

**Citizens Electoral Council of Australia conference
 “The World Land-Bridge: Peace on Earth, Good Will towards All Men”,
 28-29 March 2015, Melbourne, Australia**

From Panel 3 World War III, or a New Global Renaissance?

The Strategic Showdown with Russia and China

Jeffrey Steinberg, Counter-intelligence Director and Editorial Board member
 Executive Intelligence Review, (USA)

Craig Isherwood: I'd like to welcome now to our conference Jeff Steinberg, who is the Counter-intelligence Director and an Editorial Board member of *EIR* in the United States. We have the privilege in the Melbourne office of regularly hearing from Jeff, on a fortnightly basis, on the strategic developments that have taken place around the world, so we're directly plugged in to what we have to do as a movement and that gives us the sense of being part of the global LaRouche movement. It's very easy for a political party and organisation in Australia to be isolated, but it's through Jeff's briefings every fortnight that we're able to be updated and we really do appreciate that. That also means that Jeff has a much closer sense of what happens in Australia than most Americans, because we get the opportunity to brief him. He has had the opportunity to in the past travel down to Australia and see us in the flesh, as they say.

So without any further ado, Jeff is going to be speaking on the subject of the strategic showdown with Russia and China, so I'd like you to give Jeff a warm welcome for coming to our conference. Thank you.

Jeffrey Steinberg: Craig, thanks very much. I want to send warm greetings and congratulate all of you on this historic and most timely conference. I want to also thank Natalia Vitrenko, because she's provided a critical picture of what's happening today in Ukraine. It is extraordinarily important to understand what that Ukrainian situation represents, because right now we are closer to a thermonuclear war than we have been in any of our lifetimes. And just seeing in the crowd that there are a number of people with grey and white hair, and I see a certain amount of flesh in the back of several people's heads, many of you were obviously around during the period of the Cuban Missile Crisis, when, by all accounts, the world was really very much on the absolute verge of potential thermonuclear destruction, yet today, for certain critical reasons, the danger is even greater.

Number one, back at that time there was a certain understanding on the part of at least some of the key leaders in the United States and in the Soviet Union, that there was an awesome responsibility for protecting the world from extinction, because by the early 1960s the United States and the Soviet Union *alone*, had a sufficient arsenal of nuclear weapons to wipe out all of humanity. In fact there were a series of secret communications—letters of correspondence, between President Kennedy and Soviet leader Khrushchov prior to the Cuban Missiles Crisis. And in those letters, they reached a certain understanding that it was on their shoulders to make sure, no matter how tense the conflict between the two contending superpowers got, that it could never come down to the idea that pushing a few buttons would lead to the extinction of mankind. So even in the most dire moments of those 13 days of the Cuban Missiles Crisis, you had a quality of leadership that understood that something had to be done to reach an equitable basis, walking back from the brink of thermonuclear war.

Back during that same period, Australia came to be known very widely as the result of a very popular and scary movie called *On the Beach*, that dealt with the potential horrors of the extinction of mankind in thermonuclear war.

Today, I wish I could say that in the United States we had some kind of leadership in the White House that could be even remotely compared to President John F. Kennedy, but unfortunately and very dangerously, that is absolutely not the case. And what has occurred in the period of the last 14 years, when we have had two successive presidencies that have been more loyal to the Empire faction in London and to Wall Street, than to the interests of the United States or any other nations on this planet, as the result of that, we have reached now the crisis point where the danger of a thermonuclear war cannot be ignored or underestimated in the least. This is not a process that simply began in this last 14-year period. It is something that was clearly understood by Lyndon LaRouche during the very early years of the launching of this political movement.

The 1971 Turning Point

Back in August of 1971, when President Richard Nixon completed the process, launched in London under the Harold Wilson government, of taking down the last vestiges of Franklin Roosevelt's Bretton Woods system, which was to rebuild the world in the aftermath of the Second World War and the defeat of Hitler and the Axis Powers, that takedown of the Bretton Woods system prompted LaRouche to publish an editorial warning on August 15, 1971, that the entire foundations of the post-war financial and economic system had now been torn apart. And all of the advantages would go to the speculators, to the gamblers, to the looters.

What he warned about was a resurgence of the kind of genocidal policies that were last seen with Hitler, but in a new, more seductive form: the kinds of conditionality policies that from that point onward became the hallmark of the International Monetary Fund and allied agencies.

