions and benefits, America's workforce is looking at the very same threat of destitution in old age, to overcome which Franklin Roosevelt instituted Social Security in 1935. Two of the vaunted 'three legs' of retirement security in America—employer pension plans, and personal or household savings—are shrivelling; the third, Social Security, is under attack.

Leavitt Takes Over HHS; Medicaid in Jeopardy

by Mary Jane Freeman

The potential for deep slashing of the Medicaid program increased with the approval of Mike Leavitt as George W. Bush's new Secretary for Health and Human Services (HHS). As the President threatens the Social Security Trust Fund, so too is he sharpening his budget axe to gouge the state-Federal entitlement program which provides healthcare coverage for 52 million poor and disabled Americans.

Kremlin Scrambles To Calm Angry Pensioners

by Rachel Douglas

As an avowed believer in market forces, Alexei Kudrin does not usually blame major events on shadowy provocateurs. On Jan. 19, however, Russian Finance Minister Kudrin lashed out against surging street protests by thousands of Russians, most of them elderly. 'It's not pensioners who are organizing all this,' he charged, but rather the Communist Party and nationalist extremists, who, he said, had posted on the Internet, maps of what highways to blockade—as if most Russian 70-year-olds go online to get their marching orders!

Profile: José Piñera

Architect of Bush's 'Ownership' Society

by Cynthia R. Rush

The following is taken from 'Bush's Social Security Privatization: Foot in the Door for Fascism,' issued by LaRouche PAC in December 2004. José Piñera, the architect of Chile's 1981 social security privatization, likes to brag that he is a 'freedom fighter' whose only goal is to help the poor improve themselves, teaching them self-reliance and pride of 'ownership.' In the hundreds of self-promoting articles plastered all over his website, he quotes from the Declaration of Independence and asserts that privatization of the pension system is 'truly consistent with the ideas of America's Founding Fathers.' In an October, 1998 editorial in his online publication *Economía y Sociedad*, he even had the gall to use Benjamin Franklin's quote that 'rebellion against a tyrant is obedience to God,' to justify the bloody U.S.-backed 1973 military coup against the government of President Salvador Allende.

Argentina Defies Debt Restructuring Vultures

by Cynthia R. Rush

After numerous delays and attempts at outright sabotage by international financial scavengers, the Argentine government finally officially launched its debt restructuring program on Jan. 14, a little over three years after its Dec. 23, 2001 default on \$82 billion—the largest sovereign default in history. Between now and Feb. 25, bondholders may choose to swap the Argentine bonds they currently hold for new ones.

International:

Euro-Russian Deals With Iran Seek To Derail Attack

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

During the U.S. election campaign, Lyndon LaRouche repeatedly warned that, were George W. Bush and Dick Cheney to be reelected, the world would enter a new phase of wars, starting with a military strike against the Islamic Republic of Iran. The truth of this was spelled out at a conference of the Gulf Research Center in Dubai on Jan. 5-6, by Patrick Clawson of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy.

Will Sharon Heed God's Warning to Jezebel?

by Dean Andromidas

On the basis of a secret decision, going back to July 2004, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has ordered the confiscation of Palestinian property on an unprecedented scale, in yet another gross violation of the Geneva Conventions and the norms of civilized states. Palestinian property worth hundreds of millions of dollars, including thousands of acres of land, residential, and commercial buildings in East Jerusalem, has already been, or is in the process of being confiscated, report several sources in Israel, including the daily newspaper Ha'aretz, and Arab member of the Knesset Mohamed Barakeh. The decision remained secret until the week of Jan. 17.

On the Anniversary of the Liberation of Auschwitz

A Conversation With Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg

Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg, former president of the American Jewish Congress and former vice president of the World Jewish Congress, made the remarks below in an interview with Michele Steinberg and Marjorie Mazel Hecht of EIR, on the 60th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz concentration camp by the advancing Soviet Army, Jan. 27, 1945. His initial remarks are followed by a story from the Talmud. The full interview will appear in next week's issue. Rabbi Hertzberg was last interviewed in EIR in our April 23, 2004 issue ('Sharon and Bush 'Will Fry in Hell' '), where we also published a review of his new book, **The Fate of Zionism: A Secular Future for Israel & Palestine**.

Synarchists Promote Andean-Wide Violence

by Valerie Rush

Mutual accusations and a threatened break in relations between the neighboring Andean countries of Colombia and Venezuela, are but one of a number of showdown scenarios that have erupted in Ibero-America in the first weeks of 2005. These developments confirm Lyndon LaRouche's assessment that the fascist agenda of the Synarchist International is to orchestrate chaos and warfare across the continent, the better to impose imperial control.

The Humala Uprising: A Nazi Putsch Rerun?

by Luis Vásquez Medina

In a typically fascist propaganda move, reminiscent of the 1923 Munich putsch that catapulted Adolf Hitler into the political limelight, Antauro Humala and more than 100 heavily armed Army reservists chose New Year's Day to capture and occupy a police station in the Andean city of Andahuaylas, Peru, for three days. The 'ethno-fascists' (as the Lima press has dubbed them) assassinated four policemen, finishing off one of them in front of television cameras, and then surrendered en masse to the Peruvian authorities.

Synarchists Activate Neo-Nazis in Europe

by Rainer Apel

When the neo-Nazi National Democratic Party (NPD) of Germany received 9.2% of the vote in the Saxony state elections on Sept. 19, 2004, giving them 12 seats in the state parliament, it came as a shock to the rest of the German electorate. A governmental initiative in 2001 to get the party banned had failed miserably before the Constitutional Court. It was thrown out by the Court in 2003 because a good part of the documentation in the government's lawsuit was based on NPD statements and texts that were written by state police informants themselves. What's more, the Court found that no fewer than 30 of the 210 members of NPD executive were police informants.

National:

LaRouche Warned: Bush-Cheney Re-election Means Perpetual War

by Jeffrey Steinberg

At a conference in Dubai, on Jan. 5-6, Patrick Clawson, speaking on behalf of the Bush-Cheney Administration, announced that Washington is hell-bent on taking out Iran's 'nuclear weapons sites.' Clawson, the vice president of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy (WINEP), and a leading Beltway neo-con, was part of an American delegation to a conference sponsored by the Gulf Research Center. One Arab participant in the event told this news service: 'It was not a conference. It was a notification by the Bush people, of their intentions to attack Iran.' The source continued, 'There were several scenarios for the attack, from a military strike to a political destabilization.'

Senators Assert Constitutional Role Over Rice and Gonzales Nominations

by Edward Spannaus

The Jan. 6 Joint Session of Congress—in which a handful of fighting Democrats forced suspension of the session to consider a challenge to the Ohio Electors—marked a significant shift in the willingness of Congressional Democrats to stand up to the quiet coup d'état being conducted by the BushCheney gang. And now, to that, must be added the historic events of Jan. 26. On that day, 13 Senators (12 Democrats and one Independent) voted against the confirmation of Condoleezza Rice as Secretary of State—the most votes against a Secretary of State nominee in 180 years. And in the Senate Judiciary Committee, all eight Democrats voted against the confirmation of Alberto Gonzales to become U.S. Attorney General—a development which seemed inconceivable just a few weeks ago.

From the Congress

Conyers Rips Sanctions Against Ohio Lawyers

In reply to Ohio Attorney General Jim Petro's attack on those mounting a legal challenge to the last presidential election, **John Conyers, Jr. (Mich)**, ranking Democratic member of the House Judiciary Committee, pointed out to Petro in the letter printed below, that the election was riddled with improprieties and irregularities, including some of the actions of Petro himself.

U.S. Economic/Financial News

Senator Clinton: U.S. Economy 'Standing on a Trap Door'

"America's leaders don't have a vision, and the economy may be on the brink of collapse," Sen. Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.) told a private audience of Brandeis University alumni in West Palm Beach, Fla., on Jan. 23. Clinton also said that a chance to invest in a national energy policy may be lost, and flaws in the American health-care system are unaddressed, because President Bush is looking the other way. "I don't see that thoughtful, visionary direction that got us where we are today.... The history of America is ... to make sacrifices today for a better tomorrow. The progress that then occurred moved everyone forward.... That progress is at risk today," Clinton warned, according to the *Palm Beach Post* Jan. 25.

Clinton reportedly contrasted the achievements and legacies of Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower (highways), John F. Kennedy, (space exploration), and Lyndon Johnson (civil rights) with the failures of the Bush Administration to invest in anything for the future. Of President Clinton, she said, my husband did it just right. Noting that he had fought some hard battles, she added; "Frankly, it is not that hard cutting people's taxes." Returning to the economy, she reportedly shocked the audience by telling them that the United States borrows \$50 million each month from other countries, and said, "I think the economy is standing on a trap door, and I don't know that we necessarily hold the levers."

The Bush Administration apparently was stung by Clinton's statement, since House Budget Committee spokesman Sean Spicer told the *Washington Times* that Clinton's characterization of the economy was inaccurate. Spicer said, "Economic data, the outlook of top private forecasters, and the Federal Reserve show that the U.S. economy is in a sustained expansion with moderately strong growth, falling unemployment, and increases in payroll jobs."

