

Georgian Response To LaRouche Foreign Policy

Lyndon LaRouche's essay "A World of Sovereign Nation-States" (EIR, May 16, 2003) is circulating widely in its original and other languages. Dr. Nodar Notadze and Dr. Vakhtang Gogvadze, prominent statemen from the Republic of Georgia, offer these contributions to the discussion of the principles and proposals put forward by LaRouche.

Nodar Notadze

Dr. Notadze is a Doctor of Sciences (Philology), and chairman of the Popular Front of Georgia.

It is impossible not to agree with the author's idea, developed throughout the article, that one of the inalienable Rights of Man is the right to belong to a nation, which is fundamentally equal in rights with all other nations in the world. As the author writes, "the freedom and development of the people, and the perfect sovereignty of the nation-state are inseparable principles."

Consciousness of this principle matured long ago, but nobody has hurried to recognize it as one of the guiding principles for everyday practical policy. For one thing, protected Human Rights generally include only the rights of the individual. Secondly, an individual's national rights are generally reduced to the right to be protected against ethnic discrimination, the right to use his native language, to live in his native culture, and so forth. All of this amounts to no more than "consumer values," in the broad sense. A human, however, as a free and rational being, living in the Noösphere, requires more from reality; this higher demand may be called an "ontological need" for the existence of his nation. As a member of mankind, he desires to participate in the life of the nation not as an isolated being, incapable of acting efficiently in national history and current global policy, but rather as an element of one of the nations that comprise mankind and are the real agents of history and global policy. He wishes to exist, not only as a mortal being, but as an ideal member of a society (a particular nation), which is quasi-immortal. He identifies himself with a nation, and that is the primary reason why the Hobbesian view of human life, as a war of all against all, is wrong. A person lives not only by the needs of his body, but by the interests of the "communities," with which he vitally (genuinely) identifies: family (posterity), nation, religious group, etc.

From here—at first glance, but only at first glance—the road leads directly to the concept of a "clash of nations" (or,

"of civilizations") as an inevitable form of human life and development. The author categorically rejects this logic, and irrefutably so. An individual's genuine self-identification with a nation as a community, means that he lives not only by his individual interests, but also by the interests of his nation, which may not coincide with the interests of other nations. The non-coincidence of interests, however, is not sufficient condition for a clash, just as the non-coincidence of individual interests is no basis for living by the laws of the jungle. Relations among nations can and must be regulated by universal rules, jointly elaborated and accepted by nations, to which these nations submit as a matter of good will, just as a citizen voluntarily submits to the law, in the elaboration and adoption of which he ideally participates, as a voter.

It may boldly be asserted, that the rights of nations toward one another are as difficult, albeit possible to codify, as are the rights of the individual with respect to the state, and vice versa. A strict analytical approach is necessary in all cases, especially regarding those primary, fundamental requirements of human beings, which underlie any systems of values and any rights.

Vakhtang Gogvadze

Professor Gogvadze is chairman of the Union of Georgian-Russian Friendship, former Speaker of the Parliament of Georgia, and a Doctor of Sciences (Philosophy).

In highly developed, democratic countries of the West, a well-refined mechanism of state governance functions. Frequently, however, Presidents are chosen for their external features, such as physical attractiveness, sports skills, and so forth, while spiritual and intellectual capabilities play second fiddle. This phenomenon may be one of the side effects of living well. But when the situation changes, and the comparative tranquility of mankind is endangered, it is necessary to look for strong and gifted persons. Great trouble requires exclusively complex and strong personalities. For a minor illness, one goes to the local pharmacy, but a person afflicted with a serious disease seeks a doctor to save him, even if he has to cross a thousand mountains to find one. One of the great physicians of world politics is Lyndon LaRouche.

Today's world is in an extremely difficult situation. Never before has mankind been able to annihilate itself. But nuclear confrontation confronts the world with the dilemma, "To be, or not to be!" Mankind needs extraordinary wisdom, sagacity on the part of the leaders of the world's major countries.

In accordance with reason, the world should abandon the unnatural unipolar model. The world should be multipolar, and led through global democratic cooperation. This is not the general desire, but it is the only pathway out of the global crisis. After the breakup of the Soviet Union, the world was left with one empire, with unlimited possibilities and no oppo-

ment. The so-called “world order” is nothing but a colonial system, with various categories of colonial countries.

