

ratus, the Mukhabarat.

On Feb. 20, a high-level Washington intelligence source further filled out the picture to *EIR*, confirming that the INC-linked defectors had been prepped to provide specific pieces of tailored disinformation, often in the form of bogus “eyewitness” accounts, purporting to identify locations where they had seen canisters of chemical weapons, and other components of Saddam’s phantom WMD programs. These precise pieces of eyewitness information not only gave Luti the “sexed up” intelligence to feed to Cheney et al., to argue for war. It gummed up the “official” intelligence process with bogus information that had to be chased down, and which became part of the data base from which analysts made judgments about Saddam’s weapons.

Senator Carl Levin (D-Mich) reported, over the weekend of Feb. 21-22, what he had recently learned from the CIA: When UN weapons inspectors under Hans Blix and Mohamed ElBaradei went to the sites where American intelligence said Saddam had stockpiled weapons of mass destruction, they found *nothing* at all. How much of that bogus information came from the taxpayer-funded Cheney-Chalabi defectors’ scam?

There is good reason to believe that some of the Congressional investigators are aware of at least a portion of this story. When, last month, Senate intelligence panel leaders Pat Roberts (R-Kans) and Jay Rockefeller (D-W. Va.) reached an agreement to expand the official probe of the pre-war intelligence, three areas that were added to the investigation were: intelligence provided by the INC; the role of the OSP and a second Pentagon neo-con propaganda shop, the Counterterrorism Evaluations Group (made up, at one time, of David Wurmser and Michael Maloof); and the uses/abuses of intelligence by senior Bush Administration policymakers.

DIA Reveals Fraud

One document that Senate investigators will certainly wish to review is a September 2003 DIA “internal assessment.” That analysis, according to *New York Times* reporter Douglas Jehl, “has concluded that most of the information provided by Iraqi defectors who were made available by the Iraqi National Congress was of little or no value, according to Federal officials briefed on the arrangement.”

Writing in the Sept. 29, 2003 issue of the *Times*, Jehl revealed, “In addition, several Iraqi defectors introduced to American intelligence agents by the exile organization and its leader, Ahmed Chalabi, invented or exaggerated their credentials as people with direct knowledge of the Iraqi government and its suspected unconventional weapons program, the officials said. . . . One Defense Department official said that some of the people were not who they said they were, and that the money for the program could have been better spent.”

A serious probe into this nexus of INC-tutored liars, the OSP, and the Office of Vice President Cheney, *will* bring Dick Cheney down.

LaRouche Educates Dems On How To Save Nation

by Nancy Spannaus and Lonnie Wolfe

As the field of Democratic Presidential candidates dwindles, Democrat Lyndon LaRouche has accelerated his campaign’s organizing drive, with his sights set on the dramatic changes that must be made in the Democratic Party and the nation, by the time of the Democratic National Convention, scheduled for Boston July 26-29. The candidate has had a set of high-profile personal appearances, and aired a new half-hour television show in New England, New York City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, over the weekend prior to the March 2 primaries. These initiatives occurred within the framework of escalated activity by the LaRouche Youth Movement, which is on a recruitment drive throughout the nation.

During an interview with NBC-TV in Arkansas on Feb. 24, LaRouche described the current state of the election campaign: “The . . . issue right now, is this: People behind the Democratic Party know the financial crash is on. They don’t talk about it much, although they will tend to, more and more. But in the meantime, they know that the next President is going to face the greatest financial crash in modern U.S. history. And the bankers are saying, ‘Yes, *we* can make a reform.’ Say, bankers like Felix Rohatyn, of Lazard Frères. They say, ‘We want an office boy as President in there, in the White House, to deal with the crash, because we want to dictate how it’s done.’

“You see the policy toward Argentina: Collect every debt. And they’ll do that to the U.S. people. They don’t want someone like me in the picture. Because I’m not an office boy.