(It should be noted that while two press sources reported on Senator Clinton's reference to the brink of collapse of the economy, the formulation does not appear in the transcript of the speech posted on her website.)

U.S. Budget Still Drowning in Red Ink

While the Congress and the White House are dueling over the budget deficit, the Congressional Budget Office reported earlier this month that the government ran a deficit of \$114 billion in the first quarter of fiscal 2005, which ran from October to December 2004. While that appears to be an improvement over the previous year, when the deficit for the same period was \$126 billion, the Bush Administration is still digging a mighty deep hole even deeper. President Bush, himself, said, during his press conference on Jan. 26, that the Office of Management and Budget is forecasting a deficit for 2005 of \$427 billion, which, unlike the \$368 billion figure released by the CBO earlier this week, allegedly includes the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the director of the CBO, also said, earlier this week, that \$99 billion is projected to be borrowed from the surplus of Social Security, so that the real on-budget deficit projection, as of now, is at least \$526 billion.

U.S. Infant Mortality Rises; First Time in 45 Years

A report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), covered in the *Washington Times* Jan. 25, shows an increase in U.S. infant mortality, a key indicator of the physical-economic health of a nation. This is the first such increase in 45 years, i.e., since 1960.

In 2001, U.S. infant mortality was 6.8 per 1,000 births; in 2002, that figure was 7 per 1,000, with 27,970 newborn deaths nationwide. Worldwide, the U.S. has not even ranked in the top 10 nations for lowest infant mortality. Most European countries have about 4/1,000; Japan is on top with 3.3 deaths per thousand. While the U.S. definitely fares better than China, for example, with 25.4 per thousand, and most African countries above 50, it is the direction of the rate that indicates whether an economy is improving or declining.

Wal-Mart Workers on Medicaid

A quarter of Wal-Mart's Tennessee workforce receives health care through the state's Medicaid program, TennCare, not from the company's self-touted health-care benefits, the AFL-CIO's "Work in Progress" reported Jan. 24. A survey by TennCare and the state Department of Labor found that 9,617 of the retailer's 37,000 workers were enrolled in TennCare, designed to provide health care for low-income workers. In a recent advertising campaign, Wal-Mart claimed that its wages and health-care benefits provide its workers with a good standard of living and quality health care.

World Economic News

China To Call for Measures Against Forex Instability

Chinese Finance Minister Renqing will call for measures to prevent big foreign-exchange fluctuations, when he attends the G-7 finance ministers' meeting in London Feb. 4-5, *China Daily* reported Jan. 27. This was announced by Finance Ministry International Department head Zhu Guangyao at a Beijing forum, cosponsored by London's Economist Group. "China hopes rich nations will make more of an effort to maintain a stable forex market, as keeping relatively stable exchange rates between major currencies of the U.S. dollar, euro, and Japanese yen is of great significance to the world's economy. We need to limit forex fluctuations to create a favorable external environment for the healthy progress of developing countries, Zhu said."

Finance ministers of India, Russia, and Brazil will also be at the G-7 meeting. Zhu said that due to the "phenomenal changes" in the world since World War II, "finance ministers need to consider how to establish new economic order which can adequately represent the voices and demands of developing countries." He called for discussions of the Chinese currency's exchange rate, "in the context of international co-operation," but stressed that exchange rates "should be decided

by the sovereign state." China needs to maintain currency stability at the moment, he said.

Chinese Economist: Dollar No Longer Stable Currency

"The U.S. dollar is no longer—in our opinion—[seen] as a stable currency, and is devaluating all the time, and that's making trouble all the time," stated well-known Chinese economist Fan Gang at the Davos World Economic Forum in Switzerland Jan. 26.

Fan Gang, who is director of the National Economic Research Institute at the China Reform Foundation, said the issue for China is not whether to devalue the yuan but "to limit it from the U.S. dollar." However, he said the Chinese government is under no pressure to revalue its currency. "So the real issue is how to change the regime from a U.S. dollar pegging ... to a more manageable ... reference ... say, euros, yen, dollars—those kind of more diversified systems," Fan said. "If you do this, in the beginning you have some kind of initial shock. You have to deal with some devaluation pressures." Under pressure, the government will not change the yuan value against the dollar, he said. "But this time, I think Chinese authorities will not forget [about] it. Now people understand the U.S. dollar will not stop devaluating."

China's Development a Long-Term Process

China's economic development is a long-term process, emphasized Chinese economist Fan Gang at the Davos World Economic Forum in Switzerland Jan. 26. Since modernization began in the early 1990s, some 120 million rural laborers have moved into cities. China has a total of some 800 million rural workers in its 1.3 billion population. Another 200-300 million rural people will have to move to China's cities to spur development, Fan said. "The income disparity is huge, and income disparity will stay with us for a long time, as long as those 200 to 300 million rural laborers stay in the countryside."

Central Banks Turning Away from U.S. Dollar

Central banks are turning away from the U.S. dollar, states a new survey by "Central Bank Publications," which specializes in reporting on central banks. The survey was featured by London's *Financial Times* as the lead item on Jan. 24. Central bank reserve managers from 65 central banks, controlling \$1.7 trillion of assets, participated in the survey. And 70% of the managers said they have replaced some of their dollar holdings by euro holdings within the last two years. The *Financial Times* comments, that such actions are "likely to undermine the dollar's value on currency markets."

"Central banks are shifting reserves away from the U.S. and towards the euro-zone in a move that looks set to deepen the Bush Administration's difficulties in financing its ballooning current account deficit," the report stated. "Any rebalancing of central bank reserve portfolios has serious implications for the global financial system as the U.S. has become increasingly dependent on official flows of funds to finance its current account deficit, estimated at \$650 billion in 2004.... Any reluctance to increase exposure to dollar assets further could cause the greenback to plunge on currency markets." The survey was conducted on the guarantee of anonymity for the banks involved.

German Regulator Files Criminal Probe of Citigroup

The German financial supervision agency BaFin announced Jan. 24 that it had found evidence that Citigroup traders manipulated the German government bond-futures market on Aug. 2, 2004. On that day, Citigroup traders sold 11 billion euros of Euro-zone government bonds within less than two minutes, using the London-based trading platform EuroMTS. According to agreements, every other bank participating in the EuroMTS system automatically had to buy up a specified share of these bonds. As a consequence of the giant purchase, Euro-zone bond prices were falling sharply. Later the same

day, Citigroup bought back 4 billion euros of the same paper, now at a much lower price, thereby making some profit.

According to BaFin, Citigroup then was using certain kinds of bond derivatives at the Frankfurt-based Eurex exchange to trigger a rebound of euro-zone government bond prices. A BaFin official noted: "There is concrete evidence that they attempted to push up the price artificially and then take advantage of that." BaFin therefore has now issued a formal request to the Frankfurt state prosecutor to start a criminal investigation into the Citigroup bond case.

United States News Digest

Probe Illegal Use of Tax Dollars To Promote Social Security Privatization

A group of eight top Democratic Senators, in a letter to Comptroller General David Walker dated Jan. 26, requested that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) launch an investigation into the White House's forcing the Social Security Administration (SSA) to peddle propaganda touting its privatization scheme, an action that violates two laws that prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars for "grassroots lobbying."

"We are writing to alert you to an illegal use of taxpayer funds by the Social Security Administration, and request an expedited legal decision on the matter," the Senators insisted. The letter pointed to the Wehner memo (a memo written by White House aide Peter Wehner attacking the current Social Security system), as well as SSA's "Communications/Marketing Tactical Plan" and Social Security statement, mailed to 140 million Americans. Signing the letter were Sens. Frank Lautenberg (N.J.), Edward Kennedy (Mass), Hillary Clinton (N.Y.), Minority Whip Richard Durbin (Ill), Jon Corzine (N.J.), Jack Reed (R.I.), Carl Levin (Mich) and Mark Dayton (Minn).

Bush Plans To Eliminate Civil Service System

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) announced, on Jan. 26, the DHS's new personnel system, which replaces the General Schedule pay system with a system that bases pay on performance, and groups employees into eight to 12 "clusters" based on occupation. A pay raise or a promotion will now depend largely on a satisfactory performance rating from a supervisor, as opposed to longevity. Overall, the new system reduces the rights of employees and increases the authority of managers over employees.

OPM Director Kay Cole James said that the new system "can truly serve as a model for the rest of the Federal government," which has probably been the intent all along, since DHS was established in 2002. Republicans in the Congress, notably then-Texas Sen. Phil Gramm, screeched that anyone who joined with the unions in opposition to the civil service reforms in the DHS bill was putting the interests of union bosses over the security of the United States. The DHS "reform" was quickly followed by the "National Security Personnel System," for the Pentagon, which was passed by Congress in 2003, which was an even more far-reaching measure. The Pentagon authors of the plan argued that they needed "more flexibility" in the hiring and firing of civilian employees to meet security needs.