Reflect for just a second on what Natalia just described about the looting of Ukraine over a period of a very short number of years, and consider what has already been done in the period since 1971 in Africa, in parts of Asia, in the Middle East and, more recently, in the heart of the trans-Atlantic region itself. What we've seen since the beginning of the breakdown of the entire Anglo-American financial system, beginning with the 2007-08 crash in the United States and picking up several years later in Europe, is that the genocidal policies of the British Empire, of the IMF, have the identical impact when they're imposed on Europe and on the United States, as they have had in the past when they were murderously imposed on Africa, parts of Asia and the Middle East, and parts of Latin America.

We are in a crisis right now of a particular magnitude. The process that was begun with the ending of the Bretton Woods system back in 1971 has run its course. It has taken over 40 years, almost 45 years to play out, but we have now reached the point where the bankruptcy of the entire City of London/Wall Street financial apparatus is the single greatest factor driving the world towards war, and potentially thermonuclear war.

When the earlier phases of this financial breakdown process began to play out in the late 1990s, when you had the Asia crisis, so-called, but it was really the beginnings of the breakdown of the global financial system, at that point President Bill Clinton in 1997 and 1998 began talking about the need for a new global financial architecture. And, rather than just looking to the advanced sector countries, he put

together a larger group of nations to start looking at ways to combat the destructive role of the short-term speculative capital that ran rampant against economies all over the world.

The moment President Clinton began talking about the idea of a new financial architecture, his head was on the chopping block. You had the assault against the Clinton Presidency, which within a span of less than a year resulted in the President's going from promoting the idea of a new global financial architecture, of seeking out a new strategic partnership with Russia, to being a President with a figurative gun to his head, signing into law the repeal of Glass-Steagall, which became the next phase that accelerated the complete disintegration of what little remained of the real US economy.

Now, with the advent of the Bush/Cheney administration in 2001 and following through with the election of President Barak Obama in 2008, we've been through a 14-year period, where the policy of the United States has been set by a faction in London, familiar to many of you, centred around the British Crown—centred around certain factions and institutions within London, not universally representative, but representing the hard-core and more and more desperate empire faction, whose intention has been to prepare for war and to take the steps that would be required to bring about either a strategic surrender of Russia and China, or potentially the outbreak of the kind of war—big war—that we're seeing right now looming immediately in front of us.

Warnings about a Showdown with Russia

There are a significant number of leading American figures who share with Lyndon LaRouche the view that we are facing the gravest danger of war that we've ever faced in any of our lifetimes: war, meaning a general war that could very easily and quickly turn into a thermonuclear war. And so, in the past months we've seen an outpouring of some veterans of the U.S. diplomatic and military establishment, who were involved directly in establishing the framework for the end of the Cold War, the end of the Soviet Union, the end of the Warsaw Pact, but under terms that were intended to lead to a prolonged period of peace and ultimate full integration and cooperation between East and West.

We widely publicised through the LaRouchePAC website, and through the *Executive Intelligence Review*, the speech that was given by Ambassador Jack Matlock several months ago. Matlock was the last American Ambassador to the Soviet Union at the end of the Reagan Administration. He was involved in reaching an understanding with the Soviet leadership that, in return for the Soviets accepting the idea of German reunification under still the umbrella of NATO, given West Germany having been a leading NATO member country, it was understood that the former Soviet and former Warsaw Pact territories would not be absorbed into the NATO system and that the areas between traditional Western Europe and the borders of Russia would be considered a buffer area, a neutral area, where economic cooperation between East and West would be the priority, but where there would be no attempted either military or even economic encroachments to bring the NATO system, the European Union system, right up to the borders of Russia.

If we could see the PowerPoint “NATO's Eastward Expansion”, you'll get an idea that this understanding—which was not a formal treaty, because there was a sense of common interests at that time, to where nobody felt that the formalities of a treaty were necessary, but Ambassador Matlock, senior US military officials who

were involved at that time, similar European leading military and diplomatic officials and others, have said very clearly that this was the understanding—has been systematically violated, particularly over the last 14 years. As the result of that, we're now in a situation where NATO is sitting right at the border of Russia. You look at the map, you look at the Baltic states, you look at Poland, you look at Romania and Bulgaria right on the Black Sea coast, and now the Secretary General of NATO is openly saying that he welcomes the application for Ukraine to become a member state of NATO.

One of the leading American military officials of the last half-century commented to me personally, at the very outset of the Ukraine crisis, that everybody who has any grasp of strategy understands that for Russia, Crimea is sacrosanct. The naval base at Sevastopol is the access through the Black Sea into the warm waters of the Mediterranean. This is an existential strategic red-line issue for Russia, but one that has no strategic significance for the United States, unless there is a wilful intention to go to war against Russia and to go to war against China.

