

LaRouche on Iranian TV: Free the United States from the Grip of Imperialism and British Economics

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

November 22, 2005

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 32, Number 47, December 9, 2005.
[View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

Lyndon LaRouche gave this interview on Nov. 22, to Saeed Behbahani from a Vienna, Virginia-based Iranian TV station, “Rang-A-Rang TV.” Mr. Behbahani estimates that the interview, translated into Farsi, will have more than 1 million viewers. (See www.rangarangtv.com for satellite frequencies and coverage.)

Q: First of all, I would like you to introduce yourself, in your own way, because you are a very well-known person around the world, I think, particularly in Europe, Germany, and here in the United States. But some of the people in the Middle East, particularly in my country, Iran—although there are so many Iranians here in the United States, well-educated, well-off economically, but still they don’t know a lot about what’s going on here. So, I would like you to introduce yourself, and tell us a little more about yourself.

LaRouche: Well, of course, I’m an economist. I’m very successful at forecasting. I don’t believe in what is usually taught as economics, I think it’s a brand of incompetence—it’s not the American System. I’m an advocate of the American System, not the British System, which most people swallow. And I’ve been quite successful as a long-range forecaster.

I’ve had the distinction, of course—though I’ve been cautious to make only a few forecasts—to be right. If you make too many forecasts, you’re going to be wrong! Only make forecasts when you know what you’re talking about. One rule.

The United States economy, and the world economy, has undergone a fundamental change in character, several times during the post-war period, since World War II. First was the death of Franklin Roosevelt, in which Roosevelt’s intention for the post-war world was scrapped entirely by Harry Truman, the President, under the influence of Winston Churchill and people like that. From my view, returning as a soldier from overseas to the United States, from Roosevelt to Truman, I felt we were betrayed. And we were.

However, the problems in the economy did not hit hard until about the time of the Vietnam War and afterward. And this coincided with when the British decided to crash the Bretton Woods system, the post-war system, and by crashing the pound, which occurred between 1964 and 1967. The crashing of the pound caused a crashing of the dollar, a chain-reaction. And then, with Nixon coming in, he collapsed the world monetary system, and went to a floating-exchange-rate system—which is a British system, it's not the American System.

As a result of that, physically, the U.S. economy has been deteriorating at an accelerating rate since 1971–72, as a result of a change in the world economic system. And the world has been going down, too. You have countries, which have thought they have benefitted, like China and India, but if you look at these countries, you find many poor people in these countries. Seventy percent of the population of India is desperately poor. China: many desperately poor.

There are cultural differences between China and India, but this is still an Asian problem. The Asian populations are characterized by a special kind of colonialism, in which a small part of the population may be relatively normal in their standard of living, by their culture, but a great part is not—they're still the poor, they're the underclass.

Whereas in European civilization and the Americas, despite our problems, we still have a cultural tradition of an essential quality of the people, that we don't have cattle, we don't have masters and cattle. We may have poor, but we don't have masters and cattle. Asian culture is still victimized by the fact that the great mass of the population is in this situation.

Now, what's happened, is, we've exploited the poor countries, which have productive potential, like China, India, and so forth, and we've shipped our production to them, and shut down our production here. This has happened in Europe; it's happened more conspicuously in the United States. We have ruined the countries of South and Central America. Africa, southern Africa, is a disaster area. *We did it*. It's our crime.

We've now come to the end of the system. The system in its present form is going to finish, it's finished now. There is an attempt, which is what was happening under Bush—this Bush Presidency, especially, more conspicuously Cheney—a wild tendency, which has tended toward dictatorship. And the Middle East problems are part of this drive toward a world globalized dictatorship by some people, like the Blair government in Britain, and others. And that's the danger.

Now, what I've been concentrating on, which is of relevance, is to try to free my country of the grip of this monster. And I think we've had some success so far. And by my fighting continually, I've encouraged other people to fight, and we have now, leading circles in the

United States, who are now fighting to change the system. We do not have a solution agreed upon, yet, but we're moving against what is a non-solution.

For example, the proposal by John Murtha, who is a very important Congressman, because of his background, in particular—very credible—his proposal for *disengagement* from the conflict with the people of Iraq. Not to withdraw from Iraq, but to stay in the area; to stay there, in order to protect the nation, until Iraq can put itself back together as a nation—that's good.

