



Strategic Alert

VOL. 21, No. 13

WEEKLY NEWSLETTER

March 29, 2007

LaRouche On Gore And The Cult Of The Oligarchy

In a major article, entitled "The Cult of the Oligarchy: The Gore of Babylon," which will appear in the March 30 edition of *EIR*, Lyndon LAROCHE has raised the level of the assault against the global warming hoax being championed by the former US Vice-President, to that of the oligarchical, anti-human principle which he represents. LaRouche's exposition is followed in the same issue, by a 30-page dossier on the roots of the racist Malthusian movement which created Gore, and is currently running the global drive against industrialization, and for a new speculative bubble based on carbon trading.

LaRouche traces the roots of today's environmental fascism to the period of the ancient Delphi cult of Dionysos, and juxtaposes it to the principle put forward by AESCHYLUS in *Prometheus Bound*. It is impossible to understand Gore, he argues, "without recognizing him, as I show here, as not only a true echo of Twentieth-Century fascism, but, also, an echo, in that specific historical sense, of the example provided by Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound*."

LaRouche situates the fight against what Gore represents in the urgency of the world going *now* to a policy of rapid economic development of nuclear fission and nuclear fusion power. The alternative, which the environmentalists put forward, is nothing else than genocide.

In the followup "Gore Dossier," an *EIR* research team elaborates some of the ugly financial and historical realities behind the current Gore hoax. The carbon tax swindle is explained as a means for building up a new bubble, by the same institutions which are creating the global scare campaign. The historical background of the current Malthusian gang begins from the work of Cecil RHODES and the British imperial gang which went from supporting the eugenics policies of the Nazis, to creating a movement for the same kind of murder of the "unfit," on the excuse that there are not enough resources to support them, if we want to keep the world "clean."

Danish Schiller Institute's Maglev Proposal Sets Debate

The Schiller Institute in Denmark's proposal for the Danish section of a future Eurasian-wide magnetic levitation (MA-

GLEV) system, has garnered coverage in numerous Danish internet publications, as well as print media during the past week. The press has highlighted the possibility of a 25-minute connection between Denmark's two largest cities, COPENHAGEN, located on the island of Zealand, and AARHUS, located on the Jutland Peninsula, by building a maglev connection across the Kattegat Sea. In addition, the Schiller Institute will testify before the Danish Parliament's Traffic Committee next month, and a written proposal, available on their homepage as an official document, has been submitted for consideration.

The plan was originally presented in the article "Denmark and the Eurasian Land-Bridge," from the Schiller Institute's first campaign newspaper from July 2006, distributed to 50,000 people (1% of the Danish population). In November, 2006, the mayors of Denmark's six largest cities proposed improving the travelling time between their cities to one hour. There are also on-going negotiations between Denmark and Germany about constructing a bridge/tunnel across the Fehmer Belt.

On Monday, March 19, *Jyllands-Posten (JP)*, Denmark's largest newspaper, had banner headline coverage of traffic researcher Uffe JACOBSEN's proposal to drop the proposed Danish-German connection, due to hesitation on the German side, and to build a Kattegat connection instead. The next day, the internet version of *JP* published an interview with Tom GILLESBERG, chairman of the Schiller Institute in Denmark, highlighting the 25-minute Copenhagen-Aarhus maglev link across such a Kattegat connection, including a picture of the Schiller Institute's "Maglev Danmark" timetable.

Regarding the Fehmer connection, the Schiller Institute has argued for constructing both projects, including maglev tracks, and has called on the German government to realize that such a future-oriented investment will allow economic benefits that outweigh the costs, increased transportation efficiency. As Lyndon LaRouche has observed, "The Danes want to teach the Germans to 'play bridge!'"

A follow-up article in *JP*, on March 21, included a positive response to the maglev idea, from Nicolai WAMMEN, the Social Democratic mayor of Aarhus, who stated, "It will give a great flexibility in relation to, for example, living in Aarhus and working in Copenhagen. If the travel time is brought substantially down, whole new possibilities are created, in connection with meetings, studies, family visits, cultural experiences and

shopping, between the two Danish growth centers. It will have colossal significance."

