
Conference Report

Berlin Seminar Debates UN Role in ‘Westphalian’ Community of Nations

by EIR Staff

In Berlin on Jan. 12-13, some forty participants from Eurasia, the United States, and Africa met at an *EIR*-sponsored seminar, on the theme “Dialogue of Civilizations: Earth’s Next Fifty Years.” The meeting was keyed by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., who called for a revived “Peace of Westphalia”—a dialogue of civilizations that would place a perspective for 50 years of Eurasian economic development at the center of efforts for world peace. Like the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia which ended Europe’s Thirty Years’ War, the approach today to ethnic, religious, and regional strife must be based on the principle of each party enhancing “the advantage of the other”: wiping the slate clean of the cycles of revenge and counter-revenge that plague the Israel-Palestinian conflict, the wars in Africa and the Balkans, and many other locations.

The discussion focussed around LaRouche’s unique contribution to the science of physical economy: that only by fostering high-technology industrial and infrastructural development, can the basis for a lasting peace be achieved. This requires a conceptual breakthrough to a higher level of scientific understanding of how economic progress actually works, which LaRouche characterized as the “Vernadsky principle” (see *Feature* in this issue). The primary discussion documents for the seminar were LaRouche’s two recent articles, “Toward a Second Treaty of Westphalia: The Coming Eurasian World” (*EIR*, Dec. 17, 2004) and “The Dialogue of Eurasian Civilizations: Earth’s Next Fifty Years” (*EIR*, Jan. 7, 2005).

In this issue, we continue our coverage of this historic symposium, with presentations that address the nature of a new, just world economic order, and the problems that stand in the way of that. Specifically, several participants raised questions about the role of the United Nations, especially in the aftermath of the U.S.-led war against Iraq.

Other speeches appeared in *EIR*, Jan. 28 and Feb. 11. In future issues, we will include presentations that focus on various national perspectives on the current systemic economic crisis.

Dr. Mahander Kumar Saini

What Kind of New, Just, Economic Order?

Dr. Saini is the General Secretary of the Union for Social Justice in New Delhi, and a professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of New Delhi. Following moderator Michael Liebig’s opening greetings to the Berlin seminar, he asked Dr. Saini to say a few words in remembrance of the victims of the Dec. 26, 2004 tsunami tragedy, to which Dr. Saini also referred in his speech, which we publish here. He spoke during the second panel of the seminar, on Jan. 12, 2005. Subheads have been added.

I must thank Mr. LaRouche for inviting me to this seminar. . . .

The problems in our part of the world are quite different. So far, I’ve been hearing, that if there is a kind of combination of Euro-Asia, the problems of the world will be solved. Of course, Mr. LaRouche has given a new kind of interpretation to the historical facts. . . . This is the first time I’m hearing the way he has interpreted it, and he has shown how the financial oligarchy can continue to dominate the world system, where there are the countries that develop technology—technologically, financially; and on the other hand, there are countries which are very poor, and which face poverty because of many things.

Colonialism in Another Guise

We in India became independent from the European colonial system, as many other Third World countries also became independent, after 1950. We started looking, from the point

of development. And for development, we need finances, technology, manpower, and management—all these things were missing.

The liberators, the fighters, became overnight nation-builders. They did not have any experience in building nations. They did not have any experience how to build a modern nation. Therefore, we started looking for help outside. And whatever help came, we accepted. That means, we developed in a way which was imposed on us, or, which was given to us. It was of course voluntary: Whenever it was coming from anywhere, we accepted it.

So, our countries developed, particularly inter-developed in a certain direction, where the colonial masters gave all kinds of aid to see that they would continue exploiting the country—the raw material, and the people—the way they did it during the imperial period.

Our country became independent. But we were dependent for most things from outside. Even after 50 years, you will be surprised to know, that from A to Z, we are dependent on transnational corporations. We get up in the morning: First thing, we need a cup of tea: Lipton is there to serve us a cup of tea. Second, we need a toothbrush: Colgate is there to serve us. Then we go on to the table: the bread and the butter—now we have started doing it ourselves—but earlier it was Polson Butter and Britannia Bread (even today, Britannia Bread is still there). Next thing, we need clothes: In most of the synthetic clothes, the material comes from outside, which is manufactured by them.

Later on, we needed a motor car to reach the office. It is there to serve us: Either a Model T or a Suzuki, or some other car. Of course, we manufactured it, but everything is given by them. And we go to the office, we need a cup of coffee; it is, again, given by them. And during the day, whatever you want, we are totally dependent on them. We have computers, but we don't have the technology to manufacture computers. The computers come from outside. They're cheapest there. So, we have only their mechanics to pull things together, so that we have a computer.

At night, we retire. If we need a pill, that is also manufactured right there.

So, after 50 years, that is where these developed countries and the developing countries stand. We are more developed, and still we are dependent on them. Our life is so controlled by transnational corporations, that it is difficult for us to come out of it.