But we still have not solved our economic problems. And if we don't solve our economic problems, all kinds of disasters are probable. And that's what I'm fighting against, that's what I'm worried about.

I think we're having some success. It's not a success, like success in winning a prize, or something. It's merely the opportunity, to have a chance to make changes which will put the world back in shape. The United States has a special responsibility, because of our history, to correct our affairs, and to become again a leader in organizing the world to straighten this mess out.

And the great problem that we face, the first problem, is, we're going from a European civilization as such—we're now moving toward *Eurasian* civilization. And what we see in the Middle East is part of this process, of trying to pass from a European advanced civilization, into the integration of Asia into parity, in terms of development, where we can think of *eliminating* the 70% poor factor, which is characteristic of Asia. Or, worse, in Africa, of course. That's our situation.

Q: You started from the history, from after the Second World War, and then you came to George Bush II—because, we believe that this Bush family is like a dynasty in the United States: The inauguration was like, he put on the crown, things like that. It was something unusual. And particularly, nowadays, there are many things around his staff, such as Cheney, and the other people. Do you believe that everything is because of this particular government, or that this is like dominoes—it started from somewhere, and it still continues?

LaRouche: No, Bush is not that important. The Bush family—the grandfather of the current President, is the first significant Bush, Prescott Bush; he was a protégé of Averell Harriman. He worked with Averell Harriman, and he was the man who, for Harriman, moved money to support Hitler from New York City, when the Nazi Party was going bankrupt at the end of 1932, after the loss of an election, and the party was going bankrupt. Averell Harriman was a partner of Montagu Norman, who was the head of the Bank of England. Montagu Norman was the backer of Hitler, the financial backer.

Q: Money-wise, yes.

LaRouche: Money-wise, and policy. They wanted a dictatorship. They wanted a war. They wanted Germany to become a power, but to attack the Soviet Union. And the problem came up for them, when Germany decided to go west first, rather than east first. And at that point, the people who had backed Hitler, from the United States and Britain, began to get worried. So, the British came to the United States.

Well, that's Prescott Bush. Harriman was a very evil fellow—he's dead now, but he was part of this kind of financial Anglo—, very close to the Churchill family. And he was called a "Democrat" but he's much more of a fascist.

So, this Bush family—the father was brilliant, Prescott Bush, but evil; the son George, the former President, "41," was dumb, and evil. He had a large staff of people around him—Brent Scowcroft, for example, is typical of people who were advisors, and they controlled the idiot, that is, the former President. Therefore, he listened to them, but he made a lot of mistakes, but they would advise him. So he had good advisors, in terms of skill.

The younger son, the current President, is not just dumb, he's mentally ill. And he's only a puppet for Cheney. But Cheney himself is only a controller, for groups of international bankers, like George Shultz. The whole Bush Administration, this administration, was created by George Shultz, for a group of financial interests, including London and so forth.

So, what you've got here, is you've got a financial oligarchy, which is international, which is the same oligarchy that was behind Hitler. And some of them turned against Hitler, when Hitler went westward rather than eastward. But when Roosevelt died, this crowd came into power again, under Truman. Truman was a stooge for them: We began to go in a new direction, a stupid direction.

But we kept the economy for a while. Eisenhower saved us. The Eisenhower Presidency saved us, from worse than what happened. But then, Eisenhower left office. You look at Eisenhower's policy both as President, and you look at it after he was President: He had a large group of people, and he was working as a real ex-President, who was working for the country, but in a secondary position. You look at his policies on the Middle East, for example, when he was President, and after he was President. Well, these are not bad policies, but he was not the real controller of the situation.

Kennedy began to move in that direction, and they killed him. Because they wanted to move in a certain direction. So, we've been moving in a downward direction ever since.

Now, the Bushes. Bush is a fool. Bush, the father, began to play funny games against me, and I fought back, and as a result he lost the nomination for President—because he got into a fight with me—and Reagan won.

Q: At the time you nominated yourself for the Presidency?

LaRouche: Yes, this was in that period, yes. And we got into a big fight in New Hampshire [in 1980]. I was a Democratic candidate; he was a Republican. But his campaign decided to attack me. I told him, "Stop it!" He wouldn't stop it—so, I just unloaded the information about him, and he lost the election!