Since then, the story has been picked up in numerous other media. *Berlingske Tidende*, a major Copenhagen daily, included Gillesberg's call for financing the project through a state capital budget investment, to be written off over 50 years. *Ing.dk*, the internet version of *Ingeniøren* (Engineer), added a quote from the Schiller Institute: "Denmark should, just like future American governments, establish strong ties to Germany and Eurasian countries, and join in building up the Eurasian continent. We should act as bridge builders and offer engineering troops, instead of fighting troops."

The Process Of Merging Zombies

It is said in polite company that women don't perspire, they glisten, and big banks don't go bankrupt, they merge. Neither is true, of course. The point is today, the banks *are* bankrupt! The only problem with this statement is that they aren't really banks anymore, but giant casinos in a global gambling system.

This combination of casino-style gambling and hidden-loss-fuelled bankruptcies has led to the formation of a new class of trillion-dollar banks and financial firms. *Forbes* magazine, in its 2006 list of the world's largest companies, listed 15 banks, diversified financial companies and insurers with assets of \$1 trillion or more, and at the end of 2006 the largest US bank holding company, CITIGROUP, reported assets of \$1.9 trillion. Now we have merger discussions between BARCLAYS BANK of the City of London, and ABN AMRO of the Netherlands, a merger which, should it go through, would create a bank with some \$3 trillion in assets. Even if it doesn't go through, the talk itself is being used as the justification for another round of banking consolidation—now that ABN Amro is in „play,“ the soap opera goes, someone will have to buy it, and if Barclays' bid fails, Barclays may get eaten, too. While rumors fly about who will eat whom, as if this were a sporting contest, the real reasons for the consolidations are rarely, if ever, mentioned. The primary reasons are the bankruptcies, and the need to create imperial financial institutions impervious to national political pressures (that is, banks which are not swayed by the misery they inflict upon ordinary people).

The London *Telegraph* did, albeit indirectly, refer to this process in a March 20 article by Philip Aldrick. The Barclays-ABN Amro talk, Aldrick wrote, „has put European consolidation back on the agenda,“ adding that such a merger would „set a precedent for European cross-border tie-ups. After that, anything would be possible.“ Such consolidation, he continued, „is long overdue,“ adding that „the creation of national champions, such as France's BNP PARIBAS and Germany's DEUTSCHE BANK, has led to a degree of state protectionism and a lot of management hubris.“ An ABN deal, he said, „would blow the argument for protectionism out of the water.“

Unions Mobilize To Save Chrysler From Hedge Funds

Auto unions and union leaders in the United States, Canada, Germany, and Britain have announced that they intend to fight

any „financial locust“ takeover of CHRYSLER, whether by hedge fund or private equity fund, which they say will mean the stripping down and looting of what remains of the US number-three automaker.

Only one auto supply company, the anti-union Magna International, has shown any interest in Chrysler since DAIMLER made clear it was going to try to sell it off. That puts the giant fund CERBERUS—already all-but in control of Delphi and owning 51% of GMAC—at the head of the line of locusts circling around what they would soon turn into Chrysler's corpse. Cerberus's takeover team includes the former Daimler boss who was brought in to slash and close Chrysler plants in 2000, after Daimler bought Chrysler—a failed „corporate shrinkage“ only six-seven years old.

On March 16-17, eleven trade union confederations from around Europe met in Paris to mobilize against private-equity takeovers; Chrysler is shaping up as the big test-case battle. The United Autoworkers' Ron GETTELFINGER, the Canadian Autoworkers' Buzz HARGROVE, and German autoworkers' union representative Gerd RHEUDE, who is on the board of Daimler-Chrysler, issued a statement declaring their unions' intent to fight Cerberus, Blackstone, Centerbridge Capital LLC, or other locust funds that go after Chrysler. Also involved are Damon SILVER of the AFL-CIO in Washington; and Brendan BARBER, head of the British Trades Union Congress (TUC).