So, it's widely understood that the actions that are being taken, first by the Bush/Cheney administration and now by the Obama administration, are bringing the world to the brink of global catastrophe. There's a basic series of actions that have been taken by these two successive U.S. administrations, under tremendous influence from the factions within London associated with the British Crown and with the longstanding agenda of mass population reduction genocide, that have moved the world closer and closer to the brink of war.

Way back at the very beginning of the post-Cold War period, during the presidency of George H. W. Bush, Paul Wolfowitz was a leading strategic advisor to the Secretary of Defence, Dick Cheney. He presented a doctrine called the Wolfowitz Doctrine, which basically listed a targeted number of countries that would be subjected to regime change operations. The overall policy umbrella was to wage war against any nation or combination of nations that could emerge, at any time in the foreseeable future, to challenge the unilateral global military domination of the United States. With the end of the Soviet Union, with the end of the Warsaw Pact, this was to be the moment, in the eyes of these neoconservatives, for the United States to emerge as a dominant global power in a unipolar world.

In the late 1990s, even before President Clinton left office, you had the Project for the New American Century spelling out a perspective on behalf of the neoconservative apparatus. That apparatus then came into power with a vengeance with the George W. Bush administration, and brought us the Iraq War, the Afghanistan War, and many other things that followed under the Obama administration afterwards. In the case of George W. Bush, the administration was very clear and very open; it was dominated by neoconservatives that are part of a British imperial policy outlook, which they themselves freely describe as being part of that imperial world view.

Under President Obama, an only slightly different network of people, professing a different ideology but the same commitments, came in with the grouping known as the “humanitarian interventionists”: people like [National Security Adviser] Susan Rice, and [Ambassador to the UN] Samantha Power. In 2011, in the midst of the international operation to overthrow Qaddafi in Libya, President Obama signed Presidential Study Directive 10, which established what was called the Atrocities Prevention Board as part of the National Security Council. Under this doctrine, a radical post-Westphalian, post-nation state doctrine, Obama asserted that the United States and its allies had the right to intervene militarily, economically, or in any other

way, to carry out preventive war, to overthrow regimes that might at some future point, hypothetically, carry out atrocities against their populations.

This kind of preventive war was banned at Nuremburg and was banned in the United Nations Charter, so we're dealing with a situation in which you have this kind of absolute commitment to war against any nation state that may pose a threat to the unipolar Anglo-American Empire system, regardless of the fact that that system is right now on the brink of total bankruptcy.

Two Paths to War

There are essentially two broad paths by which this war danger can play out. On the one hand, you've had the military encirclement of Russia and China, which has been a gradual but steadily building process over a number of years, first with the encroachment of NATO into Eastern Europe, then with the breaking of the deal that had been worked with Russia about a common missile defence system over parts of Eurasia. That deal was broken, and instead you have a unilateral missile defence system being installed—again, right on the edge of Russia, with the preposterous claim that it's really only directed against Iran, and that it's just coincidental that it's on territories right on the border of Russia.

The United States is overhauling the entire nuclear war doctrine. You have a doctrine that was launched under Bush's first Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld, called Prompt Global Strike, which is based on the premise that the United States should be able to launch aggressive military operations against any nation, anywhere in the world, within a matter of just a few days. Part of this Prompt Global Strike involves using certain long-range ballistic missile capabilities of the United States that had been previously exclusively used for nuclear weapons. Now the claim is: well, some of them will be simply loaded with very powerful conventional weapons. In other words, it's a blurring of the lines of distinction between nuclear war and conventional war.

There is a major upgrade being done right now of the tactical nuclear weapons that are retained in Western Europe. People may not know it, but there are 180 American tactical nuclear weapons on European soil. Under a modernisation program, these nuclear weapons, called B61 Series 12, will be turned into intermediate-range nuclear warheads that can be either fired on longer range missiles or can be used in stealth fighter planes to penetrate fairly deep into Russian territory.

In other words, specific preparations are under way right now to fundamentally alter the nuclear balance, and Russia has recognised this and responded to this.

The other dimension of the war options that are being considered involves a lower end of the spectrum of conflict, but represents nonetheless a grave threat to world peace. You have the colour revolutions method of warfare, which Natalia just described very precisely as carried out in the case of Ukraine, beginning around November of 2013, from the moment that [President Victor] Yanukovich was persuaded to come to his senses and abandon the foolish idea of [a rush into an Association Agreement with the European Union].