“Now, I don’t think Kerry wants to be an office boy, but Kerry, on economic issues right now, is an office boy— on this issue. He does not know economics. He doesn’t understand it. He’s a good-hearted guy, but when it comes to the nuts, nitty-gritty of economics, he doesn’t know it. And the point is, that if he gets in a situation where Kennedy and others decide to go with Felix Rohatyn and Lazard Frères, and people like that, then we’re going to have a situation in the United States, which is what Hoover would have wished, but worse, back in the 1930s. And that’s the issue.

“My concern now, is, I’m not just a rival of Kerry, I’m the only rival that means anything. But intellectually, my job is also to, between now and July, to educate the Democratic Party; and also, without being patronizing about it, to educate Kerry, so we have some insurance going into July; so the



More than 250 came to hear candidate LaRouche at this Salt Lake City campaign event on Feb. 24, introduced by well-known talk-radio host Jack Stockwell (at left); and 450 turned out for LaRouche's Los Angeles speech on Feb. 26. Leading the Democrats in campaign contributions, LaRouche plans to broadcast more half-hour TV presentations before the March 2 primaries.

Democratic Party is going to have some kind of unity, about the kind of policy I represent, and the kind of understanding I represent.”

Serious Ideas

While many of LaRouche's rivals have now dropped by the wayside, in the face of their failure within the Roman arena-contest, the FDR Democrat is committing to *changing* the American electorate, so that they will be able to face the coming crises. His ability to mobilize the average citizen, without aid of the major media, was demonstrated through the significant turnouts at his campaign events in Salt Lake City and Los Angeles in the last week of February. Over 260 people showed up in Salt Lake City, and over 400 in Los Angeles, to hear LaRouche address how the nation must return to its Constitutional roots in order to survive the coming crisis, and also to engage in lengthy dialogue with the candidate.

As LaRouche emphasized at his well-attended press conference in Salt Lake City, as well as the campaign speeches, the major issues on the agenda are the need to get rid of Vice President Dick Cheney's influence in the Administration, and to prepare for a fundamental shift in economic policy, back to the policy influenced by President Franklin D. Roosevelt's commitment to the general welfare. But, to address these issues, LaRouche says, the American people have to confront the cultural paradigm-shift which has taken over during the last 40 years, the Baby-Boomer paradigm of “live for the moment” hedonism, which has actually set the United States on a track for self-destruction, and the rest of the world along with it.

To provoke the abandonment of this Baby-Boomer pessimism, LaRouche argues, will require the inspiration of his growing Youth Movement, which functions as a “university on wheels,” with a refreshingly direct address to their elders: “We want a future, and if you want to have a future through us, you had better join us.” The LaRouche Youth Movement is an international phenomenon, and in late February, was devoting its energies to supporting Argentina's fight against IMF genocide by promoting LaRouche's New Bretton Woods proposal. Democratic Party events, university campuses, and the major thoroughfares of America's cities are venues where citizens can often expect a brigade of LaRouche Youth to show up and confront audience and speaker alike, with the difficult issues that must be addressed.

Standing Up to the Bankers

In his speech in Salt Lake City, usually considered the bailiwick of right-wing Republicans, LaRouche minced no words about the need for Americans to mobilize around his leadership. He told the audience that he is the political figure most feared by the financier oligarchy, because at this moment of impending doom of the global monetary system, he is the only person who knows what to do, and who has the guts to stand up to them.

LaRouche explained that none of the other candidates has the potential to be more than an “office boy” for the bankers, to carry out their orders for a fascist financial reorganization, plunging this country and the world into the nightmare of a New Dark Age. The battle, said LaRouche, will be to mobilize the unique power of the U.S. Constitution and the office of the Presidency to solve this crisis in the interests of the people,

not the bankers—just as FDR used these powers some 70 years earlier to neutralize the powers of the financiers. This time, the candidate stated, we will eliminate once and for all the ability of the financiers to place their power above the government of the people.