Q: And then he became, eventually, the President.

LaRouche: Yes, but that's ten years later. And he was in for a full term, but he became discredited.

Now, what he did as President—the one thing he did almost right: The British and the French wanted to make a real mess in Europe, by preventing the reunification of Germany. And Bush, under advice of many of his advisors, said, "no." And, some people wanted to go in and occupy Iraq. Bush, under the influence of his advisors, said, "No. We finished our job. We get out." So, he seems sane compared to his son's administration. Not good; he's stupid and dumb, but his administration was not stupid.

The son is a mental case. He should not have been elected to anything. He does not have the mind for it. But the danger is, the family wanted a son to become President, and George W. is the son. And they wanted, even though they knew he was mentally ill and so forth, they wanted their first-born son to become a President!

He became, not the President: He became the puppet-President! He's more or less controlled. Cheney meets with him virtually every day. Cheney is the immediate controller. There's a group of women that control him—he's not his own self. So, he's a mental case.

But my concern, right now, is, to get rid of Cheney. Cheney is the representative of the dangerous evil. Without Cheney, and with eliminating certain people who should be eliminated—they committed crimes—I think we might try to control the Bush Presidency, so that it would move in the right direction, or would not prevent us from moving in the right direction.

Q: Okay, I have a question here. If things are as you say ... why did the people of America vote for George Bush a second time?

LaRouche: Well, you know, democracy is exaggerated. Because, you had an idea of democracy which is like that of ancient Greece, when Greece destroyed itself. The Democratic Party of Greece, destroyed Greece: Here was Athens, the leading power which had defeated the Persian Empire—which was not really the Persian Empire, it was the Babylonian Empire, right? And, at that point, the Babylonian priesthood, which really ran the Persian Empire; that is, Babylon collapsed, and, at a certain point, the Babylonian

priesthood brought in the Medes, and then they brought in the Persians and said, “You run the government as a dynasty.” But behind the scenes, behind the dynasty, was the power of the priesthood, the Babylonian priesthood.

So, they corrupted Greece, and Greece destroyed itself. So, that’s the kind of situation we have today, still. What runs this government? What runs the governments of Europe? The world is run by a financial system, a group of financial interests, which were traditionally based in Venice, and they’re still partly based in Venetian bankers. The British Empire was a creation of these bankers.

In the United States, we have a fight between the national tendencies, which are in our Constitution; but you have what’s represented by Wall Street, [which] represents largely foreign bankers, foreign financial interests. And the problem we’ve had, repeatedly, because, initially we were an isolated, small country—not small in size, but small in numbers—we’ve always had the problem of struggling to assert ourselves against control, foreign control, which was largely by foreign bankers, foreign financial interests. And since 1763, those big financial interests were centered in London. So, we’ve been fighting against the British Empire, essentially.

So, we’ve had Presidents who were skunks: For example, Jackson was a skunk; Van Buren was a skunk; Polk was a skunk; the ancestor of Barbara Bush, Pierce was a skunk; Buchanan was a skunk.

Lincoln was great. We’ve had a few great Presidents. But, in our country, it’s been a struggle for the independence of our system, as defined by our Constitution, and then foreign powers.

Now, what tends to happen, is, a President is stuck in on us, who is not really—he’s national, that is, he’s an American citizen, but he’s not really the President: He’s a puppet of powerful financial interests, which people here call “Wall Street;” it’s actually London and Wall Street. So, that’s the power problem. And Bush is a—Bush is stupid. I mean, there was no reason to make him President. If you were serious about the country—that is, George Bush, I—you wouldn’t make him President, if you wanted a real President, if you wanted an independent country! You want an intelligent President, like Roosevelt, or like Lincoln: You want someone who can represent the country, its spirit, its ideas, its tradition. They don’t represent that!

Q: Okay. If I believed these things that you said, if you become the President, what would you do to change all these, you know, the system, or the conspiracy behind all these things.

LaRouche: Well, you know, I also have a conspiracy.

Q: [laughs] Uh-huh, okay!

LaRouche: I'm 83 years old. I probably would be the best President the United States has had in a hundred years.

Q: How?