Those methods are not just being used in the Arab world and in Ukraine. Similar methods are being directed at [Russian President Vladimir] Putin himself, as was made evident when President Obama sent Michael McFaul, not a professional diplomat, but a specialist in colour revolution regime change, to be the U.S.

Ambassador in Moscow. This was an unprecedented provocation that was a further reminder that at the top of the U.S. government, there's no understanding whatsoever about the implications of going to strategic conflict with Russia.

This administration, under the umbrella of the so-called Asia Pivot, has similarly developed a new military doctrine targeted against China, that blurs the lines of distinction between nuclear and conventional war. Australia, of course, is one of the countries targeted to be drawn wholly into that containment and potential war-alliance, directed against China.

So we're dealing, as I say, with a situation that is gravely dangerous and must be stopped, and there are important forces in the United States, including but not restricted to the LaRouche movement, that recognise that, in a certain sense, the only way to remove this danger of war is for the President of the United States to be removed from office on legitimate constitutional grounds, before we reach a situation where we have another Cuban Missiles Crisis, but without any of the sense of responsibility for mankind that we fortunately had back in 1962 with John Kennedy and even with Nikita Khrushchov.

Terrorism: Asymmetric Warfare against the Nation-state

The other form of warfare that has been developed in Britain, under the British Monarchy, and has been exported to the United States and is a major danger, is forms of asymmetric warfare that have been developed as an assault against the nation-state system, and are particularly virulent right now in the Middle East.

You have an alliance between the British and the Saudis which has a long history. Aspects of it go back hundreds of years, to the time of the British East India Company, when the tribal areas of the Arabian Peninsula were all under direct British control. The Arabian Peninsula was a way station en route to India and on to China, for the East India Company for the opium trade and other activities.

Right now, what we're dealing with is a situation in which the British strategy for the entire greater Middle East, Southwest Asia, Persian Gulf, and North Africa region is to create a new Hundred Years' War, a population war within the Islamic world, pitting Sunnis against Shiites, Arabs against Persians, and starting a process that, if it's allowed to get fully off the ground, will take generations, like what happened to Europe during the Hundred Years' and then Thirty Years' War, which decimated the European continent. Now we are dealing with a war inside the Muslim world, with 1.2 billion people or more.

One of the greatest vulnerabilities of this Anglo/Saudi apparatus is the fact that there is a growing chorus in the United States, demanding that the full truth about what actually happened, what was behind the 9/11 attacks, must come out publically. That fight, in which our movement has played a pivotal role, centres today around the demand for the declassification of 28 pages, a full chapter, from the original Congressional Joint Inquiry into 9/11 that was carried out during 2002. It produced a report, which included a chapter that began to document the role of Saudi Arabia, the Saudi Monarchy, and particularly the Saudi Ambassador in the United States, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, in preparing and supporting the hijackers who carried out the 9/11 attacks. We don't know the precise wording, we don't know all of the details of what's in those 28 pages, but what we do know is that there is core evidence presented there that shows that Prince Bandar, other officials of Saudi Intelligence, and a major Saudi defence company with exclusive contracts with the Saudi Ministry of Defence and Aviation, provided critical logistical support for the 9/11 hijackers.

Prince Bandar bin Sultan is known in Washington as Bandar Bush, because he was such an intimate member of the inner circle of both Bush presidents, that he was considered virtually an adopted son of the family. That very Prince Bandar poured at least \$72,000 into the pockets of the 9/11 hijackers via agents of Saudi Intelligence. When the Congressional Joint Inquiry report was put on the desk of President Bush and Vice President Cheney back at the end of 2002, they immediately ordered the suppression of those 28 pages. President Obama was pressured during his 2008 campaign for the Presidency, to promise the families and the survivors of 9/11 that he would release the 28 pages. He swore up and down, face-to-face with 9/11 family representatives, that he would do exactly that. In fact, nothing has been done. The 28 pages have been suppressed. Now there is a groundswell in the U.S. Congress for the release of those 28 pages.

The issue is not just simply exposing what's already widely known about the role of the Saudi Monarchy in sponsoring global Sunni jihadist terrorism. What those 28 pages open up the aperture for, is not just the Saudi role, but the British role. Prince Bandar was also known for having being the architect, along with Margaret Thatcher, of a British/Saudi deal called Al-Yamamah. Under this deal, which was a barter arrangement, the British company BAE Systems provided enormous amounts of military equipment to the Saudi armed forces, upwards of \$40 billion in military equipment and an additional \$20 billion in bribes to leading Saudi princes. Prince Bandar's cut, officially, publicly, was \$2 billion, but it's understood he actually received a lot more. In return, the British got 600,000 barrels of Saudi crude oil per day, beginning in 1985 and continuing right up through to the present day. When that oil was sold by British Petroleum and Royal Dutch Shell on the international spot markets, an *enormous* wealth of cash profit was produced. In an authorised biography, Prince Bandar boasted that those funds were used as an offshore slush fund to "fight communism." Among the projects that money was devoted to was building up the Afghan mujahedin, who fought against the Soviet Red Army in Afghanistan for the decade of the 1980s.