The White House is expected to propose legislation in a month or so, that would allow all agencies to restructure their personnel systems in the same way, and finish off what is left of the civil service system. The switch-over to the new system in DHS is expected to take until early 2008.

The Federal employees' unions are up in arms. John Gage, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, said, "They are encouraging a management of coercion and intimidation. This is not a modern system. This is a step backwards." Colleen Kelly, president of the national Treasury Employees Union, agreed. "These regulations were designed to ensure there is no outside judgment of what goes on within the Department." The two unions have joined in a

lawsuit to block new restrictions on collective bargaining and employee appeals. Even Sen. Joe Lieberman (D-Conn), who co-wrote the legislation that created the DHS, expressed concern. He said that while the new rules are better than earlier drafts, the new system "will undermine key employee protections that prevent workplace abuses and improve employee performance."

Pentagon Blames Veterans for Budget Squeeze

Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness David Chu is complaining that veterans' benefits have grown so much in recent years that "they are taking away from the nation's ability to defend itself." Rising veterans benefits are being blamed for the billions of dollars in cuts in weapons programs to be proposed in the fiscal 2006 budget to be released on Feb. 7. The *Wall Street Journal*, on Jan. 25, lumped growing spending on veterans benefits, including health care and concurrent receipt (when a disabled retiree receives both retirement and disability pay), with the overall entitlement issue, where spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid is squeezing out funding for other programs. About 50% of the beneficiaries of the military's Tricare health program are now retirees, causing the Pentagon to shift about \$2 billion a year into the program from other accounts. "It is quite painful to reallocate that money," says Chu.

The Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), whose president, retired Admiral Norb Ryan, was interviewed for the *Journal* article, replied that Chu's statements are "disappointing and misleading." What Chu left out, the MOAA said, "is that Congress, over the past two years, has passed legislation specifying that no money for Tricare for Life or concurrent receipt is to come out of the DoD budget, but is to come from elsewhere in the Treasury." The MOAA statement also took issue with Chu's assertion that retirement benefits have little effect on recruitment and retention, pointing to the battle to repeal benefit cuts in the 1990s because they were contributing to serious retention and readiness problems.

GOP to Bush: Social Security Privatization Not Selling

In a private White House meeting Jan. 25, President Bush got an earful from selected Republicans, who told Bush that the public is not buying the administration's line on Social Security privatization, according to the *Washington Post* Jan. 26.

The *Post* obtained a private memo which says: "Both President Bush and Republicans in Congress are deficient on messenger credibility *and* issue handling confidence on reforming Social Security." The 35-page analysis was prepared for Republican legislators when meet at upcoming retreat in West Virginia. They will also be shown polling data that reportedly shows that, while "the majority of voters 55 or older believe that major changes to Social Security are necessary," the pollsters, the Tarrance Group, and Public Opinion Strategies also found that "a majority of respondents believe that GOP policies have hurt seniors," the *Post* reports.

No Democrats were invited to this White House meeting, and Bush promised the Republicans that he would take the point on the Social Security issue by talking about it in his State of the Union speech on Feb. 2, and then going on a multi-city tour of town meetings—running the campaign just like the election.

Unfortunately, lazy Democrats like DNC chairman, Terry McAuliffe, and Rep. Steny Hoyer (D-MD), are already crowing that "the Republicans are in disarray," the *Post* said. This kind of cockiness can kill them, warned a well-placed Washington, D.C. intelligence source.

The biggest danger is that the Dems are counting on dissident Republicans to vote against Social Security privatization, the source told *EIR*. The White House knows that it cannot lose a single important issue, or else Bush will be a "lame duck" for the next four years. They are already negotiating like crazy with all the Republican opponents to privatization, to come up with something with which they can beat the Democrats. After Bush gives his Social Security speech, a series of ads

promoting the program will kick in. The source emphasized the crucial role that Lyndon LaRouche has played in seriously wounding the Social Security privatization, but the Democratic Party has to be kicked into action, to make sure this is defeated.

Conyers Requests Investigation of Vote Suppression

In a Jan. 19 letter to Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisc), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Rep. John Conyers and eight other Democrats on the committee requested that the panel "hold hearings and investigate the vital issue of protecting our citizens right to vote."

Conyers cites the evidence of irregularities gathered in Congressional forums in Washington and in Columbus, Ohio, which is compiled in the 102-page Conyers report. These include:

- * manipulation of voting machines that disenfranchised possibly hundreds of thousands of predominantly minority Democratic voters;

- * GOP "caging" tactics which targetted 35,000 predominantly minority voters for intimidation;

- * GOP use of partisan challengers, which disenfranchised many legal voters who were intimidated, and discouraged by long lines in adverse weather;

- * numerous instances of "intimation and disinformation ... that would appear to violate the Voting Rights Act."

- * illegal dirty tricks, such a fake, but official-looking notices, telling voters that their polling place or date for voting had changed.

"The fact that many of these instances appear to be focused particularly on minority voters is all the more disheartening," Conyers wrote, "and triggers even more clearly our jurisdiction involving civil rights."

Senators Warn Against Imposing Austerity on Veterans

The possibility that the budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be subject to a freeze or even cuts in services, especially health care, dominated the confirmation hearing this morning of Jim Nicholson, as Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Sen. Daniel Akaka (D-Hi) pointedly told Nicholson, "It's a non-starter to cut back services or cut who is eligible for VA care." He added that because we are at war, "we must do everything we can to show our military that VA health care will be there for all veterans who serve." Sen. Jim Jeffords (I-Vt) noted that many of the hundreds of thousands who have gone to war "have suffered both visible and invisible wounds. They require immediate care today, and many will require extensive care for the rest of their lives. We cannot equivocate in providing that care; nor is it morally acceptable to provide that care at the expense of veterans of previous eras."

Jeffords later asked Nicholson if he would fight for additional funding if, as all indications suggest, the fiscal 2006 budget cuts the VA budget. After invoking the "balancing act" between resources and needs, Nicholson said that his commitment in accepting the nomination "is to the veterans and their needs." He also agreed with Jeffords and other members of the committee that mental-health issues, which are being magnified by the Iraq war, present "an unprecedented challenge," and that more effort needs to be brought to bear to deal with veterans affected by that. The Senate confirmed Nicholson by a voice vote on Jan. 26 with little debate.

U.S. Special Forces Operating Domestically

Special Forces commando units are operating inside the United States, and were deployed around the Presidential Inaugural events in Washington this past week, the *New York Times* reported Jan. 23. The exact number of Special Operations forces who were in Washington is highly classified, the *Times* says. Under a top-secret military plan, code-named Power Geyser, the commandos are also conducting counterterrorism missions in support of civilian agencies within the United States. The units belong to the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC), the joint command for military special operations units which is based at Fort Bragg, N.C. They also work in coordination with the new Northern Command. In the past, the *Times* notes, the command has also provided support to domestic law enforcement agencies during events such as the Olympics and political party conventions, according to reports by GlobalSecurity.org. The *Times* says that these deployments come under a program begun in 1997; however, as we report below, JSOC was involved in the 1986 raid directed against Lyndon LaRouche.

The 1878 Posse Comitatus Act prohibits the use of military troops for law enforcement inside the U.S., but that law has been amended several times to make exceptions for public health, drug interdiction, and, most recently, for assisting civilian agencies in the event of a national emergency, particularly one involving nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Power Geyser and other secret code names, were mentioned publicly for the first time this week, on a web site for the new book by former Army intelligence analyst William Arkin, called "Code Names: Deciphering U.S. Military Plans, Programs and Operation in the 9/11 World." The book also discusses "Special Access Programs" and military operations in many countries.

Ibero-American News Digest

Exposé of Bush's Fascist Social Security Scheme Now in Spanish

Executive Intelligence Review is pleased to announce that it has published a Spanish translation of the entirety of the famous LaRouche PAC "Twins" pamphlet, in the latest issue of its biweekly, *Resumen Ejecutivo de EIR*. The pamphlet, which features a picture of a little President George W. Bush leaning against a much larger Gen. Augusto Pinochet, the former dictator of Chile, on its cover, is titled, "Bush's Social Security Privatization. Foot In the Door For Fascism."

The Separatist 'Lion' Unleashed in Bolivia

The fascist display of manipulated "People's Power" in Santa Cruz, Bolivia on Jan. 28, has unleashed the deadly virus of "autonomy" upon the country. "This is the first day of national autonomy! Autonomy now!... The lion has awakened," Ruben Costas, head of the Santa Cruz Civic Committee, roared to the crowd of anywhere from 170,000 to 350,000 people who chanted "Autonomy! Autonomy!" as they waved the green and white flag of their province, at the separatist "town hall meeting" in Santa Cruz that night.

Costa's 50-minute harangue was classic, fascist sophistry: "Bolivia is being refounded. Welcome, everyone, to the new Bolivia," he cried, in between Schwarznegger-like attacks upon the corrupt "bureaucratic elite" of the State which has kept "the People" down. "Democracy here and now!... The People ask, and the People must be respected."