LaRouche: Well, first of all: The United States has a constitutional system, which the world would benefit from. Not as a U.S. empire, but as a model. For example, we had the Bretton Woods system, under [Franklin] Roosevelt who established it. That's our system, the so-called American System—not the British System. Our interest, as a nation, is to create a new order on this planet of sovereign nation-states. That means two things, right now: It means going to a Eurasian world, not a European world. That is, we have large nations, like China, India, so forth. These nations are nations. They're not developed properly; they're not developed adequately. But we have to have a long-term agreement about their development, as Roosevelt intended at the end of the war. We have other Asian nations. You have the Middle East situation. These are not really nation-states. They really never got their freedom from the Ottoman Empire. Because, immediately, Sykes-Picot came in, at the end of the First World War, and began to play games with the whole Arab world, and the world around it.

Now, this area has a right to develop its own nations. These nations have the right to develop. You have this ugly thing in Israel and Palestine. *It's ugly*. It's wrong. We need a world, in which we have nation-states which are developing as sovereign entities—not as colonies, but as *sovereign entities*. Because, otherwise, you can not have peace and prosperity in the world; you can't have empire.

And the interest of the United States has always been, first of all, in the Americas, to have a system of sovereign nation-states, which would enter into long-term cooperation in the common interest. We need that now. Now, that means, you've got to take continental Eurasia, essentially, and unite it, in the way the cooperation is coming from Germany to various countries in Asia, like China, India, into Iran, and so forth. This is the direction we must go in.

This means that we have to include Russia in this, as a key pivot. Because Russia is not a European nation; it's not an Asian nation: It's a Eurasian nation. It has been a Eurasian nation ever since the—oh, almost a thousand years.

So therefore, we have to integrate Asia, Eurasia, as an area of development among respectively sovereign nation-states. That's the interest of the United States. Why? To have a world in which we can live. We can't have an empire. But we must have a world in which we can live! A world which is not going to war, constantly.

We also have the worst financial crisis, the worst mismanagement in the past 40 years, the world's ever seen. We have to go back to industry, to agricultural development, to technological development, to ideas, and things of that sort. So—

Q: I have another perspective, because my perspective says to me, that after the Second World War, because of the victory of the United States, so automatically the United States becomes like a hero. So, everybody cheers for them. That's after these—you would see lots of coups in many countries like Iran, by Mossadegh, you know—and these things happen also in South America. And, to me, these things, this is like a process—you can not stop it, you can not change it. It's just going, it keeps going.

LaRouche: No, it's an imperial—

Q: You see, because the result of that—how do you define these things happening in France, right now? These people, poor people came out, because of these things.

LaRouche: No, look, France is essentially a very efficient dictatorship. This is a legacy of—despite de Gaulle and a few great people in France's history—but, since the French Revolution and Napoleon, the Napoleonic tendency is a characteristic of France. We make a joke: We say, "France has more policemen than citizens."

Now, you have a tendency in France, in dealing with the Algerians—now these are the *pieds noirs*, the Algerians who left after the Algerian War. They went into France, they typified the former French Empire, the French colonies. Many people from the French colonies had the right, under de Gaulle, to go into the main part of France, the main body of France. They went there. They went there with the promises that they were going to be given the means of development and so forth. What they constitute, were the Algerians as a hard core of this whole group. They have never received what was promised to them.

Now, somebody wanted to play games in France. France is an effective police-state. The policemen run it, and police agencies of many kinds of run it! So, one faction in the police decided to stir up trouble in France, for the purpose of changing the policies of France in a certain direction—and Sarkozy represents that.

But there are people on the *other* side, who are not Sarkozy, who also wanted to play this game. So, what they did is, they took what is a politically stable situation in these areas of Paris, for example, and other cities, in which these people who would come from Africa—largely Africa, Algerians and others, who were sitting there, very poor, 60% youth unemployment! Under terrible conditions, they've never had what was promised to them!

Q: Yes, discriminated and—.

LaRouche: All right, so now, somebody decides to make a fuss about that—so they hit them! They hit them with a few atrocities and provocations, and they explode!

Before, the way it would happen normally in France, they would keep each section separate—and they would maintain peace and quiet. Each section would have its own—.