But what is the unions' solution for Chrysler's shrinkage? Their decision to fight brings up—in fact, *requires*—endorsement of Lyndon LaRouche's Economic Recovery Act policy of Federal retooling of auto for infrastructure; otherwise, they have no alternative with which to stop a takeover beyond a few months' delaying. Daimler is trying to dump Chrysler immediately now. Either a Federal capital budget for infrastructure intervenes, and assumes the closed and underused Chrysler plants, or an equity fund locust comes in and gets rid of them.

Is Gore Chancellor's Merkel's New Ghostwriter?

With as much desperation as overdrive, the German Government is making an effort to save as much of the failed and discredited European Constitution as possible, and Chancellor Angela MERKEL is convinced that the climate protection issue can serve as the great unifier among the otherwise dissenting European Union governments. The *Berlin Declaration*, signed in the German capital on the occasion of the Treaty of Rome's 50th anniversary, is so obviously inspired by the CO2 emissions debate, that the question whether Al Gore has become a ghostwriter for Merkel, is justified.

For Germany in particular, Sigmar GABRIEL, the German Environment Minister, announced his promotion of a nationwide campaign to provide German schools with the Gore movie, with a kick-off for free showings of the movie in 27 German cities for 5,200 teachers on March 18. A total of 6,000 DVDs with the Gore movie are to be made available, funded by a Munich-based firm, GOETZ PARTNERS, which has close business relations to a number of hedge and equity funds (!) like Bain Capital and Cerberus – and that just illustrates where the original drive for the “investment” in climate protection comes from. Gore himself works with two funds, Gen-

eration Investment Management, and Metropolitan West Financial.

Gabriel's scare-campaign on the CO2 issue was attacked in a March 22 statement issued by Helga ZEPP-LAROUCHE, national chairwoman of the BUESO party, who calls on German school authorities and teachers not to show the DVD with Gore's movie, but rather to show the British television *Channel 4* anti-Gore documentary (cf. SA, 12/07).

The international mobilization of the LaRouche movement and of other critics of the Gore-mania, has begun to have a considerable impact also in Germany, reflected in a March 23 article in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Entitled, "Is Climate Change Nothing But A Big Swindle?", the article reported on page one of its literary section, on the broad criticism of Gore among scientists around the globe. The article recalls the insane 1970s discussion about "global cooling," which is revived in the present discussion about "global warming," and not even the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) pressing ahead with its report has silenced the many critics in the scientific community. Critics charge that the billions of dollars that people like Gore want to pump into climate protection, will lack in the struggle against the real global challenges like children's undernourishment and infectious diseases, the article notes. A panel event at the American National Public Radio March 14 yielded a victory of the critics over the pro-Gore voices, the *FAZ* writes, also mentioning the *Channel 4* documentary.

British TV Expands Anti-Gore Campaign

Following its devastating expose of the fraud of ecological alarmism, British television *Channel 4* has commissioned a debate program about "The Great Global Warming Swindle" program, to be broadcast next month, *The Guardian* reported March 16. Final title, format, and scheduled broadcast are not yet confirmed, a *Channel 4* representative said.

The expose of the global warming fraud prompted „a storm of controversy," *The Guardian* reported, and a spokesman said that they had received 758 comments via phone and email four days later, six to one in favor. „We want *Channel 4* to be the place where people feel they can debate big issues. The Great Global Warming Swindle has kicked off just such a debate with people eager to voice their opinion," the spokesman said. Hamish MYKURA, the *Channel 4* head of history, science, and religion, told *The Guardian*: „The environment and global warming are urgent issues and *Channel 4* is the place where all perspectives can be heard."

Channel 4 can be contacted by email at <mailto:viewerenquiries@channel4.co.uk>.

EIR Releases Devastating Study Of Post-Soviet Russian Economy

EIR News Service on March 23 announced publication of *The Anatomy of Russian Capitalism* by Professor Stanislav M. MENSHIKOV. Translated from the Russian by Rachel Douglas, the book is an authoritative study of the Russian economy during the first fifteen years after the break-up of the Soviet Union. The Preface by Lyndon LAROUCHE, „Russia's Next

Step," poses the need for US policy-makers to study and grasp the „disease" presented in this book, since it represents „an economic global pandemic which we must all join to defeat."