The crowd roared approval of the formation of a "Provisional Autonomous Committee," which is charged with negotiating the transfer of powers and resources from the national government to the province. The crowd screamed "Yes," also, in response to two other propositions: that they "authorize" said assembly to convoke gubernatorial elections, if the national

government does not do so; and to call a binding referendum on autonomy, should the national government not do so. The "town hall meeting" did not "elect" a provincial governor on the spot, as originally threatened.

Faced with an insurgency which he did not have the power to defeat, President Carlos Mesa went on national television that evening, and announced two major concessions to Santa Cruz. He announced he had signed a decree convoking direct elections of provincial governors, the winners of which he would then appoint as governors. (Under Bolivia's Constitution, the governors of the departments must be appointed by the President.) He also announced a national referendum on whether all departments should be granted autonomy to be held *before* a planned Constituent Assembly, where a new constitution is to be drafted.

The latter is violently opposed by the "popular" Jacobin forces, who also advocate autonomy for particular interests (Indians, provinces, etc.), but believe they can control power, if the Constituent Assembly is held *before* autonomy.

There is no basis for a domestic solution to this crisis, until the international system is changed, to restore sovereignty to nations. Over three decades of post-industrial looting have reduced the State to "an intermediary between the NGOs and the multinationals," as one Bolivian official commented privately to *EIR* last week. Now, he noted, the state is slated to become the negotiator between autonomies. The battle of "every people for themselves" is on.

Meanwhile, *cocalero* leader Evo Morales has called a mass meeting for next Jan. 31, in Cochabamba, to organize mass protests against Mesa's "sell-out" to oligarchic interests.

Confirmed: Bush-Cheney Plan to Invade Iran; Separatism and Genocide for Bolivia

On Jan. 27, one day before the Santa Cruz Civic Committee's "town hall meeting," *EIR* threw a polemical hand grenade into the operation to break up the nation of Bolivia, circulating throughout Ibero-America a press release with the above headline as its title. The EIRNS release was posted in full on the website of the independent Bolpress agency. The text of the release follows:

A group of neo-conservative ideologues held a conference in Dubai, UAE on Jan. 5-6, to publicly announce that the Bush-Cheney government is considering an attack on Iran this year. "It is not a question of 'yes or no,'" the conference attendees said, but only "when and how."

This confirms what former Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche had warned of during the entire period of the 2004 electoral campaign, as a campaign leaflet had stressed: "A vote for Bush-Cheney is a vote for perpetual warfare and economic hell...."

In the Dubai seminar, organized by the Gulf Research Center, the loudest voice was that of neo-conservative Patrick Clawson, of the Institute for Near East Policy, who boasted of his ties to the Bush government. Clawson also maintains close links to the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) of Washington, where he is a frequent speaker.

This same collection of neo-conservative ideologues behind the policies of the Bush-Cheney government, and specifically AEI, also have Bolivia in their sights. In the June 2004 issue of the AEI publications *Latin American Outlook*, the Mark Falcoff has a commentary entitled, "The Last Days of Bolivia?" which concludes: "If current tendencies continue, we could be witnessing the first large-scale alteration of the political map of South America in more than 100 years." Falcoff ends by proposing the division of Bolivia.

Whether or not the business leaders participating in the campaign are witting or not, the scenario for the autonomy of Santa

Cruz is a script written by AEI.

According to Falcoff, Bolivia will disintegrate and divide, along its "perhaps irreconcilable" racial and geographic differences, into two countries, according to their principal export product: the high plateau regions which export coca, and the low lands, headed by the department of Santa Cruz, which produce natural gas. According to Falcoff, the coca-nation would be primarily dominated by Indians, and the low lands by people of more "European" origin.

Falcoff is no mere analyst, but has been promoting his scenario in the Chilean press, adding into the equation the old conflict between Bolivia and Chile for an outlet to the sea.

Falcoff—who promotes the Chile model that Pinochet introduced in the name of George Shultz—assured the Chilean press that should the "Republic of Santa Cruz be created, it would have absolutely normal relations with Chile." He said he didn't know what Argentina would do, but Falcoff suggested that if Brazil were to recognize "this new republic," Argentina would have no alternative but to do the same.

To encourage possible border wars, as well as racial wars, is a guaranteed recipe for genocide, Lyndon LaRouche warned at the time. They are trying to unleash perpetual warfare in the region, a war which, once begun, could not be stopped.

And drum-beating for war is precisely what these diligent mouthpieces of the Bush government are doing in Ibero-America. One of them, the exiled Cuban Alberto Montaner, is circulating an article which practically threatens that the Bush government will unleash war across Ibero-America, if the governments of Brazil and Argentina do not support the "efforts" of the U.S. at the OAS, against Venezuela's Hugo Chavez regime. According to Montaner, Chavez will otherwise support Bolivia and Peru against that "bastion of neoliberalism," Chile, in a reenactment of the War of the Pacific."

Neo-Cons Hype Regime Change for Venezuela

The notorious neo-conservative Cuban exile, Carlos Alberro Montaner, projected in his Jan. 23 syndicated column, that there could be a new "Latin American War" in coming years, in which over 250,000 may die. Montaner claims Hugo Chavez will be responsible for the war he foresees, but Montaner's war reflects his neo-conservative masters' intentions.

Montaner—most famous for his book, *The Perfect Idiot*, blaming Ibero-America's woes upon "statists" who refused to accept the free-trade doctrine—threatens that Argentina and Brazil had better decide to back an "intense diplomatic effort" by the U.S., Mexico, and the Organization of American States to bring down the Chavez regime, or they may face war. Chavez aims to provoke war with Chile—using Peru and Bolivia—in order "to destroy that bastion of 'neo-liberalism.'" Montaner's parting threat? "If the Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia (1932-1935) left 90,000 dead, that of the Venezuelan *caudillo* could be capable of tripling this amount."

That this is Wall Street's policy, was made amply clear in the Jan. 21 op-ed column by Mary Anastasia O'Grady, titled, "Should Chavez Be on the List of Terrorism Sponsors?" "President Bush has made it clear that any government that gives safe haven to terrorists is a U.S. enemy," and on those grounds, Hugo Chavez's Venezuela must be treated as such," she argued. "All those tender souls who worry that Chavez will 'cut off the oil' need to be told that he would do himself far more harm than the U.S. if he ever attempted such a power play." (See ["Synarchists Promote Andean-Wide Violence,"](#) in InDepth, for background on this story.)

French Water Utility Under Fire in Ibero-America

"There's a love that kills," was the quip from Argentine President Nestor Kirchner in response to the president of the

French water utility Suez, who insisted that his company "loves" Argentina. Kirchner's government has been in a dispute with Suez over the latter's failure to invest, after it bought up the privatized Aguas Argentinas water utility company years ago. Buenos Aires Gov. Felipe Sola announced Jan. 22, that the government is now considering rescinding the privatization contract for Aguas Argentinas and establishing a new company jointly owned by the federal and provincial governments. "Demands have been made on Argentina by this French company which we aren't prepared to tolerate, neither as a national nor a provincial government," Sola said.

Suez's record in Argentina is appalling. In its original privatization contract, it foresaw no rate increases. But between 1993 and 2003, rates increased by 88% on average, while it invested only 60% of the amount originally promised. In the 17 districts served by Suez in metropolitan Buenos Aires, there are 1.03 million residents without sewers and 800,000 without potable water. Treatment of sewage which was supposed to be maintained at a level of at least 74%, remains only at 7%.

The same pattern was demonstrated by Suez's Bolivian subsidiary, Aguas de Illimani. Bolivian officials report that the French company invested zero capital in Bolivia, despite its contractual obligations, while raising rates on water usage by three times since 1997.

The Argentine government slapped a multimillion-dollar fine on Aguas Argentinas in January, and is refusing to grant Suez President Yves Thibault de Silguy's demand that Argentina allow his firm to increase rates by 60%. To the reported surprise of Argentine officials, when French President Jacques Chirac and Kirchner met in Paris on Jan. 21, Chirac told Kirchner that he should do what he sees best in the with Suez's Aguas Argentinas firm. Chirac said that this "pebble in the shoe" should be removed, and if it meant rescinding the contract, then Argentina should feel free to do so.

Western European News Digest

Senior German Social Dem Cites Hersh on Threat to Iran

Senior German Social Democrat Gernot Erler, who is chief foreign affairs spokesman of the Social Democrats, said that the problem with the U.S. position on Iran is that it is already preparing a military strike, carrying out covert operations in Iran and spying on targets for a potential attack. The report filed by Seymour Hersh in the Jan. 29 *New Yorker* has to be taken very seriously, and indeed, it has not been officially denied.

The other option, namely regime change in Iran, along the model of the recent change in Ukraine, also has to be taken very seriously, as Rice indicated with her naming Iran prominently as an "outpost of tyranny."

For a solution to the Iranian nuclear problem, it would be helpful if the U.S. officially joined the European team in the ongoing, grantedly difficult, talks with Tehran, this would also give more weight to the diplomatic effort, Erler said. One of the bigger, yet-unsolved problems is, he added, that Tehran wants sound guarantees concerning the Israeli nuclear potential, and the lifting of international economic sanctions.