And if we are to develop an independent polity, we have to have a kind of system, where we can control these transnational corporations. These transnational corporations come to our country, they tell us, "Look, you permit us to operate in your country." Then, they do not come alone. They come with the influence and the ideology of their country. That ideology is also backed by the respective government of their countries, by international institutions, the IMF and World Bank: They are the ones who guide us

in which direction we have to develop.

Once we've accepted, they give us conditions. With those conditions, we have to follow a certain path of development, which is not good for us, which is not self-reliant, which is not for the betterment of our people.

We have motor cars; we have now, underground railways, metro railways; we have modern infrastructure. But, for whom? Only for a limited elite. That elite uses it. Other people do not have anything. They suffer the same way they suffered during the colonial period, and this colonial period is still continuing in a different way.

Strengthen the United Nations

We must go for a certain kind of system, because Mr. LaRouche has introduced certain things, and he's said what should be done, what should be the remedies. And the remedy which I thought would be appropriate, is to strengthen the United Nations system. The sovereignties of these countries after the Iraq War, have been threatened. Not that they were free from influences earlier. But now, it is totally threatened, and we have to strengthen the sovereignties of these countries, if we have to adjust as modern independent nations, which can decide things about themselves, which can do things the way we want to do it. If we want to remain an independent member in the international community, then sovereignty has to be defended. And one of the methods of defending the sovereignty, is, strengthening the United Nations.

At the time of the League of Nations, at the time of the Second World War, and after that, the United Nations had been bypassed by the vested interests, who imposed their will on these countries. So, how do we strengthen the sovereignty of these countries? As long as sovereignty is not defended, we will be perpetually dependent, as we were during the colonial era.

The Non-Aligned Movement and Regional Systems

Second, in my opinion, the Non-Aligned system, which India, Indonesia, and Egypt started, to defend the newly emerged countries, because we wanted to remain independent in terms of our thinking, in terms of our actions—. It was a power-bloc; it was a Cold War period; we wanted to remain independent, so that we could develop on an independent line. It was an assertion of sovereignty; it was an assertion of independence; it was an assertion to take independent decisions, [and so] this Non-Aligned Movement was started.

And the Non-Aligned Movement, even today, is relevant. We were condemned by both superpowers, in the beginning, but later on, they realized, "No. Non-alignment has a place in the world, because these people have a right to think independently, remain independent." Both the superpowers understood. And today, also, the Non-Aligned Movement has the potential to contribute to development and strengthening of sovereignty of these countries.

Third, in my opinion, they need to strengthen the regional associations. Regional associations must come up in these regions. And it has come, because, trade will increase, self-reliance and collective self-reliance will also increase, if the neighbors can come together and contribute to each other the kinds of things which are required. For example, India and Pakistan come together: Our needs and their needs are similar. But, we are developed. We can give them much more, which they cannot get today, or for which they have to pay a high price. Therefore, regional associations must be strengthened.

Next, what we passed in the United Nations, the Fifth Special Session and the Sixth Special Session, in what Mr. LaRouche has said in one of the write-ups in the latest issue of *EIR*, that we have to have a new kind of international system, a new kind of economic system, to solve the problems which have come after this tragedy [referring to the Dec. 26, 2004 tsunami]. Because it is a failure of President Bush, in two terms, that he did not inform the world that such a kind of tragedy was likely to take place. They had the information. Why did they keep it to themselves? I do not know. I have no answer. But, it appeared that there was some vested interest in doing it. "Let these people die—it doesn't matter at all. Some of the population will be reduced in the world. And then we will go in. We will be one who will be the builder. We will be the one who will finance. And we will be the one, who will again control them," as . . . we have heard, "like animals." So, they want to revive the same old system, by different methods.

A Community of 'Self-Aligned' Nations

Next, the new economic order must be strengthened. And how to do it? We have to put, and we have to apply our collective mind to this, because it cannot be done by one nation. It has to be done when all nations, and powerful nations must come on the same platform, and think in terms of improvement of the poor. And, as a matter of fact, a country like India needs a program which President Roosevelt initiated. We are all aware, if we do not invest in development in the country, the financial markets, which are speculative markets, can lead the country to ruin any day.

Today, India's reserves are believed to be in the billions of dollars. From where is the money coming? It is coming from foreign financial institutions. They are investing in India, because the rate of interest in India is higher than the rate of interest in their own country. And the day they decide to take this money back, what will happen? Our economy will come back. Speculation is going on, share prices go up and come down; several times there have been crashes in the share market. So, they can play with countries.

We have to have a program which can bring people to a [higher] level. And India needs, not globalization, because globalization is nothing but only a new name of colonialism, where you control nations through remote control. Nations which became independent—they have their parliament, they

have their sovereignty, they have their decision-making processes. But, ultimately, remote control is what controls their decisions. That has to be stopped, if these nations have to develop. And India really needs a new kind of program for development, something based on President Roosevelt's thinking. Our Prime Minister aims to do some of these things in his program, like creating employment, like giving employment to everyone, in certain areas. And one of the newspapers in India did say that Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has gone on the path shown by President Roosevelt.