There's countless funds buried in offshore accounts around the world. A thorough investigation into the 28 pages, by declassifying them and reopening the entire 9/11 investigation, will reveal not only that Saudi Arabia is a devout enemy of the United States, but will reveal that the British have been, if anything, the overlords and senior partners in the empire arrangement between Britain and Saudi Arabia that has been the source and the root cause of global terrorism.

We've got a movement under way in the United States among members of Congress, among the 9/11 families, with former senator Bob Graham who chaired the original Joint Inquiry, to force the release of these 28 pages. Had those pages not been suppressed back in 2002, it's very likely that there would not have been an Iraq War; that there could not have been an Al-Qaeda; that there could not have been an Islamic State that's now carrying out Dark Age beheadings and similar things all throughout the Middle East and into North Africa. So we're at a moment right now where it's in our hands to deliver a powerful shock effect blow to the heart of that system of Empire.

You've got a Bush, Jeb, talking about running for President of the United States, which is an abomination. And so, we're in a battle in the United States, a battle that I'm becoming more and more confident by the day we will win, to allow for the truth to come out about the top-down British Empire/Wall Street/Saudi control over the scourge of international terrorism, because if the Empire factor concludes that Russia and China will not back down, will not be blackmailed under the threat of nuclear war into capitulating and bailing out a dying empire system, then it's very

likely that Plan B for the Empire will be to launch permanent wars of each-against-all genocide in every part of the globe. That's what we're seeing right now in the Middle East. It's not a localised reaction. It's a top-down process that has been led by the Empire faction in Britain, with their Saudi and other Gulf underlings, to blow up that entire part of the world.

This is the moment we've reached. It's a moment of truth. The Empire system that has been around for centuries, and that effectively took over the entire global financial superstructures back with the end of Bretton Woods in 1971, has reached its dying moment. Fortunately, we have an alternative system through the BRICS initiative, through the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, through the emergence of new alliances of sovereign nations for real economic development. We have an alternative already being put in place, so that we can make a fast and smooth transition to a world that's a lot more appropriate to what human beings potentially can accomplish.

Craig Isherwood: Just announce who you are and where you're from just so that Jeff knows and we'll just move through the questions.

Gerry Bartlett: Thank you Craig. Gerry Bartlett from Gunnedah, New South Wales. Thank you, Jeff, for a most amazing description of what's been worrying us all the time. We heard about the British role in 9/11, we heard about the Saudi role in 9/11 and we heard about the 9/11 families who lost members from the Twin Towers. What can you tell us more about the dancing Israelis' role, and the people whose workers who were told to stay away from the Twin Towers on that occasion?

Jeffrey Steinberg: The dominant operation was what I described: the British/Saudi apparatus. I'll give a little bit of the background, because I think it's critical to understand how these things work. Back in 1975, one of the leading British Intelligence figures assigned to work in the Middle East, Dr Bernard Lewis, was dispatched to the United States and very rapidly became a key advisor to Henry Kissinger, later to Zbigniew Brzezinski. He was one of the most frequent guests at the Vice President's residence when Dick Cheney was Vice President. Bernard Lewis was the author, by the way, of the doctrine of the Clash of Civilisations. As a key advisor, he developed the notion that the West should support Islamic terrorism along the entire southern tier of the Soviet Union, stretching from the Caucasus all the way through Central Asia, literally right up to the border of China. And under that policy doctrine, that's exactly what happened. Months and months before the Soviets were invited into Afghanistan during Christmastime 1979, Brzezinski, under the advice of Bernard Lewis, had launched covert operations directed at building up what originally came to be known as the Afghan mujahedin. Later they would morph into Al-Qaeda, into the Taliban, into the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, into virtually every form of radical jihadist terrorism that we see in the world today. It started out as part of an operation that was sponsored by networks under the direct control and supervision of people like Bernard Lewis. Now, there was an Israeli piece in this, no question. What I can confidently say, is that there were Israeli Intelligence networks on the ground.