'No Way' Blair Will Back Bush on Iran Attack

There is "no way Tony Blair could back George Bush in attacking Iran," said a senior British defense establishment source, in a discussion with *EIR* Jan. 26. The British Prime Minister "would be out immediately if he tried to do that," he said emphatically. This source has no illusions about any effective political opposition to Blair in Britain, and fears that, without any such attempted adventure on Blair's part, the Labour Party will likely win the upcoming national elections in May. There might be some kind of covert intelligence cooperation on Iran, but that would be maximum from the British side. If you look at what Foreign Secretary Jack Straw is saying, and even more the views of Blair's biggest rival, his

Chancellor Gordon Brown, Blair "would absolutely not be able to support Bush on Iran," the source said.

Militarily, the U.S. could *not* invade Iran, to say nothing of Britain. The U.S. would have to "walk away" from its other military commitments in order to do anything against Iran, and it cannot afford to pull so many troops out of Germany, to say nothing of Korea, at this time. "The sheer logistics make it impossible," the source said.

"I think that there are far deeper reservations about trying something against Iran, within the U.S., than there were on Iraq," said the source, who knows the U.S. establishment very well. Even moves on sanctions and propaganda "are a high risk," he said. The U.S. would have "a hell of a ride" trying to get anti-Iran sanctions through the UN, he said. Sanctions would create a big destabilization of the oil markets, he said.

"I would not disregard the U.S. dropping a bomb on Iran's nuclear reactor," he said. This would be a U.S. operation: Israel would not participate, since it would backfire on Israel itself. "Cheney's remarks about restraining Israel, were total hypocrisy," the source said.

He then pointed to the Russian factor. Look at the deal on missiles just reached with Syria: "That will be setting feathers fluttering in Washington," he said. And, look at what Putin might do on Israel-Palestine relations. Russia is "in there, but *sotto voce*," he said. Putin may calculate soon, that he should put something into that situation, which would cause big concern in Washington," he said.

Blair: UK Is Preparing To Withdraw from Iraq

Confirming source reports received by *EIR* from military experts in Europe, Tony Blair said, in an interview to the *Financial Times* Jan. 26, that this is on the agenda. "Both ourselves and the Iraqis want us to leave as soon as possible. The question is what is 'as soon as possible'? And the answer to that is: when the Iraqi forces have the capability to do the job."

Blair said that, as soon as the elections have taken place, "we have got to sit down with the new government and look at how we manage the transition." He acknowledged that both the U.S. and UK were "looking with the Iraqis now at what are the timelines for the 'Iraqi-isation' [of the security forces] to be achieved." Without going into details, he did say deployment would shift. "There are areas where we would be able to hand over to those Iraqi forces. Remember, 14 out of the 18 provinces in Iraq are relatively peaceful and stable."

Blair was miffed at the idea that the U.S. and UK are occupying forces. "People still refer to this as an occupation by U.S. forces," he said. He explained that the forces are there by permission of the interim government, which, in turn, is authorized by the UN.

On the insurgency, Blair repeated that it is not the whole Sunni population, but admits there are former Ba'athists and others involved.

As for Bush's policy, he said he was sure that Bush would seek a peaceful solution to the Iranian crisis, though, when asked if, theoretically, Iran might be stopped only by force, he answered, "Yes." He said he thought Bush would seek a peace between the Palestinians and Israel, too.

Blair Hires DLC Neo-Con To Win Conservative Votes

British Prime Minister Tony Blair has hired Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) neo-con Mark Penn to help him win Conservative votes. Penn, one of the triangulation gurus (with dirty Dick Morris) who misadvised Bill Clinton on

pandering to the right wing, has been visiting Blair monthly since the autumn, according to the *Telegraph* Jan. 23, which reports that the meetings have been kept secret from most of the Cabinet. The *Telegraph* writes that its revelation will upset many Labour activists, who oppose the plan by Blair and his top election adviser Alan Milburn to make the campaign "unremittingly New Labour."

Penn's firm, Penn, Schoen & Berland, the *Telegraph* notes, represents such firms as American Express, BP, Coke, and several leading casino hotels. Labour MP Alan Simpson said: "My impression is that this kid from the casinos will turn out to be an expensive mistake."

UK Announces Change in Handling of Terror Suspects

British Home Secretary Charles Clarke announced Jan. 26 that terrorist suspects would be put under various restrictions, rather than being held indefinitely in prison, as is the case now, under the emergency "anti-terror" laws passed after Sept. 11. In late December, in a big political upset, a panel of Law Lords—Britain's highest legal body—ruled that the detention in prison without trial of 12 foreign nationals in Britain, was illegal, and threw out the severest anti-terror measures.

Clarke's proposals are clearly an effort to blunt the effect of the Law Lords' ruling, by allowing house arrest for terrorist suspects. Also, in a controversial move, the Home Secretary, and not the courts, will be able to impose the new control measures.

Clarke said that terrorism suspects, both British nationals and foreigners, could be put under a series of restrictions, from limits on internet communication, curfews, electronic tagging, to house arrest. The new measures take account of the "more significant role" British nationals were playing in the terror threat, Clarke said.

Otherwise, foreign terror suspects will be deported, on grounds that they would not face torture or the death penalty if they were deported to their own nations, Clarke said. The nine foreign nationals still being detained in British prisons will not be released until legislation is passed for Clarke's proposals.

Meanwhile, the last four Britons who have been held in Guantanamo prison for three years, were returned to Britain Jan. 26. Their lawyers charge that they had been subjected to torture and require urgent medical treatment.

Blair Disputes Bank of England Over Housing Bubble

British Prime Minister Tony Blair claimed Jan. 24 that house prices are going to continue to rise, but Bank of England Monetary Policy Committee member Kate Barker warned of falling prices. Blair is launching an "affordable housing" scheme, a big election ploy.

Public-sector land is to be used to build "cheap" homes—just 60,000 pounds (\$113,000)—for some workers and first-time buyers. Teachers, nurses, and others, and first-time buyers can no longer afford homes in Britain. The government would continue to own the land on which the houses are built. Blair said that the plan is to ensure that "as housing prices rise, which they will do, they don't rise at a level that is so great that people feel that they're simply losing the chance to get into the market".

The whole New Labour economic "stability" is based on the huge housing price bubble in Britain.

Barker, however, in a speech to the Institute of Economic Affairs, said that house prices would likely continue to fall: "The likelihood of some decline in house prices, at least relative to earnings, seems now to be much greater than that of a

significant increase."

Barker also warned that the fall of the dollar could be more of a risk to the economy than house prices: "The housing market is far from the dominant issue. It is perhaps not even the most important asset price, in the light of the significant decline in the dollar rate in the fourth quarter of last year."

Netherlands Legalizes Murder of Disabled Newborns

Officially, the debate is still going on among Dutch physicians and politicians, but so far, euthanasia is legalized only for adults. Several weeks ago, directors of the eight university clinics in the country published an open letter calling for euthanasia also against severely disabled newborns.

That is no longer a debate: The Dutch medical journal, *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde*, just published an article reporting that 22 newborn children with *spina bifida*, a severe malfunction of the spinal bone marrow, have been killed, since 1997, already.

Russia and the CIS News Digest

CIS Official Sees Spread of 'Ukraine Scenario'

The Georgia or Ukraine scenario of regime change may be played out in any of the member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States, CIS Executive Committee Chairman Vladimir Rushailo said Jan. 25 at a press conference in Dushanbe. "And it may happen in non-member countries, as well, as we have seen many times," he added. Rushailo is heading Russia's team of observers of the run-up to Tajikistan's Feb. 27 parliamentary elections. Kyrgyzstan will also hold elections that day. *Nezavisimaya Gazeta* of Jan. 24 wrote about Roza Otunbayeva, former Kyrgyzstan ambassador to London, as a likely "Burjanadze" (Georgia) or "Tymoshenko" (Ukraine) figure for Kyrgyzstan, referring to the female activists who played a high-profile role in regime change in those two countries.

The German daily *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* of Jan. 26 carried an interview with President Michael Saakashvili and reported on a recent declaration, issued by him together with incoming Ukrainian President Victor Yushchenko. That statement said, "The Georgian and Ukrainian revolutions mark a new wave of European liberation, which will lead to the final victory of freedom and democracy on the European continent." Saakashvili told *FAZ* that this was not a threat, adding, "Some people in Moscow don't like these developments, but they have to live with these realities." He also asserted that Kyrgyzstan's President Askar Askayev was among those who "are now becoming very nervous because of us."

Yushchenko Names Tymoshenko Prime Minister

Inaugurated on Jan. 23, new Ukrainian President Victor Yushchenko promptly named Yulia Tymoshenko as his Prime Minister. Head of her own "Party of Yulia Tymoshenko," she was one of the leaders in the November-December demonstrations that overturned the initial Presidential election results in Ukraine. Earlier, she made her fortune in the energy sector, and was linked with former Prime Minister Pavlo Lazarenko, now jailed in the United States for embezzlement.

