

Third World, as current British policy dictates, through the vehicle of a one-worldist governing body called the U.N., renewed trade relations of the sort which Paris, Moscow, Rome and, probably, Bonn have been preparing with Iraq, would define a policy outlook of peaceful relations through mutually beneficial economic cooperation. Not only would Iraq's economy be rebuilt, but its status as a sovereign nation in the process of industrialization would be restored and enhanced.

Stated bluntly, the U.N. agenda calls for deindustrialization, depopulation, and the deconstruction of the nation-state, all of which would be threatened, were France to clinch its Elf Aquitaine and Total deals with Iraq. Trade deals of the sort and dimensions discussed between the Iraqis and the Russians, to the tune of \$9 billion, would signal a shift away from the shock therapy approach imposed by the IMF on Russia. The fact, furthermore, that Russian President Boris Yeltsin recently called for a high-speed rail line from Moscow to Paris, echoing the LaRouche idea, surely set off alarm bells in London and Washington, just days prior to the Security Council meeting on Iraq.

The plot behind the arm-twisting that went on inside the Security Council's "Permanent Five" is yet thicker. The question to consider is: How is it possible for the American secretary of state to emote over the historic significance of the Israel-PLO agreement and Israel's subsequent granting of Palestinian autonomy, in the interests of Middle East peace, just days after uttering an unequivocal condemnation of Iraq and reiterating his determination to maintain the embargo, before the convening of the U.N. meeting? It is an economic fact that the only nation in the region which has the technological capabilities and physical economic base to provide a motor force for regional development is Iraq. Therefore, maintaining the stranglehold through sanctions is tantamount, in purely economic terms, to sabotaging a "great projects" approach to the Middle East.

It is political fact that, although leading figures in Israel, Jordan, and the Palestine Liberation Organization are committed precisely to introducing advanced technologies into the Mideast to generate real, physical economic growth, there is a nasty crew headquartered in London and working through the World Bank which is pursuing an economic policy course aimed at transforming the region into a "free enterprise zone" predicated on consumer goods and services produced by cheap labor of the sort dictated by the International Monetary Fund. There is good reason to hypothesize that the overriding concern behind the U.K. and U.S. insistence on sanctions is to prevent the development dynamic from being unleashed among the parties to the peace agreement.

Thus, the decision rubber-stamped at the Security Council meeting was not only an outrageous assault against Iraq, but it was also a policy intervention designed to smash a Eurasian-Middle East development configuration which was looming large to British eyes—almost the ghost of 1990.

## EIR in dialogue with Iraqi intellectuals

In the first week of May, Muriel Mirak-Weissbach and Anton Chaitkin of *EIR* conducted a lecture tour in Iraq, on invitation of the Institute for Foreign Service, associated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They addressed groups of intellectuals and political personalities associated with the leading institutions of the country, which included Mustansiriyah University and the University of Baghdad (both in the capital), Mosul University, the Union of Arab Historians, the Association of Iraqi Economists, and the Institute for Foreign Service in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

The speakers addressed the current strategic crisis from the standpoint of the historical conflict between British oligarchism, and its economic school of liberalism, and the American, republican system of national industrial economy. Chaitkin reviewed research on the development of British geopolitics, from the time of Lord Palmerston, including treatment of Nazism and Zionism as geopolitical projects, as well as current plans to deploy the U.N. as a one-worldist dictatorship. Mirak-Weissbach concentrated on the philosophical and historical foundations of a new, just world economic order, presenting Lyndon LaRouche's economic method and programs, as well as his approach to making a renaissance in science.

### 'What can we expect from America?'

Dr. Sa'adoon Zubaydi, dean of the Institute of Foreign Service, introduced the speakers, noting that after having gone through the traumatic experience of the aggression and embargo, Iraqis are asking what they can expect from the world, particularly from "the most important country, America." Which tendency will prevail in the United States, the tradition of the American Revolution, which made America a nation "which others should have looked up to, in the fight against colonialism," or the imperialist tendency rooted in Britain? Considerable discussion was dedicated to the implications of Britain's takeover of U.S. politics, particularly regarding America's responsibility for the Gulf war. Was the American government not responsible for Desert Storm? An animated debate broke out at Mustansiriyah University and, later, in Mosul, on the true reasons behind Desert Storm, as many had not fully explored the implications of the threat posed to British geopolitical interests by the eastern European revolutions of 1989 and 1990, and the

role which British objectives on the European continent had to play in orchestrating the aggression against Iraq. Since Margaret Thatcher's memoirs have been widely read in Arabic, there is ample evidence to document the case made. Whether the British today have actual "power" in Washington, or only "authority" was one question raised by an economics professor.