Professor Menshikov, author of in-depth studies of the international and Russian economies, became famous as one of the Soviet Union's top experts on the United States. In his new book, he turns his attention to Russia in the post-Soviet period. Here is the story of the new Russian oligarchs: who they are, and how they amassed their fabulous fortunes during the chaotic 1990s. Does the emerging Kremlin financial industrial group of President Vladimir Putin's second term represent a shift? The author believes that the Russian economy has fallen into a trap, from which the only escape route leads through a fundamental break with the oligarchical system.

Professor Menshikov analyzes the sudden appearance of private enterprise in Russia after 1991 as „Bolshevism in reverse." He writes, „The post-Soviet Russian reformers' blueprint followed Western neoclassical dogma, according to which, to restructure socialism into capitalism, it should suffice merely to replace state-owned property with private property, and the planned economy with the free play of market forces. In reality, this was Lenin in reverse," since it was only formally that socialism had prepared the ground for capitalism, whereas in practice it had made this task extremely difficult, costing enormous social sacrifices in the form of an acute deterioration of living conditions for the majority of the population."

"Gulf Of Tonkin"-Style Incident In Iranian Waters?

The seizure of 15 British Royal Navy sailors by the Iranian authorities on March 23, may have been orchestrated, in order to provoke a "Gulf of Tonkin"-style incident which would be used to justify military action against Iran. The sailors, who were allegedly conducting „routine" anti-smuggling checks, had boarded a merchant ship and then been apprehended by Iranian authorities, and taken to Tehran. Although British Prime Minister Tony BLAIR swore that they were not in Iranian territorial waters, the Iranian government declared they were. The Shatt al-Arab waterway, where the incident occurred, is disputed territory.

Factors to be taken into consideration in evaluating the event include the following:

* The UN Security Council had just passed a resolution okaying new sanctions. Russian Ambassador to the UN, Vitaly CHURKIN stressed that the wording had been very carefully chosen, such that existing contracts will not be affected by financial sanctions. Furthermore, he said, the text speaks "not of a *ban* but a *call*" on state and financial institutions to refrain from new financial pledges. The resolution passed, and, despite the careful wording, signalled a further escalation against Iran.

* Iran responded to the new resolution by threatening to review its cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and pledged to continue its energy program.

* The London *Independent* reported on March 25 that the US policy would have been to shoot the Iranians who were trying to detain them—indicating the level of tension and atmo-

sphere of provocation that exists with the huge naval buildup. The paper wrote: „Lt-Cdr Erik Horner - who has been working alongside the task force to which the 15 captured Britons belonged - said he was „surprised“ the British marines and sailors had not been more aggressive.“ Queried as to whether his troops would have opened fire, he answered: „Agreed. Yes. I don't want to second-guess the British after the fact but our rules of engagement allow a little more latitude. Our boarding team's training is a little bit more towards self-preservation.“ An executive officer of the USS Underwood, which is working the HMS Cornwall, was quoted saying: „The unique US Navy rules of engagement say we not only have a right to self-defence but also an obligation to self-defence. They [the British] had every right in my mind and every justification to defend themselves rather than allow themselves to be taken. Our reaction was, 'Why didn't your guys defend themselves?‘“

* The leftwing German wire service *Junge Welt* reported that the incident may be a deliberate provocation, given that the British vessel involved, the HMS Cornwall, is a „high-class, well-armed warship, which was certainly superior to the Iranian boats. It is difficult to imagine that they (the Iranian boats) could have operated in the range of the frigate, unless this were so intended.“ The {Cornwall} is also well-equipped for surveillance operations. So the wire service asks: „What was its commission? To provoke an incident?“ *Junge Welt* adds that the Cornwall had just recently been deployed to the region.

* The Iranian government also indicated awareness of the possibility that this may have been a deliberate provocation. Foreign Ministry spokesman Mohammad ALI HOSSEINI condemned the British „illegal entry“ into Iranian waters. He said he considered this „illegal and interventionist“ entry as a „suspicious move and contrary to international rules and regulations.“ Referring to the „biased nature of such movements,“ he went on to say: „Violating the sovereign boundaries of other states and illegal entry denote unusual goals in violation of international commitments, the responsibility for which cannot be evaded under any justification.“ The Iranian authorities also said this is not the first time the Brits have violated Iranian sovereignty, not only on the seas but also over land.

