

World Looks To The U.S. To Change Failed Policies

by Paul Gallagher

As virtually all nations condemned the Sept. 11 attacks, the world was nonetheless waiting for the United States to respond to the crisis by changing its foreign policies. Despite President George W. Bush's "if you're not with us, you're against us," for most potential allies, the axioms of recent and present American strategy cannot succeed.

Nations from Mexico to Russia to Malaysia have seen terrorist and pro-terrorist insurgencies supported, funded, headquartered by Britain, the United States, the Inter-American Dialogue, the George Soros-funded non-governmental organizations; and seen their own efforts against such destabilization branded "human rights violations." Foreign leaders meeting with President Bush or Secretary of State Colin Powell have also made it "diplomatically" known, that the economic and foreign economic policies of the United States have been contributing to the deadly problem of terrorist irregular warfare. Under the hard shock of the deadly attacks on New York and Washington, with the Bush Administration facing strategic destabilization and financial collapse simultaneously, dramatic policy shifts are necessary and possible.

The widespread international radio appearances and newspaper coverage of Lyndon LaRouche's views and statements after Sept. 11, reflects this anticipation of a possible shift. In the interview published in this issue of *EIR*, LaRouche insists that the first things the United States must do to defend itself, are to deal with the financial and economic crisis, and to achieve Middle East peace rather than be driven to war in support of the faction backing Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. In a Sept. 20 interview with Italy's widely heard Radio Radicale, LaRouche went further. "My approach to all this," he told the Italian audience, is

"to use the crisis as the occasion, in a sense, to evangelize people back to a conception of what man is. The only real cure of this problem, is *agapē*." The U.S. Presidency, LaRouche said, "is looking into alternatives to the kind of insanities which seem to be U.S. policy right now. And very important is the cooperation which the President is enjoying with other countries. Cooperation with Russia is very important, as well as with China."

'Deal With Relevant Issues'

This cooperation begs changes from the United States. China's President Jiang Zemin held discussions on Sept. 19 with Russian President Vladimir Putin, French President Jacques Chirac, and British Prime Minister Tony Blair on the crisis, publicly urging all to "keep calm and deal with relevant issues cautiously." China's Foreign Minister Tang Jiaxuan was to visit the United States the next day. On Sept. 18, the Chinese Foreign Ministry officially declared, "We should crack down on all international terrorism. . . . The United States has asked China to provide assistance in the fight against terrorism. China, by the same token, . . . ask[s] the United States to give its support and understanding in the fight against terrorism and separatists," he said. "We should not have double standards." The clear reference is to Tibetan and other separatists in southwest China; the Chinese did *not* raise any demands regarding U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, but insisted NATO consult at the UN before taken military action in Eurasia outside Western Europe.

The United States has yet to consult the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), a task-oriented alliance of China, Russia, and four of the five Central Asian Republics, formed in 1996 precisely to deal with the threat of "Taliban" terrorism



President Bush with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on Sept. 16: Coalitions cannot be built on U.S. media story lines, but on new policies that solve real crises.

out of Afghanistan into Central and South Asia as a whole. The SCO is now being strongly supported by Thailand and Malaysia; the latter nation's pro-terrorist insurgency was openly supported by former Vice President Al Gore, in his notorious 1998 speech in Kuala Lumpur calling for the overthrow of the Mahathir government.

As of Sept. 20, Russia, India, Iran, Tajikistan, and France were preparing a meeting of their foreign ministers in the Tajik capital, Dushanbe, in an effort to rebuild the Afghan opposition to the Taliban, known as the Northern Alliance. Paris had announced the urgent preparation of this meeting just three days after the U.S. massacres of Sept. 11. Uzbekistan's President Islam Karimov sent an urgent public message to the United States: "First dry out the flow of funds from financial centers to the terrorists." Kazakhstan's national security adviser came to Washington and told U.S. officials that nothing less than an end to Afghanistan's civil war and to the huge flow of arms (and drugs) there, could succeed. But U.S. policy has been based on regarding as an enemy, one of the nations considered by all in the region to be key to this, Iran.

President Karimov's call to "first dry out the flow of funds" point toward crucial changes of policy. This is particularly true, taken in context of issues raised by Serbia's Interior Minister Dusan Mihajlovic, concerning "bin Laden bases" in Bosnia, Kosovo, Albania, and Macedonia.

London has been, and continues to be, the international communications and fundraising headquarters for the majority of the most dangerous terrorist networks operating internationally. (The United States has refused numerous petitions from nations as distinct as Egypt and Israel, to pressure its "special ally" Great Britain, to shut down what has been jok-

ingly called the headquarters of "Osama bin London.") In addition, NATO, since the 1999 Rambouillet "Balkans negotiations" and the subsequent bombing war against Serbia, has been aggressively supporting the Albanian Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), against both moderate Albanian parties and surrounding Balkan nations. NATO is therefore effectively protecting the large-scale traffic into Europe of heroin, nearly all of which comes from Afghanistan and is trafficked by the Albanian mafia bound up with KLA irregular warfare. This in turn feeds large volumes of funds and guns to pro-terrorist warfare all over Eurasia.

The same principles of necessary policy corrections apply to British support, tolerated or abetted by the United States, for the ongoing Chechen insurrection against Russia. Or to the United

States' high-profile support for the pro-terrorist political forces who overthrew Peru's Fujimori government—and whose co-thinkers met this week in Cochabamba, Bolivia and sent "fraternal greetings" to the attackers of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

No Clash Of Civilizations

The most important issue is a change in the overall principle guiding U.S. policy, to one of supporting and joining rapid economic development along the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as Lyndon LaRouche has proposed it. There has been intense public urging from among U.S. allies in Europe, from both governments and other leaders, that the United States abandon entirely the "clash of civilizations" policy of the West against Islam for the 21st Century. So universal have been these calls from leading Europeans, that even the two principal authors of the "clash of civilizations" doctrine—Harvard's Samuel Huntington and former U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski—have been forced to move publicly away from it during this crisis.

LaRouche stated the problem to Radio Radicale: "Under these conditions, the United States and these countries, and Western Europe together, can lead a group of nations which can develop a solution, an alternative to the present crisis. And the problem, therefore, is to have the key figure of the United State, who is now President, George Bush, to see this situation." And LaRouche added, "To my knowledge, at this time, the institutions of the United States Executive branch, at least a great part of it, are recognizing the existence of the problem I have described; they do not fully accept yet everything I have said, but they recognize that I am generally right."