Q: Because, before then, by the time you're talking about, the Communist Party was there. And after this, there is no Communist Party there, so the mosque, or religion trying to substitute these activities—

LaRouche: This religious thing is a Venetian trick. It's a trick with religion. Look at the history of Europe. You go, for example, the Roman Empire did that. The Roman Empire was an empire of the religions. They turned religion into an imperial force, so you would play each religion with a Roman cult.

Then you had the Crusades: The Crusades were Venetian-controlled, but it was a Venetian-controlled alliance with the Normans, the Norman chivalry: From about 1000 A.D. on, until the collapse of the system in the 14th Century, they ran crusades! So, you take the fight—take the case of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, who was in a sense the Emperor at that time. He had a fight with the Church. The Church was controlled by the Venetians, controlled by the Venetians and the Norman chivalry. They were running crusades. They wanted to run more crusades in the Middle East. Now, previously in this period, you had the great Caliphate of Baghdad, and the Caliphate in its original form, of al-Ma'mun, Harun al-Rashid and so forth, was the center of culture of the world. Iran in that period, was integral: You had great figures, great scientific thinkers, Iranian thinkers—this was a single movement, a cultural movement, the great Islamic movement, the Islamic Renaissance. They moved to destroy that: They used Turkish and other forces to destroy it.

Q: Hmm, Usman, yes.

LaRouche: Yes. So this game goes on!

Now, what we had, for example, we had a Renaissance in the 15th Century, which established the modern nation-state in Europe, based on scientific progress, typified, led by Nicholas of Cusa—that sort of thing. What happened is, the Venetians started religious warfare: They controlled the Spanish, so the Spanish—Torquemada, the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, who was a Venetian agent, started religious warfare in Spain. Now, Spain had been a country of Islam, Jewish, and Christian. And it was a peaceful country! The peace of religions existed. One of the great cultural centers of the world in that period—they destroyed it! What? With religious warfare. In the beginning, at first, they didn't expel the Islamic population, but they expelled the Jews in 1492. And that began a whole chain-reaction: From Torquemada in 1492 to Hitler is a direct line in European history.

We had, in Europe, from 1492 to 1648, religious warfare, with the Habsburgs being steered by Venice against the various Protestant states, and you had a butchery beyond belief! We stopped it in 1648, with the Treaty of Westphalia. And the law of Europe was, Treaty of Westphalia: no religious warfare; peace of religions.

All right. Now we come to the period of the recent 40 years, and you get this British tendency, in our country, which, with people like Samuel P. Huntington, and Brzezinski, and so forth, and people around them, start religious warfare, as a policy: the clash of civilizations!

Q: Which I believe in that—I think Huntington, somehow—I don't 100% believe in that; I was against that in the beginning—but it seems to be happening!

LaRouche: He always believed in it. This guy's a pig. I know him. He and Brzezinski and Kissinger come from the same thing. They're all evil. And this is—this is a method. This is a fascist method, it's the method the Roman Empire used.

Q: Yes, because if you look at the President—the President of United States has been to China, and the first thing he did is, he went to the church! So, how do you explain that?

LaRouche: Well, he's an idiot! I mean—the man's an idiot.

Q: Oh!

LaRouche: No, there is, of course—among the nations that are targetted for destruction is China. Therefore, everything can be done, to find in China something to stir up, as an internal problem.

Look: China's going to have a problem. China has 70% poor. It has some billionaires (which, of course, they did not have many before). But, China has a propensity for a tradition of gambling. And so, they approached business as gambling.

They don't really have independence, because what they've done, is they've used the cheap labor as a way of getting contracts from abroad, and they process as the middle processors of production for many things, in many parts of the world. They really don't control their production. What they do, is, they receive a contract to produce something, a concession to produce something. They produce it, then it goes out, and it's changed again, and becomes a foreign product. So, the Chinese are actually caught in the cheap-labor market. Their ability to do this, has depended upon cheap labor: that is, they do not receive an income which is sufficient to cover the cost of their entire population.

It's like India: India is prosperous in one way, but it does not receive enough for its exports to pay for the 70% of India's poor, which is the reason why the change in the recent election.

This is the kind of problem we're having: We're headed for an attempt to destroy the nation-state in the world, by an imperial force which is centered in London, of Venetian tradition. And it has people in the United States and other parts of the world, who agree with that objective. You'll find people attacking the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, saying, "No! We can't go back to the Treaty of Westphalia. We've got to abandon the Treaty of Westphalia." Well, that's religious warfare!