You referred to the dancing Israelis who were up on a rooftop in Hoboken, New Jersey. There were other elements that were more pivotal. The Israelis unquestionably knew that something was about to happen on a very large scale, and whatever information they had from their own activities spying on some of these Islamic jihadist networks inside the United States, they failed to provide any of that information to the U.S. government.

Members of Congress who have been able to go in, under very restrictive circumstances, and read the 28 pages have come out and said "everything I thought

about the history of the last two decades has been shaken up by what I read in just those 28 pages.” One in particular said that the issue that comes up immediately is that you've got to consider that elements of the 9/11 attack could not have happened, were there not people on the inside who wanted that attack to occur, because of everything that followed from it: wars, the kind of Patriot's Act dictatorship, and everything else that went along with that.

So the Israeli issue is a feature, a secondary feature; the dominant factor was this Anglo/Saudi deal that was at the core of creating a Dark Age movement, now spread around the globe, that's committed to population wars and to the destruction of what remains of the system of sovereign nation states on this planet. It's a top-down operation, it's been wound up, it's been unleashed, and that's the thing you've really got to understand. If we can force the release of these 28 pages—and this is a major issue in the United States right now—if we can force the release of those 28 pages, that opens the Pandora's box. That puts a spotlight top-down rather than bottom-up. It ends the mythologies about world terrorism and puts the top-down spotlight on those who created, who sponsored and run it to this day.

Craig Isherwood: We have three questions up here. I'll ask the questioners to come forward and ask their questions.

Audience Member: My question follows on from the previous one. Could you comment further on the role of the British Crown in all this? I understand that Prince Charles has had a very chummy relationship with Saudi princes, but what about the role of the Queen herself? Is there any evidence that the Queen has had any role in the relationship of Britain to Saudi Arabia?

Other Audience Member: We're all concerned about the nuclear war. However, I'm not. The reason being that, nuclear war, if you're going to die, takes you one second, you wouldn't even feel it. What has been happening since the '90s, as an example, in Yugoslavia as a result of that war, today people are still dying from cancer. Land, water is all contaminated, babies are born deformed, still today, nobody talks about it. Now, what about all these new wars of late in the Middle East? That's all contaminated; Ukraine is probably all contaminated too. My question: what is the international union, or whoever governs this planet, or American government, going to do with Britain, France and America in production of [nuclear weaponry]; what are they going to do to stop the masking of nuclear weaponry under the umbrella of conventional weaponry?

Jeff Davy: Thanks for the presentation. Jeff Davy from Numurkah. I recently had a letter in our local paper about what you spoke about: that agreement between Margaret Thatcher and the Saudis. Not a word in the Australian press about this. Never. And my question would be, as I understand it, the families of the 9/11 victims are now suing the Saudis. Is that correct and what can you tell us about that?

Jeffrey Steinberg: Let me say, very briefly, that I think the answer on the British question is very clear. Prince Philip, in his own words, talks about the need to eliminate 80 per cent of the human race. From the standpoint from the power of that oligarchy, the really demonic element of that oligarchy, their problem is that there's too many people to be able to impose a new kind of form of post-modern feudalism on the world. So by every means available, the intention of those like Prince Philip, who typifies the thinking in those high-level circles within the British Crown, is that

we've got to use every means necessary to carry out a mass genocide on a scale that's never been seen before in human history.

So, yes the contaminants, yes the idea of permanent war of each against all—all of these things are elements, as I say, of one issue. And I think it's true: nuclear war—the message of that famous movie *On the Beach* is that the people you've got to feel sorry for the most are those who were not killed in the first wave, but are doomed to die a very painful and not so slow death in the aftermath.

The British genocide policy has many means and many dimensions to it. The reason that we're in a grave danger of a nuclear war at this point is because out of the desperation, born of the fact that their system is doomed—it's dead, they are willing to go to the very brink, to risk everything, to put the very survival of mankind on the line, in the hopes that maybe they can be so crazy and so desperate that you'll get a back-down from the Russians and the Chinese, and then there'll be a new avenue for looting to keep this dead system going a little bit longer.

To answer the last question very briefly: yes, there is an ongoing federal lawsuit. It was at the initiative of the Obama administration. There was an attempt to have it thrown out of court, claiming that the Saudis are protected under sovereign immunity, but that suit was reinstated over the course of the last year; it's going forward in court and it's another venue in which we can expect to see some dramatic things coming out. We knew the case of San Diego, California, which is documented in the 28 pages. Researchers down in Florida have now developed a parallel story down there, where high-ranking Saudi wealthy businessmen, closely aligned with the Saudi Royal Family, were hosting Mohamed Atta and the other 9/11 hijackers in the Sarasota area. So you've got San Diego, California; Sarasota, Florida; and there were a number of other locations where there clearly or likely were similar protection made available through the Saudis and others. You've got Paterson, New Jersey; Herndon, Virginia; parts of the New England area. This was an enormous operation, and the idea that 19 people who didn't speak English could sneak into the United States and carry out the biggest terrorist attack on the United States in history—inside U.S. territory, on their own—is absolutely preposterous. So, a lot is moving forward, but the point that we've got to keep focused on is the top-down story here.