In a speech Yushchenko Jan. 26 to the European Council in Strasbourg, after first visiting Moscow, he emphasized that Ukraine will push through "democratic reforms" in order to boost its bid to join the European Union. "We have a three-year plan. We would like it to end in 2007 with a concrete commitment," said Yushchenko. The European Parliament had

earlier passed a resolution for bringing Ukraine into the EU quickly, something EU officials have said they are not prepared to do.

Syrian President Visits Moscow

President Bashar Al-Assad visited Moscow Jan. 24 for talks on economic and political cooperation. Both Damascus and Moscow are denying media reports about a deal for sophisticated missile systems. Head of the official media delegation accompanying Assad, Dr. Fayez Al-Sayegh, stated, "The military file is not currently on the agenda. It is put off until restoring the strength of political and economic ties. Syria is not seeking Russian weaponry as much as seeking a political atmosphere in which Russia plays an effective role in the international arena to resume the [Middle East] peace process and restore security and stability to the region." In an interview published Jan. 24, Assad told *Izvestia*, "Russia's Defense Minister has said that such a deal does not exist and thus he has answered the question."

Syrian strategic analyst Gamal Barout said he thought "Syria needs Moscow to stave off European-American pressures." Furthermore, "Damascus also needs to maintain and modernize its army," Barout added. Echoing the analysis presented at EIR's Jan. 12-13 Berlin seminar, he said that Russia also needs a foothold in the Middle East. Syrian journalist Hayan Niouf also expected the talks to touch on a possible Syrian role in pushing for Moscow's membership in the Organization of Islamic Conference, in exchange for Russian political support in the UN and Security Council.

Russia has come to the defense of Syria recently, in the face of attacks by neo-cons in Washington. After Secretary of State-nominee Condoleezza Rice warned Damascus that it faced new sanctions because of "its suspected interference in Iraq and ties to terrorism," Russia's Foreign Ministry called the Arab state one of its "most important partners" in the Middle East. "It's well known that slapping labels on countries and unilaterally describing certain states as part of the 'axis of evil' has not improved anyone's security," Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Yakovenko had said Jan. 21.

Following their summit, Assad and Putin issued a joint declaration, on a wide range of cooperation agreements. Economic agreements included commitments to: establish a factory to produce pipes and basalt yarns; support the Syrian-Russian Businessmen Council; cooperate in the field of oil and gas; and develop international land transportation. In addition, a protocol was signed to settle Syria's debts to Russia, dating back to the Soviet era. The Russians agreed to forgive 73% of the debt, which amounted to \$13 billion. Russian Finance Minister Kurdin said this would leave a debt of \$3.6 billion, 40% of which will be repaid in cash over 10 years. The remainder will be in Syrian currency, and will be used for purchases of goods and investments in Syria. The Syrian delegation prepared a number of proposals, which it submitted to the Russian side, in an enlarged meeting of the Russian-Syrian Business Council. The projects are in industry, agriculture, oil and gas sector, and the environment. Another topic on the agenda was to be the creation of a bilateral free trade zone.

Southwest Asia News Digest

EIR Confronts White House on Iran Military Strikes

White House spokesman Scott McClellan denied that the U.S. was preparing military action against Iran, in reply to a question from this news service Jan. 25. *EIR*'s question was based on reports from a symposium in Dubai, where the Washington Institute for Near East Peace's Patrick Clawson claimed that it was only a question of time before the U.S. would act militarily. The transcript is as follows:

EIR: Scott, a few days ago, Pat Clawson, from the Washington Institute was briefing a number of officials from the Gulf Cooperation Council. And he said that in terms of military action against Iran, the question is not "if," but "when" and "how" the U.S. will act. He insisted also that this was not his private opinion, but reflected the thinking of the

administration. Is that accurate? Does this reflect the—

McCLELLAN: I think the thinking of the administration has been expressed by administration officials, by the President and by others. In terms of Iran and its pursuit of nuclear weapons, we've made it very clear how we're working with our European allies to pursue a diplomatic approach to get Iran to end its pursuit of nuclear weapons. They've made some commitments and we expect them to abide by their commitments. We will see if they are serious about ending their pursuit of nuclear weapons by their actions.

EIR: Is it really the case that you are willing to pursue a diplomatic approach, or you're simply letting the Europeans do what they have to do, with an eye to them failing, and then going for some kind of military action?

McCLELLAN: We're pursuing a diplomatic approach to get Iran to end its pursuit of nuclear weapons. That's the approach we are pursuing.

Hamas, Palestinian Authority Reach Agreements

After a week of meetings between Palestinian President Abu Mazen (Mahmoud Abbas) and Khaled Meshaal, exiled leader of the radical Hamas, Hamas has agreed to a 30-day trial ceasefire, reported *Ha'aretz* on Jan. 25. Hamas is demanding, in return, the release of "thousands" of prisoners from Israel, and the end of military incursions into the occupied territories. Although nothing is official, "we speak of a conditional calming," said Meshaal, there has been an "unknown calm" in the area since Abbas deployed Palestinian security forces to police the border

Ha'aretz on Jan. 26, also reports that President Abu Mazen reached an agreement in principle with the Hamas leadership for cooperation in the decision making process with the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

The agreement reportedly involves the creation of a "supreme diplomatic authority" that would include the PLO and all other Palestinian organizations, such as Hamas and Islamic Jihad, which do not belong to the PLO. Up until now, all diplomatic decisions were made by the PLO. There is also an agreement in principle that Hamas will run candidates in the upcoming legislative elections later this year, but Hamas will not participate in Abu Mazen's government before then.

Hamas leader, Khaled Meshaal, told the Arab daily, *Al Hayat*, that "with these agreements reached, the ball is now in the international and American court. There is no barrier to the PLO being the supreme legal framework of the Palestinian people after it is rehabilitated and rebuilt on appropriate foundations." He added that participation in the Palestinian government now being formed "is not on the agenda." The agreement would also mean that Hamas would accept a state based on the 1967 borders.

A third development was reported by Associated Press, Jan. 27: Senior Palestinian advisor Mohammed Dahlan said in an interview with *AP* that during meetings on Jan. 26, Israel agreed, in principle, to stop pursuing militants and halt targeted killings. In addition, the Palestinian Authority issued a ban on civilians carrying weapons.

Separately, *Voice of America* reported that U.S. envoy William Burns is holding three days of talks with Palestinian and Israeli leaders. Burns met with Shimon Peres and Palestinian Finance Minister Salam Fayed Jan. 26, followed by talks in Ramallah on Jan. 27 with Abbas and Prime Minister Ahmed Qureia. Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat told Palestinian radio that the Palestinians want a clearer American commitment.

Human Rights Watch Scores Israel for Destroying Homes

One of the issues for Israel in the Gaza Strip is the tunnels through which weaponry for the Palestinian Resistance travels. The Israelis, who think that Palestinian homes are built above the tunnels, since they are located near the Egyptian border, have bulldozed hundreds of these homes over the past year. Now, Israel is feeling the pressure over this, from a Jan. 14 press release from Human Rights Watch, which warns the Israeli Defense Forces not to build a proposed trench along the Egyptian-Gaza border, which would wipe out 300, to as many as 3,000 homes, depending on the route chosen. The HRW letter was particularly strong, charging Israel with deliberate destruction of property, illegal under international law. It cited the North Koreans, who also police a border such as this, and use uninvasive electromagnetic and sonic technologies to protect the border.

Hamas Wins Big in Gaza Municipal Elections

In the first Palestinian municipal election ever held in the Gaza Strip, the Islamic Hamas Party won 76 of the 118 seats in 10 local districts. The ruling Fatah Party only won 39 seats, and three seats were taken by independents.

"We consider this victory as the victory of the Palestinian people," said Hamas spokesman Sami Abu Zuhri. "It's not the victory of somebody against somebody, the competition was to serve our people's interests."

Voter turnout was over 80%. Similar elections were held in the West Bank in December where Fatah won 12 of the 26 councils and Hamas won eight, and the rest went to independents.

The U.S. State Department had little to say about this exercise of democracy, except, "We'll follow this situation and see if it has any effect on President Abbas's moves to control the security situation and to eliminate violence." This, of course, is no comment at all.

Iraq's Road to Democracy Passes Through Police State

Judging from remarks made by Iraqi Minister of State for National Security Kassim Daoud to reporters at the Pentagon via video-teleconference from Baghdad, the U.S. occupation and the puppet Allawi government in Iraq, believe they can hold an election under police-state conditions, and call it free and fair.

According to Daoud, the security measures to be adopted for the elections, from Jan. 28 to Jan. 31, include preventing all civilians from moving from one province to another, banning the movement of vehicles (other than those specifically exempted), including keeping them away from polling places, and a ban on carrying arms, even by those with licenses. There will also be curfews during certain hours.

These measures are supposed to facilitate the vote and prevent insurgents from disrupting it. "So it seems to me that with these measures and with the mentality of the people, I'm sure that the Iraqi people are convinced to go and participate in this process," Daoud said.