We shut down the nation-state, we have to have globalization. With globalization, it's impossible to maintain capital formation for the development of—. If you insist that everybody produce at the cheapest price, on a global scale, you can not have capital accumulation! If you can't have investment in productive capital, if you can not raise the level of productivity and education of your people, how can you have development?

So therefore, you have to have a system, which is sovereign nation-states, which have the right to protect their economic development—by tariff agreements with other nations. And therefore, they can build up industry, build up the agriculture, build up the development of the population as a whole!

For example, like Iran: You have a population which has a high level of culture, by traditional standards. But you have many poor, very poor. And that has not been remedied. You have an area, in which many areas are dry and arid, could be developed, but they're very poor. The poverty of the Iranian people is an internal danger, because it's a vulnerability to explosions of the effects of poverty on a people that are poorly educated.

You know, like the thing of Persian carpets, where you had certain parts, where you had children were being beaten by their parents and others, to work in these looms! Beating a child, to work in a loom as child labor, does not produce a happy result in terms of the population. It produces anger, poverty, desperation. And the objective of any country, is to be able to develop its people, to find the means for its young to be educated, not used as child labor, to raise the standard of living, to raise the life-expectancy—.

Q: But how? How are we to do that?

LaRouche: Protect! By protection. By the right to protection and cooperation in technology. For example: Basic economic infrastructure. Water, for example. Can Iran have enough water? Of course, it can have enough water! But it requires development to get the water systems. Can it have enough power? Of course it can have power! It can have nuclear power! It can use the oil for a different kind of purpose, for a product, for a raw material for a product.

It has neighbors. It can be part of a system, part of the Asian system, Southwest Asia. Because, Iran, Transcaucasia, Turkey, and the Arab world are all one niche. They're different nations and so forth, but they all have this common interest, that this region be developed.

The key thing, is *water*. Water management, number one. A simple one. Transportation. Development of agriculture, development of higher-technology agriculture. General education of the entire population, to bring it up to a higher level of consciousness, and morality. And enjoying the fact that you have neighbors who are developing. I mean, when you have a country that you can go to, a neighboring country, and they have a different development than yours, but they're developing! Then you have something in common: development!

Q: Okay. If they become developed, then how do these multinational companies, you know, get benefits out of that?

LaRouche: Well, I'm not worried about them, because, first of all—

Q: I'm not worried either, but—I bring it as a question.

LaRouche: No, they're all bankrupt now. The system is totally bankrupt. This system is not going to go on. It's totally—

Q: You believe in that?

LaRouche: I know it! I know this system is finished. It's hopelessly bankrupt.

Now, the question is, production was not really based on the large corporation. The large corporation was a controller of production. Now, General Motors is a funny case—General Motors and Ford. Right now, I'm trying to defend this industry, not the management—I would fire the entire management of General Motors, because they're all incompetent. Get rid of them.

I could put in the machine-tool people who work inside General Motors. They could run the thing better. We don't need so many cars. We do need some railroads; we do need some other things, that the tool capability of these industries can build! There's no problem of changing product from an automobile to something else: You keep the same people working in the same cities and towns, use the same facilities, but you have a different mission.

For example: If the United States government were to give a group of these automobile companies, which have a machine-tool capability which is precious for the world—there are very few parts of the world that have this kind of thing, that kind of machine-tool capability. Japan has something like that; there used to be something like that in Russia, in the military sector; Germany has something. But there are very few parts of the world that really design

completely new products of the modern type. Like the export of the maglev system to China: typical of German technology.

Well, we have technological potential, still, if they don't destroy it. It's concentrated largely in the automobile industry, and the aircraft industry. We have people whom I'm now associated with, in the labor movement, who could take a factory area and design a new type of car, a new type of nuclear plant, a new type of locomotive, railway locomotive—all kinds of systems of that type!—they could produce that within a year. New products. And you would employ the same labor force, that is now producing automobiles, and produce fewer automobiles, and produce more of these other things.