I know that one of the next presentations, after a short break, on this panel is going to take up in a good deal of additional detail, elements of the Anglo/Saudi control over terrorism, so I'll leave it at that.

Craig Isherwood: Thanks Jeff. We've got two questions to come, and then Professor Toloraya would like to make a comment or ask a question, so that's going to be the end of this panel.

Maurice Hetherington: Yes, Jeffrey. Maurice Hetherington. I was your guest for a couple of weeks way back in the '90s. You've probably forgotten me but...

Jeffrey Steinberg: Not at all. Unforgettable!

Maurice Hetherington: You're right about, we're all getting old. I'd like to say thank you, a big thank you, because somebody asked a question this morning: what do we do with our life? Well, there are people that do something with their life other than improve their golf handicap. They actually give something back for humanity, and there's no doubt that you and all of your mates—and you in particular—have done an enormous amount of work, with that thought in mind, unselfishly gave up a lifetime so that humanity might survive. I don't think you can do much more than that with your life; it's not about how much gold you've got in the bank.

You are an incredible bloke; you've come from a long way from a pastry cook to where you are today. I've let the cat out of the bag! But, we both started off as colonies with immigrants from all over the world. You guys fought the Brits in 1783, 1812, 1860-65. We haven't got around to fighting them yet; they still think they're "Hallelujah! Rule Britannia", I don't know, but we are wearing them down. Thanks for everything that you've done for us out here and the world as a whole. You're an incredible human being. Thank you.

Roy Broff: Hi, Jeff. I'm Roy Broff from the beach—the movie that you're referring to—Frankston, in other words. My question is actually, I read all about history and I can't stop making some parallels between the Reichstag Fire in the 1930s, which gave rise to fascists in Germany and the 9/11 story that many of us know. And I somehow believe that 9/11 was masterminded by the American Intelligence community in an effort to suppress the opinion of people like us, which is against the war aggression and so on, and also to control the community to a much higher degree than we would like.

So, my more detailed question is about the attack on the Pentagon, which somehow nobody really talks about these days. We all talk about the Twin Towers and so on, but the attack on the Pentagon somehow gets hidden behind and there is so many mysteries about it, like the missing video footage, the lack of any victims and the mystery plane that left no parts and so on. What's your opinion about that?

Jeffrey Steinberg: Let me answer both parts of the question. First of all, in January of 2001—in other words, nine months prior to the 9/11 attacks—Lyndon LaRouche delivered through Debbie Freeman, testimony at the Senate Confirmation Hearings for John Ashcroft, who was nominated by President George W. Bush to be Attorney General of the United States. Apart from opposition to Ashcroft personally, what Mr LaRouche said is that now that we've seen the shape of this administration: Bush, Cheney, Ashcroft, Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, others; what Mr LaRouche warned about was that we are looking at the kind of government that *will* look for the first opportunity to conduct a Reichstag Fire in order to move for dictatorship. So, that's in the record of the United States Senate Hearing on the confirmation of Ashcroft as Attorney General. From that standpoint, *prior* to 9/11, Mr LaRouche was already warning about the Reichstag Fire parallels that this administration would look for the opportunity.

Now, if you go back just briefly to what I said during my presentation: the Saudi Ambassador, Prince Bandar bin Sultan, was not only one of the major actors in facilitating the 9/11 attacks, but he was a critical partner of Margaret Thatcher and later Tony Blair in putting together this Anglo/Saudi apparatus that was instrumental in creating the entire array of international terrorist organisations we're confronted with today. And I also said that he was virtually a member of the Bush Family. So the Bush/Cheney administration were principal beneficiaries of what happened. And whether it was done by this Anglo/Saudi apparatus with a kind of a wink-and-a-nod, or whether it was done with further domestic complicity, is something that needs to be explored. The best way to do it, is to make sure that those 28 pages are released to the public. We've got a flank on this fight against the British Empire and the Anglo/Saudi apparatus, with the whole global terror apparatus now in full mobilisation. And we've got to make sure that we win that fight.