Do U.S., Brits Have Secret Exit Plan For Iraq?

British Defense Secretary Geoff Hoon and his American counterpart Donald Rumsfeld have secretly agreed on an exit plan for Iraq, according to the British *Guardian*, Jan. 28. The plan would be "based on doubling the number of local police trainees and setting up Iraqi units that would act as a halfway house between the police and the army," says the paper.

The secret deal, brokered Jan. 25, was reportedly based on recommendations made by retired U.S. General Gary Luck, whom Rumsfeld had deployed to Iraq, for a "reassessment" of the situation. There is no deadline set for the withdrawal.

"Everything the defense secretary is working towards now is an exit strategy, but without a public timetable," the *Guardian* quoted a British military source as saying. Another British defense source is quoted saying that help should come as well from Spanish and Italian forces, who could help train the Iraqis. The Iraqi police would still be "backed up" by thousands of troops from the multinational force.

At the same time, the Pentagon announced publicly days ago, that 150,000 troops would stay for two years.

President Bush, in an interview with the *New York Times*, printed on Jan. 28, said, for the first time, that he would withdraw troops from Iraq, if the new government requested it. He added, that he expected the new government to ask the U.S. troops to stay on. "I've, you know, heard the voices of the people that presumably will be in a position of responsibility after these elections, although you never know," he said. "But it seems like most of the leadership there understands that there will be a need for Coalition troops at least until Iraqis are able to fight."

Bush said one "fundamental question" was how to make Iraqis look at U.S. troops "as helpers, not occupiers," adding that as long as they are seen as occupiers, the resistance will promote the idea that the Iraqi government is "complicit in having their country occupied." He said he thought this was "reasonable," and said it was a "positive sign" that many people in Iraq have "a nationalist sentiment that says, 'This is my country.' I mean, to me, that's a positive sign." At the same time, Bush noted "a certain realism amongst the leadership ... that says, 'Look, there's much more work to do before we're ready to move out on our own.'"

Taken together with other reports received by *EIR* over the last week, it looks as though the gameplan is to stage an "agreement," after the elections, whereby the new "sovereign" government asks the U.S.-UK forces to leave, but not right away. The first step should be redeployment out of population centers, into bases (which should be permanent), from which troops could be called out to help, against the insurgency.

Neo-Cons Push for War with Iran and Syria

According to a source at the U.S. National War College, an American strike against Syria nearly took place a month ago, but was nixed due to objections from the Army, wrote Middle East specialist, Patrick Seale, in *Al-Ahram Weekly* Jan. 28. Until recently, Seale says, "most observers believed the U.S. was too busy and overstretched in Iraq to contemplate new wars. But ... the view one now tends to hear in Washington is that there can be no victory in Iraq until Iran and Syria are brought to heel."

Seale asserts that another explanation "for the recent bout of war fever" in Washington, is that the neo-cons are anxious to preempt any change of course in policy that might be made by Condoleezza Rice.

Doug Feith, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, "is said to be working closely with Israeli officers in identifying weapon sites for targetting in Iran," Seale reports, "much as he did in planning the war against Iraq."

The article was written before the announcement that Feith will step down this summer was made public. The removal of Feith weakens the Cheney neo-con faction, but is not decisive in stopping more of the Bush-Cheney wars.

Asia News Digest

China: India Should Play More International Role

China, which was once dismissive of India's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, has not fully come around to support India's bid, but it has made a calibrated shift in its position, according to the Indian daily *The Hindu* Jan. 26. Beijing, during its two-day strategic talks with New Delhi this week, indicated that it would support India's effort to play a greater role in world affairs.

The implications of this nuanced policy statement will only be clear over time. China indicated that it also supports UN reforms, and India should play a role in the reform process. Meanwhile, a high-level panel set up by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, in their report, "Threats, Challenges and Change," submitted last month, recommended that the role a country played in ensuring global stability could be one of the main factors to be considered while making a judgment on its eligibility for a permanent Security Council seat.

China, India Share 'Broad Convergence of Views'

At the first meeting of their new strategic dialogue Jan. 24, India and China had a "broad convergence of views," in their discussions on Iraq, North Korea, Afghanistan, non-proliferation, the threat of terrorism, and the United Nations, which includes a broader role for India at the United Nations.

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Kong Quan called it a "successful dialogue" and said China hopes that both sides would make "new moves" to find an early solution to the boundary issue, "so that bilateral relations will witness faster development on a new basis." China also asked India when it would appoint a Special Representative for the border talks, following the death of former Special Representative and National Security Advisor J.N. Dixit.

Both sides supported the trend towards "multipolarity," an Indian External Affairs Ministry spokesman said. The two sides agreed that the threat of terrorism "could not be tackled unilaterally."

The Chinese representative, Wu Dawei, who is also China's leading negotiator for the six-party talks on the North Korean nuclear issue, also met Indian External Affairs Minister Natwar Singh.

Jakarta Officials To Meet with Aceh Rebels in Finland

A high-powered government team from Jakarta, Indonesia will meet with the Free Aceh Movement (GAM) leaders in Finland, Reuters reported Jan. 25. Coming off the ceasefire established during the tsunami disaster relief effort (a ceasefire that has been only partially successful—some reports say that dozens have died in fighting this month), Indonesia's Chief Security Minister Widodo Adi Sutjipto and Foreign Minister Hassan Wirayuda will lead a delegation to meet, under the auspices of former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari's Crisis Management Initiative, with the leadership of GAM, which is living in exile in Sweden. Given the positions of those in the Indonesian delegation, some progress is clearly expected, despite the GAM's continued insistence on independence, which is unacceptable to Jakarta and to most Achenese.

Afghan Opium Production Expected To Fall This Year

After massive opium crops in 2003 and 2004, each exceeding 5,000 tons, Afghanistan's opium production in 2005 may decline significantly, according to officials. Although the harvesting in the southern and eastern part of Afghanistan doesn't begin until April, Kabul officials claim a significant drop in opium production, in the order of 30-70% in some areas, is expected, due much smaller acreage under poppy cultivation this year.

Afghan President Hamid Karzai, who had declared "jihad" against opium production, has claimed credit already. The fact remains that Karzai neither possesses the authority to prevent poppy planting, nor has he done anything of substance which

could be cited as a reason for such a sharp drop.

Observers point out that the smaller crop is due to drought, disease, and a crash in opium prices in Europe, where 95% of Afghan opium is sold. A similar situation had developed in 2001, during the Taliban regime after two years of record-breaking opium production. In 2001, opium production had fallen by 75%. The Taliban had claimed credit, but the analysts pointed out the massive production of opium in 1999 and 2000 had collapsed prices by 2001.

Opium production rose sharply again during the American occupation of Afghanistan during 2002-2004.

Malaysia: U.S. Will Stand Alone if Iran Attacked

Malaysia, which currently chairs the world's biggest grouping of Muslim countries, the Organization of Islamic Conference, and which, simultaneously, heads the Non-Aligned Movement, has warned that the U.S. will stand alone in the world if it attacks Iran, AFP reported Jan. 26.

The world community, including allies of the United States, is opposed to any such action by the superpower, Prime Minister Abdullah Ahmad Badawi said on his return from a trip to Paris Jan. 25.

"Europe does not agree, the United States' close ally Britain does not agree, and I believe no one else will agree," said Abdullah, who chairs the 57-nation Organization of the Islamic Conference. "The Islamic world will definitely not agree to an attack on Iran," he said. "Talks should instead be held and made a priority, rather than military action."

Bush Inaugural 'Suicide Jump Into Dangerous World'

An editorial in the leading establishment newspaper in the Philippines blasted President Bush's Inaugural address as a "suicide jump into a dangerous world." The *Philippines Inquirer* editorial reads in part: "What has U.S. President George W. Bush's extraordinary second Inaugural address wrought? Mainly, it has pushed Americans right to the brink. The leader of the world's only superpower has asked his fellow citizens to take a leap of faith with him, but in truth, it is a suicide jump into a dangerous world ... [which] seeks to spread the gospel of freedom throughout the world in a way guaranteed to subvert it."

The *Inquirer* says that Bush has "turned freedom into an American religion. Using evangelical language, Bush announced the new mission. 'America, in this young century, proclaims liberty throughout all the world, and to all the inhabitants thereof.' It is an echo of Leviticus 25:10, when the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob instructed Moses: 'Consecrate the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout the land to all its inhabitants.'"

The editorial concludes: "The new Bush doctrine is Manifest Destiny all over again, but this time in theological terms.... By assuming his new role as high priest and prophet of freedom, Bush has not made the world safe for democracy. On the contrary, he has made it more difficult for democracy to take root elsewhere in the world."

U.S. Military To Withdraw from Aceh Relief Effort

The U.S. military will immediately begin to withdraw forces from the relief operations in Aceh, announced U.S. Pacific Commander Adm. Thomas Fargo on Jan. 20. Admiral Fargo said the mission has moved from the "immediate relief phase ... toward rehabilitation and reconstruction." He said that all 15,000 troops would be out within 60 days—thus meeting the time frame requested by the Indonesian government, which has expressed its gratitude for the U.S. help, but also concern for national sovereignty, with foreign troops on its soil.