This would mean the government would have to provide the credit, to back up this operation, and these companies would grow! And we would have a better economy. Now, what you need, for example, in the case of Iran, for example, is the ability to have capital formation for 25- to 50-year perspective development projects. You think in generations: 25 years to bring a child to young adulthood. So, you have two generations, 50 years. We can change the world in 50 years. It means we have to develop a *current generation* coming up, and change our orientation and think, as the Chinese do, in two generations.

In two generations we can change the world. If you look at some of the changes we've made in successful periods in the past in European civilizations, in two generations we can change the world.

Q: Okay, what kind of tools are you going to use to do these things?

LaRouche: You will invent them. You will make them. We have science which will show us how to do it. We already have the tools. For example, you take the way a typical—

Q: No, no, I mean—when I said “tools,” not tools, real tools, but you need something, because *people*—we are working with the people outside, and people outside, you know, they take time. They're *built* like that. How're you going to change the society?

LaRouche: Ah! The change is the leadership. True leadership is leadership that goes to a people, opens their eyes where the eyes are dark, and makes the eyes bright—

Q: Hmm.

LaRouche: And gives them hope. And says, “Your government is committed to help you do this. Here are some of the changes we're proposing. Here are some of the things we plan to do. If you want to do this, you have our support as a government.” And you'll find that poor people who are desperate, angry, because they feel there's no future for them—they're *crushed*, hmm? And you tell them that you love them!

Q: Hmm!

LaRouche: Leadership is largely love with the people! And they know it—it's just, they know it.

Q: Okay! So, to make this story short, what do you see, about this situation for American policy. I mean, the war, are they going to draw back all the troops from Iraq? Or are they going to continue? How do you see that? Are they going to attack more countries, like Syria, Iran, or—?

LaRouche: I think we can stop that. We will not stop it, if we keep Cheney in there.

Q: Because, my last interview was with Mr. Webster Tarpley. And Mr. Tarpley believes that they're going to attack, because they have no other choice. And, what is it?

LaRouche: It's not true, it's not true. They do have choices.

I know him, he's not—I know him very well, he's not always that sharp.

What we're doing right now: You saw—you had a vote, 98 of 100 Senators voted against torture, against Cheney! In the House of Representatives, on the provocation of a member of the House, [Rep. John] Murtha, 403 to 3 votes, for Murtha's policy: Murtha's policy is correct. I agree with it. It's what I proposed before: U.S. troops must be disengaged from the Iraqi population. They don't leave the area, but they go into a reserve area. Because, the problem is, we just can't leave the country. We've got to let the Iraq nation build up its own security. But, we should not try to police the people of Iraq! That's the mistake! And particularly, we should not imprison them. We should not torture them. We should not run these provocations. They're angry!

So therefore, if we pull back, take certain areas of Iraq, desert areas—we build up our bases there, we're there. If somebody tries to attack Iraq, we'll help defend the country. But, we tell the Iraqis, "It's your country. We're not an empire, it's your country. You put yourselves in order."

Now, they're beginning to do that, you know, this thing about calling back some of the old military back into service—very good idea; that should have been done in the first place. Normally, when you occupy a country, you take its establishment, its military, and you say, "Now, you've surrendered, but now this is your country. You've got to rebuild your country—and we'll leave!"

All right, now: If we win this fight, this fight, sort of concentrated on the figure of Cheney, and Blair in London—these two figures, these are the Anglo-American bastards—in that case, then we have a new perspective. Right now, the mood in the Congress, in the Senate

and in the House of Representatives, is *overwhelmingly* for a process of disengagement from an occupation. Not abandoning the country, but to pull our troops out. *We are not to police the Iraqi people.* We may act in a friendly way, but we are not going to sit there, day by day, next to the Iraqis and shoot back and forth with the Iraqi people who are enraged. They're enraged, in particular, by the fact that U.S. forces are *torturing people.* That torture is a provocation.

There are other problems. We can not solve all the problems of Iraq. We do not have a magic solution. The people of Iraq have their own *internal* problems which are now exploded as a result of this war, and this occupation. We can not solve that problem. We can be a friendly force, hoping that they solve the problem. We must adopt that policy now. And withdraw from engagement of trying to be policemen inside Iraq. We're not policemen.

Q: Okay, the last question, about my own country, Iran: You know Michael Ledeen is trying to do something—you know, they have the American enterprises, they talk about the federalism, and all the separatists in Iran go into that—because, the federalism to me, has its own meaning, to me: Half of the Earth's population lives under federalism. But each of these countries has their own culture and rules, although they are under federalism; but, the federalism which is used in the United States, is different than the federalism which is used in India.