* The incident occurred just as major Iranian defensive naval manoeuvres began.

It is mooted that the Iranians may use the 15 British sailors in their custody as a bargaining chip, in the effort to obtain the release of five of their diplomats arrested in Irbi, in Iraq by the US.

French Elections: How The Financiers Rigged The Game

On March 19, France's Constitutional Council announced the names of the 12 contenders to the Presidential race. Besides the four largest – Ségolène ROYAL (SP), Nicolas SARKOZY (UMP), François BAYROU (UDF) and Marie George BUFFET (CP) – the others include on the left, three Trotskyists and two Green movements, and two extreme right-wingers (LE PEN and DE VILLIERS). The glaring absence of Jacques CHEMINADE, or even of Nicolas Dupont AIGNAN, a traditional Gaullist who recently broke with Sarkozy's UMP, shows that a special effort was made to eliminate the currents that Cheminade wanted to assemble around his candidacy: true Gaullists, Social Christians, and Republican Socialists. Among the smaller

candidates who deserved to run but didn't make it is architect Roland CASTRO.

A week before March 1, when the state delivered the official documents which elected officials must sign in order to “present” a candidacy to the Presidency of the Republic, only the largest four were sure to make into the race. None or hardly any of the “small” parties had been able to assemble the pledges for the 500 signatures needed to participate. The reason for this was the massive propaganda carried out by the nomenclature's media, to stop elected officials from “signing” for small candidates, accusing them of having been responsible for Jean Marie LE PEN's getting into the second round in 2002, having granted their signatures to too many small candidates.

Realizing the danger of total uproar in the population if only the biggest four would run, and calculating that it was to his advantage to promote left and rightwing candidacies which would suck votes away from his main rightwing and leftwing adversaries, Sarkozy decided to grant the “signatures” to a few of the smaller candidates. In a public statement, he committed himself to making sure that Olivier BESANCENOT (REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE) and LE PEN (NATIONAL FRONT) would get their signatures, and called on the mayors to sign for those who represent “legitimate political currents” in the French population. And lo and behold, signatures started falling as if from heaven, on the chosen candidates. Among others, Dominique VOYNET and Jose BOVE, reportedly got their signatures from the Socialists, Besancenot from Sarkozy and the Socialists, Le Pen from Sarkozy.

None of these candidates will bring any fundamental changes to the present system, except for the worse. Sarkozy is undoubtedly the most liberal in economic terms and has the full support of France's great fortunes: Bernard ARNAULT (LVMH), Martin BOUYGUES (public works), Antoine BERNHEIM (ASSICURAZIONI GENERALI). Ségolène Royal is more in the continuity of the French style social-liberal model of the post-Mitterrand era, a “compassionate” defense of the population against the excesses of the ultraliberal system. Her anti-nuclear policies would deal a blow to France's scientific and technological excellence. The worst one is perhaps François Bayrou, of the UDF who rose to the position of “third man” in the race, and who claims to be in the Center but whose economic policies are the most reactionary of all. Bayrou is increasingly being accused of being an impostor because, while claiming to be on the side of the lower 80% income earners, his only program is a three-year austerity cure of the State to eliminate France's functioning debt. His obsession with the balanced budget is such that he proposes to introduce to the French Constitution that a ban on government deficit budgets in the area of functioning expenses.

EIR Strategic Alert

Herausgeber: »Executive Intelligence Review« Nachrichtenagentur GmbH, Postfach 1611, 65006 Wiesbaden, Tel.: 0611 / 73650,

Fax: 0611 / 73 65 101,

Verantwortl. f. d. Inhalt: Muriel Mirak-Weissbach, D-65006 Wiesbaden,

Jahresabonnement EUR 3000 / ISSN 0936-7527 <http://www.eima.com>

© »Executive Intelligence Review« Nachrichtenagentur GmbH

Alle Rechte vorbehalten, auch die des Nachdrucks von Auszügen, der photomechanischen Wiedergabe und der Übersetzung