“We have a right to be human,” LaRouche said. “We have a right to maintain the welfare of our people. And to protect it against all contingencies, including bad bankers. We have an obligation to promote the education, and welfare, and development, of our children and others, in such a way that they can find a way in which to express—in a *meaningful* sense—to express their immortality: their connection to what went before them that was good; and their connection to what they are going to help bring into being in the future. . . .

“We, therefore, with our Presidency, which is the best Constitutional form of government in the world—when we use it that way—have the power to deal with any crisis; that is, any crisis within the means of man. We can take leadership in changing things. We can mobilize ourselves to act, in a way to correct our errors, even the errors of the past 40 years, and say, ‘It was a mistake. We’re going to correct the mistake.’ We have the influence, as an example, to reach out to other nations, if we treat them properly, to influence them. And to get them to join us, in making those great reforms in institutions of this planet, which will ensure the well-being of humanity.

“That’s what we are. There is no other nation on this planet which, so far, has that Constitutional legacy that we have. What we must do is, we as a people must demand, especially for times of crisis, that we select leaders, especially Presidents of our Republic, who have the capacity to express the obligations inherent in that conception of our Constitutional system. We’re now in such a time. If we do—then, from what I know of the world, from what I know of the problems in countries, in Europe, Russia, for example, or some situations in Africa, South and Central America, *we have the potential*; I know, that if I were President of the United States at this moment, as of tonight, that the governments in Europe would immediately take certain actions in anticipation of what I was, as President” going to do. “Governments, if they thought I was going to be nominated, would also tend to move in that direction, and change their ways, on the basis of that.

“The United States’ great power, is not its physical power—that’s important, but it’s not its great power. Its great power is its inherent moral authority on this planet, by virtue of the process which created this nation and its Constitution. And our job is to awaken to that reality.” And also to realize that “the objective of leadership, is not to exert power, though that’s necessary in leadership, but to make people happy, in the sense that Leibniz described: to give the nation a sense of purpose and direction, that we are doing something in our time, in our generation, that whatever happens to us, what we do, will be of a benefit to future generations, and will be considered honorable by our ancestors.”

Unreal Bush Budget Will Worsen Fiscal Crisis

by Carl Osgood

President Bush’s Fiscal 2005 budget, submitted to the Congress on Feb. 2, is already provoking confrontation with Congress and is sure to worsen the fiscal crisis. It is based on assumptions that ignore the realities of the economic collapse, the fall of the dollar, and the consequent collapse in Federal revenues. The rate at which the collapse is occurring, as shown by the ballooning Federal deficit, makes Bush’s promise to cut the deficit in half over the next five years completely ludicrous. While Congressional critics have been jumping all over the budget plan, they have yet to offer a viable alternative, further complicating matters.

The entire budget process promises to be difficult this year, not the least because of the huge Fiscal 2004 deficit of \$521 billion promised by the White House. Added to that, confrontation is already looming between the White House and large constituencies in the Congress for such domestic spending items as transportation, construction, and veterans’ healthcare. Finally, while defense spending usually enjoys broad support in the Congress, members of both parties are rankled that the \$401.7 billion defense budget does not include the costs of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, nor other contingency operations related to the so-called war on terrorism—making inevitable yet another large Supplemental Defense Appropriations bill sometime in the next twelve months.

Meaningless Projections

Just three years ago, the White House projected that the Fiscal 2004 budget would produce a \$387 billion surplus; now, a \$521 billion deficit is being projected—a swing in “projections” of \$908 billion in three years’ time. The projections for Federal tax revenues and outlays show similar dramatic changes over the same period. The effect of this was demonstrated by Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan, who set off a political storm in testimony before the House Budget Committee on Feb. 25, when he called for reducing Social Security and Medicare benefits—both of which are entitlements that the Federal government is required by law to pay—for workers at or near retirement age.

Promoting the same Mont Pelerinite policy of brutal austerity sought by financiers today, Greenspan said, “We will eventually have no choice but to make significant structural adjustments in the major retirement programs.” He demanded that Congress cut “as much as you can,” claiming that the