LaRouche: Yes.

Q: So, this Ledeen, and this group, the radical right group—you know, Ledeen knows me—I don't know how, but he had a fight with me, physically, he wanted to break my hand at one point, I have a video I can show you some time.

But the only question I was asking him was the simple question: How did you get the people to believe you? Because of the past relationship between America and Iran, the Shah's regime, and coups in Iran—what do you do? The only answer from him, was to come and jump on me, and it was, you know—he hit me.

LaRouche: Well, Ledeen is not an American—he's of American origin. He is a Venetian. He's a Nazi.

Q: But he's a Jew.

LaRouche: So what?

Q: So he's a Nazi Jew?

LaRouche: Look, what he's in, he is part of, with the American Enterprise Institute as the cover for it here, he's a part of the Nazi International. What happened at the end of the war:

Remember, the Dulles brothers were Nazis. But then the war came, and Hitler was going westward instead of eastward. But he was a negotiator, and he was always very close to his Nazi friends. Now, at the close of the war, starting in Italy, where Mussolini was in retreat—I had a friend of mine who was—in that period, who was the OSS boss for Italy, the Office of Special Services, and he was in charge of these operations in Italy against these guys, against Mussolini. At the close of the war, Allen Dulles moved in, got my friend out, and put in James Angleton. Now, what Dulles did, was to absorb a large part of the Nazi apparatus under the U.S. and British—we have them in Mexico, we have them in South America, still today.

It exists. For example, you had the Strategy of Tension in Italy, during the early 1970s, which Ledeen was part of. This was Licio Gelli, for example, who was a part of this—a younger man then, who was a young Nazi in the Salò Republic service, at the time he was picked up by Dulles and company. These people constitute, formally, the Nazi International today. Ledeen is part of it.

Now, take the case you talk about, Jewish Nazis? There's nothing inconsistent with that: How about Jabotinsky? Jabotinsky was a British agent, recruited out of this Colonel Zubatov crowd in Russia, which was actually a British asset inside the Russian secret police; along with Parvus, so-called Alexander Helphand. He then went to France; he was part of the French-based operation controlled by the British. He went to Turkey, as part of the Young Turk operation, he was the editor of the *Jeune Turquie* magazine. Jabotinsky, Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky, then went to Italy. While he was in Italy, under the sponsorship of his old friend of Mussolini. He had not been originally a friend of Mussolini, he was a friend of Volpi di Misurata, the banker. So, he was brought in as a collaborator, because Volpi di Misurata had been a part of the Young Turk operation for the British: he was a Venetian banker, who was a key figure behind the Mussolini power, inside Italy. So, Jabotinsky went into Italy, and had a Fascist organization, sponsored by Mussolini. During this period, Jabotinsky wrote twice to Adolf Hitler, trying to get an alliance with Hitler. Hitler turned him down, seriously. Hmm?

So, if you understand the situation, that there is no such thing as areal, simple Jewish interest: There's a Jewish interest which is united, and defined by, what Hitler did to the Jews. So, this now becomes an umbrella in which you get this particular mystique.

I've known people, involved in this, who were opposed to this: For example, I've known Nahum Goldmann, I knew him in the last part of his life. I knew some of his friends—and they were opposed to this. But, from 1967 on, this fanaticism—. And then you had, those in Israel, said, "Hey, what've we done? What've we done? We've been stupid! What've we done? We started a war with all these people! We shouldn't be having a war." But then, before that could be changed, then you had the Likud come to power, and it was the

Jabotinskyites who came to power. And so, they are played—they are not their own ministers, they are instruments of a policy, and they're used by the same people that used Hitler.

Ledeen is part of it. Ledeen is a fascist. He's a *completely* intellectual, witting fascist. He's a part of international right-wing terrorism. Forget the fact that he was born Jewish! Forget it—it's irrelevant. He's a pig!

Q: Hmmm! Okay. Well, thank you very much, sir, and I highly appreciate you for letting us have the interview with you. I appreciate that. hope we have the opportunity to come back to you, in the future, and talk again.

LaRouche: Absolutely, absolutely. Anytime.