The fundamental question which arose regarding the Gulf war involved the definition of American "interests." Many Iraqi intellectuals have embraced the view that George Bush's aggression had been launched in pursuit of the interests of the United States and the U.N., whether these be to control oil or to divide the Arab world or to impose hegemony over economic competitors in Europe and Japan. To deal with this question, which was raised in various settings, the speakers elaborated LaRouche's concept of economic science, identifying in physical economic terms what the true interest of any sovereign nation must be: to develop, through science, infrastructure, industry, and agriculture, the productive powers of labor. From this standpoint, such an aggression could not be in the interests of the American population, or economy. (As one leading government official put it, "Either in Washington they are not seeing the true interests of the American nation, or they are amateurs, ignorant.") Thus it becomes necessary to understand historically how a nation could be brought to deny its original identity and actively sabotage those values, at home and abroad, for which it once stood.

### **The global strategic crisis**

What brought this point home was the briefing given by the speakers on the dimensions of the current, global economic collapse and the impending financial blowout, the perfect example of how adherence to British economic policies over the last 30 years has led to the destruction of the world economy. Some participants were skeptical of the accuracy of the analysis, and there were attempts by several, including economists, to minimize the gravity of the crisis. Some characterized it as a "cyclical crisis," whereas the majority saw America's economic ills deriving merely from competition from Europe, Japan, and the emerging economies. Debate centered on finding out more about the reality in America: How big is the problem? Is it temporary? How is it related to the collapse in military production following the death of communism? How do you measure the real growth of the physical economy, if not by monetary parameters? How much has Third World cheap labor undermined U.S. economic performance? Is the United States not still the most powerful economy in the world?

None of the discussions, whether in university lecture halls, round table debates, or private meetings, were academic. The central concern was to identify the means with which to overthrow the British-imposed policies and mode of thinking, responsible for bringing on the depression crisis

and posing the world on the edge of the abyss. Although the particular conditions created by the embargo are such as to tend to limit one's horizon to solving the immediate life-and-death problems of the country, nonetheless Iraq's intelligentsia has maintained a clear sense of the strategic dimensions of political processes. To be sure, regional problems, like that of "Arab unity," are often raised as those to be addressed first, as being more "practical"; however, most of the participants in the round table discussions were eager to consider solutions on a global scale. The idea of redefining foreign policy relations among nations on the basis of new monetary structures and a development perspective in the interests of all, is not new to Iraq; it is an eminently practical idea there, by virtue of the fact that the country has pursued an "American System-style" development policy over decades, and with extraordinary results. The question is feasibility. As one participant put it, "When will the new, just world economic order, which has been discussed in developing sector nations for 30 years, finally be implemented? Is it not like waiting for Godot?"

### **Respect for U.S. remains**

Persons in positions of political leadership in Iraq displayed an acute awareness of the gravity of the current strategic crisis, and the unprecedented threat for civilization which it poses. Likewise, they showed a keen interest in the political process in the United States, particularly surrounding the Whitewater affair: Will President Clinton indeed strike out on an independent policy course, or will he be contained by the scandals? It is not only because the Iraqi leadership understands the particular role that the United States has played as a superpower which generates this interest, but also the honest desire to reestablish good relations with Washington. As professors, doctors, journalists, and politicians would stress from their personal recollections, much of the country's elite has been educated in the United States, and many, despite the horrors perpetrated by George Bush on their country and their families, still manage to conserve a sense of respect for American people whom they have known.

Thus, what is uppermost in the minds of Iraq's leaders is: How can America, and the West more broadly, be brought back to its senses? In this connection, significant interest was shown in the activities of the movement and publications associated with LaRouche. Capping the tour was a lengthy talk show interview with Chaitkin and Mirak-Weissbach on Iraqi television, during which many of the themes discussed in the universities were summarized. In addition, ample time was given to presenting *EIR*, and the political campaigns run by LaRouche candidates in the United States.

At the conclusion of the round table at his Institute of Foreign Service, Dr. Sa'adoon made a comment which might sum up the sense of the week-long dialogue: "One must never forget the importance of guts and a vision."