Rob Holden, who heads a health-assessment team from both the UN and the U.S. military, said: "What we're trying to do is civilianize the humanitarian operations."

India Reaches 'Significant Milestone' in Nuclear Power

India's first 540 MW heavy-water reactor is ready for fuel loading, said S.K. Jain, Chairman and Managing Director of the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd. Calling it "a significant milestone" in India's nuclear-power program, Jain pointed out that this is the first time India has manufactured a 540 MW reactor. India's earlier reactors were capable of generating only 235 MW of electrical power. The new one in Tarapur is TAPP-4. TAPP-3, also of 540 MW capacity, will be commissioned by the end of this year, after the TAPP-4 is commissioned. In Tarapur, two boiling-water reactors, each 220 MW, were commissioned by General Electric in 1968, and are still in operation.

The pressurized heavy-water reactors (PHWRs) in India use natural uranium as fuel and heavy water as coolant and moderator. The natural uranium fuel bundles are fabricated by the Nuclear Fuel Complex at Hyderabad. Several plants in the country manufacture heavy water.

New U.S. Ambassador to Japan Appointed

President George Bush has named Tom Schieffer as the new ambassador to Japan. Schieffer was a member of the investment group that bought the Texas Rangers baseball team in 1989, and was president of the baseball team while Bush was a part-owner. He was also a Dallas lawyer with a portfolio centered on oil and gas companies.

A Department of State biography also points out that Schieffer is the brother of TV reporter Bob Schieffer, and while still in college at the University of Texas, worked in the offices of State Sen. Don Kennard and former Gov. John Connally. Schieffer was elected to the Texas state house at age 25 and served three terms. He also serves on the advisory board of the JP Morgan Chase Bank in Fort Worth, and Drew Industries of White Plains, N.Y.

Schieffer replaces incumbent Ambassador Howard Baker.

This Week in History

January 31 - February 6, 1865

The 13th Amendment: Lincoln Outlaws Slavery

"This finishes the job," said President Abraham Lincoln on Jan. 31, 1865, as Congress passed a bill calling for an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would abolish and prohibit slavery. For two years, Lincoln had been working to put freedom for the slaves on a secure legal footing. The Emancipation Proclamation had freed only the slaves who were under the power of the Confederacy and were able to flee to the Union lines, and Lincoln believed that when the war ended, that Proclamation would become void. There was a further difficulty, for when the Proclamation became law on Jan. 1, 1863, there were many Union supporters who objected that the President had turned the war into a battle to free the slaves, not to save the Union.

Even in his home state of Illinois, there was simmering opposition. In August 1863, Lincoln wrote a letter to his political friends in Illinois, a letter which was intended to be widely circulated. After stating that the Proclamation was indeed a Constitutional document, having been issued by the Commander-in-Chief in a time of war, Lincoln noted that many of his best generals, some of whom were never counted as Abolitionists or Republicans, believed that the emancipation policy and the use of black soldiers constituted a heavy blow to the Rebellion.

Lincoln continued: "You say you will not fight to free Negroes. Some of them seem willing to fight for you; but no matter. Fight you, then, exclusively, to save the Union. I issued the Proclamation on purpose to aid you in saving the Union. Whenever you shall have conquered all resistance to the Union, if I shall urge you to continue fighting, it will be an apt time then for you to declare you will not fight to free Negroes.

"I thought that in your struggle for the Union, to whatever extent the Negroes should cease helping the enemy, to that extent it weakened the enemy in his resistance to you. Do you think differently? I thought that whatever Negroes can be got to do as soldiers, leaves just as much less for white soldiers to do in saving the Union. Does it appear otherwise to you? But Negroes, like other people, act upon motives. Why should they do anything for us if we will do nothing for them? If they stake their lives for us, they must be prompted by the strongest motive, even the promise of freedom. And the promise, being made, must be kept."

In December of 1863, a Constitutional amendment to ban slavery had been proposed in the House; a similar one reached the floor of the Senate in January. The Senate passed it, but the House failed to give the bill a two-thirds majority, as all but four of the Democratic members of the House refused to vote for it. Lincoln was convinced, that if the measure were put to a popular vote, the American people would approve it. Therefore, he made it a central issue of his 1864 Presidential campaign.

Before the Republican Convention in June 1864, Lincoln sent for the chairman of the National Committee, Senator Morgan of New York, and told him, "I want you to mention in your speech, when you call the convention to order, as its keynote, and to put into the platform as the keystone, the amendment of the Constitution abolishing and prohibiting slavery forever."

The National Committee followed the President's policy and article three of the Republican platform read as follows: "Resolved, That as slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength, of this rebellion, and as it must be, always and everywhere, hostile to the principles of republican government, justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the republic; and that while we uphold and maintain the acts and proclamations by which the government, in its own defense, has aimed a death-blow at this gigantic evil, we are in favor, furthermore, of such an amendment to the Constitution, to be made by the people in conformity with its provisions, as shall terminate and forever prohibit the existence of slavery within the limits of the jurisdiction of the United States."

After his decisive victory over Gen. George B. McClellan in the November election, Lincoln addressed a lame-duck Congress in December 1864. He reminded the legislators that the American people, in reelecting him as President, had also voted for a Constitutional amendment prohibiting slavery. "Although the present is the same Congress," said Lincoln, referring to the 1863 Congress that had defeated the bill, "and nearly the same members, and without questioning the wisdom or patriotism of those who stood in opposition, I venture to recommend the reconstruction and passage of the measure at the present session. Of course, the abstract question is not changed, but an intervening election shows, almost certainly, that the next Congress will pass the measure if this does not. Hence there is only a question of time as to when the proposed amendment will go to the states for their action. And as it is to so go, at all events, may we not agree that the sooner the better?"

Lincoln worked unceasingly to get the measure passed. He reached out to the Democrats and to border-state Congressmen,

and worked closely with James Ashley of Ohio, the principal sponsor of the amendment in the House, to identify members who might be persuaded to support the legislation. For example, Lincoln had a long talk with Rep. James Rollins of Missouri, who had originally voted against the amendment, and appealed to him as a former Whig and a follower of "that great statesman, Henry Clay," to now support it. When Rollins said he would now vote for the amendment, Lincoln asked him to use his influence with the other Congressmen from Missouri, for "The passage of this amendment will clinch the whole subject." The President also assured Rollins that, "it will bring the war, I have no doubt, rapidly to a close."

As the 13th Amendment moved through Congress, the legislators were also debating a reconstruction bill submitted by Ashley of Ohio, as well as a bill, backed by President Lincoln, to create a new Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands. This Freedmen's Bureau Act gave the Federal authorities guardianship over the recently emancipated slaves in order to protect them from exploitation by their former owners. In the final balloting on Jan. 31, more than two-thirds of the House voted for the 13th Amendment, and it was sent to the states for ratification. The House then sent the bill to Lincoln for his signature, and he signed it, with great satisfaction, on Feb. 1, even though some Senators pointed out that a Supreme Court decision of 1798 declared that Presidential approval was not required for Constitutional amendments.

On the night of Jan. 31, when news of the passage of the legislation reached the public, a large group of citizens came to the White House and celebrated by serenading the President. Lincoln's remarks to the serenaders were extemporaneous, and so there was no written speech to pass on to posterity, but the newspapermen took notes, including the reactions and comments of the listeners. One of the newspaper accounts reads as follows: "The President said he supposed the passage through Congress of the Constitutional amendment for the abolishment of Slavery throughout the United States, was the occasion to which he was indebted for the honor of this call. [Applause.]

"The occasion was one of congratulation to the country and to the whole world. But there is a task yet before us—to go forward and consummate by the votes of the States that which Congress so nobly began yesterday. [Applause and cries 'They will do it,' &c.] He had the honor to inform those present that Illinois had already today done the work. [Applause.] Maryland was about half through; but he felt proud that Illinois was a little ahead. He thought this measure was a very fitting, if not an indispensable adjunct, to the winding up of the great difficulty. He wished the reunion of all the States perfected and so effected as to remove all causes of disturbance in the future; and to attain this end it was necessary that the original disturbing cause should, if possible, be rooted out.

"He thought all would bear him witness that he had never shrunk from doing all that he could to eradicate Slavery by issuing an emancipation proclamation. [Applause.] But that proclamation falls far short of what the amendment will be when fully consummated. A question might be raised whether the proclamation was legally valid. It might be added that it only aided those who came into our lines and that it was inoperative as to those who did not give themselves up, or that it would have no effect upon the children of the slaves born hereafter. In fact it would be urged that it did not meet the evil.

"But this amendment is a King's cure for all the evils. [Applause.] It winds the whole thing up. He would repeat that it was the fitting if not indispensable adjunct to the consummation of the great game we are playing, He could not but congratulate all present, himself, the country and the whole world upon this great moral victory."

All rights reserved © 2005 EIRNS

[top of page](#)

[home page](#)