There is an objective need to reject such a system of unipolar dominance. The United States itself needs to be freed from this global burden, and from imperial arrogance. And for this, the U.S.A. bears primary responsibility. “All nations of the world acknowledge today’s relative power of the U.S.A. as a fact. Most, I suspect, believe they must deal with that fact. So must we in the United States itself. The distinction to be made, is not whether or not nations must deal with that fact; the question is, whether the United States will deal with other nations as partners, or as clients of an empire. We must manage the problems of the world at large, but the authority and responsibility for what happens in the international arena must lie in the cooperation among equally sovereign powers.” (Lyndon LaRouche)

The reality of a new ordering of the world is at hand. The U.S.A. should construct new relations with the rest of the world, not as vassals, but as equal partners.

As a foreigner, a Georgian, I offer my profound apologies for expressing my thinking and desire, regarding the upcoming U.S. Presidential election. But, as the saying goes, the big things can be seen at a distance, from afar. It seems to us that not only should the U.S.A. be proud of Lyndon LaRouche, but so should the world community, and every progressively thinking person who values peace on Earth. Peace must reign across our entire planet, if we wish tranquility for “my home” (“Peace Unto This House”). Contemporary man sees the Earth as if from space, which is why it has become small—ours, our home.

Lyndon LaRouche is a globally recognized authority, an economist, sociologist, philosopher, a person equipped with a universal array of virtues. God has granted him a hard life, and he has been tempered in the crucible of life and struggle. That is why he knows people everywhere so well, whether they be flying in space or ploughing the land. He knows humanity, which he sees as indivisible from his beloved United States. This is what distinguishes noble internationalism from atheistic cosmopolitanism, which rejects the individuality of the person, of nations and peoples. Lyndon LaRouche need make no superfluous explanations to the world community. He has won trust with the lofty morality of his whole life. LaRouche tries to preach and convince and show humanity, that the only pathway to salvation is moral ideas and honest policy. Nobody is going to fool anybody else in this world. And the epoch of populist patriotism has vanished. Lyndon LaRouche relies on the noble traditions of his forebears, on the experience of the truly wise U.S. Presidents.

Lyndon LaRouche’s style, the style of national self-criticism, makes foreigners sympathetic to America as a whole. National conceit and stubbornness, by contrast, breed nothing good. It may be that at first glance, the American man in the street likes the proclaimed formula: “oil for us, sand for the Iraqis!” The Iraqis are not the only ones annoyed by such

ambitions. “I love Americans like LaRouche, and I love such an America,” one pro-LaRouche compatriot of mine told me.

Evidently there has always, everywhere been a political struggle between deceptive populist patriotism, and real patriotism. It is high time to separate the grain from the weeds. The spiritual teacher and leader of the Georgian national liberation movement in the 19th Century, Ilya Chavchavadze (Ilya the Just, as he was canonized in Georgia), in his day passionately denounced egotistical patriotism, which is distant from universal human values:

“They say of me, that I spread accusations.
Only the foolish deem it so.
Wise men understand in an instant,
How much love I put in those accusing words.”

It is a fact of great urgency, that the world cannot endure a unipolar system of governance. Although the multipolar form has not yet been completed, it is in the process of being established. The dialectical unity of contradictions is the basis of the world’s existence.

Thank God, the Northern alliance (NATO) is no longer a military organization. The war in Iraq demonstrated its effective dismantlement. Only Great Britain supported the United States. A military organization rests on orders alone, without any “democratic” disagreements and debates.

The multipolar world will be completed with the formation of regional currencies, as the dollar does out of control. Mr. LaRouche has warned of this onrushing crisis for a long time. And the entire world financial system has reached the boiling point.

Unfortunately, the initiative for a transition from a unipolar to a multipolar world has not come from the political leadership of the United States. But this idea, substantiated in theory, is expressed by a great American—Lyndon LaRouche.

Lyndon LaRouche is a theoretician, but he is not divorced from practice. This makes him a great politician.

In the future, a politician pursuing policies without theoretical and specific knowledge will be like a ship at sea without a compass. “Theory is gray, my friend, while the tree of life is evergreen.” These words from Goethe’s *Faust* may be applied to Lyndon LaRouche. His insightful forecasts, based upon profound analysis of reality, almost always come true. Public opinion, unfortunately, frequently prefers a sweet lie to the bitter truth. But a truly apocalyptic time is upon us. The peoples, and all mankind, must seek salvation through repentance.

I wish the people of the U.S.A. clear vision. For the true path of choice, lit by God, is the guarantee of salvation and success. I wish for the American people to elect as President the brave, wise, world-famous person, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, who is capable of reconciling even the irreconcilable. The time has come for the right policy!