Winning that fight changes everything, in the same way that passing one simple law—Glass-Steagall—in the United States will bankrupt Wall Street and the City of London and create the basis for a fundamental restructuring of the entire global financial and economic system. So we've got to do that.

On the other thing, because there's an enormous amount of speculation, in some cases probably some witting disinformation out there, it happens that not long ago, a month or so ago, I had a meeting at the Pentagon, and as a by-product of that meeting, got a fairly extensive tour. It turns out that the Pentagon is probably the world's largest military museum. Practically every corridor, every hallway has documentation. There is an entire wing that has the most comprehensive documentation of the attack on the Pentagon that took place on 9/11, including very detailed photographs, a complete list of everyone who was killed in the attack and to my satisfaction, I have no doubt whatsoever that the plane that crashed into the Pentagon was the hijacked plane and that that was the basis on which that happened.

Again, there are all kinds of stories and questions that remain unanswered, because some of the most fundamental evidence of what actually happened that was gathered up by investigators for the United States Congress who were honest and serious people, at least for the most part—that's been suppressed! That evidence has been suppressed for 13 years. That report was completed before the end of 2002, and so, again, opening up the entire Pandora's box by getting those 28 pages released is, to my mind, the way to go, the most efficient and effective way to get to the bottom of the story and force it fully out into the open.

Craig Isherwood: Professor Toloraya has a question or comment for you.

Georgy Toloraya: In July this year BRICS leaders will gather in Russia. What will you suggest them to do—well, three things—to arrest the tendencies you've been speaking about? Thanks.

Jeffrey Steinberg: I'm sure that yesterday in her keynote address, Helga pointed to the fact that colleagues of ours, both of us included, spent the better part of the last year producing the *EIR* Special Report called *The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge*. We began work on that report in the latter part of 2013, prior to the Fortaleza Brazil meeting of the BRICS countries.

We started work on that report because we were confident that the emerging leadership of a new paradigm, reflected in people like Xi Jinping in China, like President Putin in Russia, like Prime Minister Modi in India, and others grouping around them, were moving in the direction of abandoning the world dominated by Anglo-American criminal finance, and were moving to pick up on the enormous accomplishments that have been realised in recent decades in Asia. China went through an enormous revolution in just 30 years, since the death of Mao Zedong and the launching of the new China revolution by Deng Xiaoping. We knew that the potential for strategic cooperation between China, Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, represented the greatest prospect for mankind to move into a new period—a new paradigm—where, in a certain sense, humanity gets out of puberty and adolescence, and emerges on the stage of history as adults, who can have adult relationships among one another and think about the future with bright ideas and with a commitment to making sure the future generations will in every cultural and material way, have a better life.

What I see is that within the initiatives coming out of the BRICS countries, you've got the makings of a renaissance, and it's at every level: it's a scientific revolution, it's a cultural renaissance, it's a revitalisation of the system of nation-states that's been under massive attack. Back in April 1999, Tony Blair went to Chicago and delivered a speech there, in which he said Westphalia is dead, nation states are dead; the Kosovo War means the end of sovereignty, the end of the nation-state. Fortunately, he was proved dead wrong and the BRICS are in the leadership of the process to just prove how wrong he was.

So, I think that we've got to think very big, the sky is the limit, because we're not just talking about cooperation among a group of nations, around valuable development projects and space exploration and all kinds of important things. We're talking about a new paradigm, a coming to age of mankind as a whole, and that leadership coming out of the BRICS countries must be a basis on which *my country* is brought back into that arrangement.

Not only are we facing the danger of war coming from those who control this Obama Presidency and the Bush Presidencies before it, but the United States, from a positive standpoint, has an absolutely vital and indispensable role to play. And remember, we did make a revolution. We have that tradition, we spread that revolution around the world. In the post-Civil War period of the 19th century, we were everywhere. You'll hear things about Australia that many of you may not know, that our organisation there has pioneered reviving and rediscovering. We were in Germany, we were in Russia, we were in Japan, we were in China, and the ideas that are now being embodied in the BRICS initiative are ideas that have been kicking around for 150 years. Thank God we've reached the point now where they are being realised on a vast scale. So by doing more, the BRICS countries can bring the entire world under the umbrella of that new paradigm, and that means that we're committed from here in the United States, to bringing the United States fully in as a cooperative partner of the BRICS initiatives, which means another revolutionary change in the United States, and I think we're on the cusp of exactly that happening. So the more that comes out of the BRICS, the better. It's for the entire world and all of humanity, not just for the member countries and those adding their weight to the process.

Craig Isherwood: Thanks very much, Jeff. That's all we've got for this panel.