Last, not least: The method of development has to be self-aligned. We cannot depend for all time to come, on outside help. Outside help comes only to a point. Some help comes with certain constraints, certain conditionalities, that you have to develop only this part. Most of the development, we must, at least Third World countries, should do, and the Gandhian way is one way of doing it. Why can't the village be self-aligned, in terms of its needs? Gandhi showed a new way: You can make clothes your own way; you can have an election your own way. But, this can be self-aligned. And ultimately, it can be a nation self-aligned.

Thank you very much.

Dr. Hans Köchler

International Rule Of Law and the UN

Dr. Hans Köchler of Austria is president of the International Progress Organization. He presented this paper to the Berlin seminar on Jan. 12. Subheads have been added.

I would like to highlight some aspects which are within the field of my research interests, namely the theory of international law and in particular the relationship between power and law in international relations, and I shall illustrate the problems by reference to the international conflict over Iraq.

The Collapse of the Bipolar System

As a result of the events that have followed the collapse of the bipolar (post-World War II) system, the international order, as a system of mutually accepted norms governing the relations between states on the basis of sovereign equality, is not just being eroded at the present time, but more or less disappearing. The developments following the collapse of the Soviet bloc have brought about a situation in which the United Nations Organization is rapidly losing ground, and is definitely not able any more to act as guarantor of what the UN

itself used to call “the international rule of law.”¹

The system of collective security, as it has been incorporated in the United Nations Charter and was practiced (albeit with problems and shortcomings) in the era of bipolarity until 1989-90, has now been effectively ended. That system was based on a kind of directorate of five powers which was tantamount to the establishment of the rule of the victors of the Second World War over the rest of the world, within the framework of the United Nations Organization. Undoubtedly, granting the veto privilege to only five countries (the “permanent members”) was neither a just nor balanced measure in terms of power relations. In a certain sense, however, it stabilized international relations and guaranteed the viability of the post-war system of collective security, in a way that no country had authority to use force against another country, except in the case of self-defense (according to Article 51 of the UN Charter), or in the case of a collective use of force—after the Security Council has determined that there exists a threat to the peace or a violation of the peace.

As far as the great powers’ actions were concerned, this system has only worked in an imperfect, and often contradictory, manner. Furthermore, the ban on the use of force, enshrined in the UN Charter, could only be upheld—or “enforced”—as long as there existed a bipolar power structure. As soon as one of the two major players of the Cold War era had disintegrated, and a unipolar structure had replaced the bipolar order, the checks and balances which were built into the United Nations Charter did not, or could not, work any more. The most drastic example of this new state of affairs, which is, in fact, the absence of an international power balance, was the assertion by the United States of America of a right of “preventive self-defense.”² Thus, the U.S. has “taken the law into its own hands,” and, by using force against and eventually invading Iraq, without authorization by the United Nations Security Council, has set a dangerous precedent, a *fait accompli* from which the international system may not recover for a long time.

The Case of Iraq

There is one particularly regrettable fact, which I would like to mention in this context of (super)power politics: Although the use of force against Iraq occurred by the U.S. and the “Coalition of the Willing” alone, and was not in any way endorsed by the UN Security Council, this very Council reconvened a few months after the war had been launched, and, by “recognizing” the responsibilities of the occupying powers (the so-called Coalition Provisional Authority), more or less endorsed the actual state of affairs on the territory of Iraq.

1. For details see Hans Köchler, *Democracy and the New World Order* (Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1993).

2. See *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 2002 (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2002), and *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*, December 2002 (Washington, D.C.: The White House, 2002).



Hans Köchler: The U.S. invasion of Iraq, without UN authorization, has set a dangerous precedent, from which the international system may not recover for a long time.

Without going into any further details, the United States, having created new “facts on the ground,” having invaded Iraq and established an albeit “imperfect” occupation regime, finally had succeeded in imposing its will on the world organization, thus obtaining international “legitimacy,” if not for the invasion itself, then for the subsequent occupation (in fact, re-colonization) of Iraq.³

Let me again draw your attention to the basic facts, as far as issues of constitutional legality and international legitimacy are concerned: A single member state of the United Nations, the most powerful one for that matter, in collusion with a group of “willing” allies, has committed an act of aggression for which there is no effective remedy in the present international system. One of the most fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations, namely the ban on the use of force (Art. 2 [4]) has been violated—and the aggressor state, a founding member and one of the original sponsors of the Charter, “got away with it.”

The resolutions which have subsequently been adopted by the Security Council, acknowledging the occupying powers as the “Authority” (Coalition Provisional Authority), have been described by the occupying powers as the international “legal” basis for a series of administrative measures aiming, *inter alia*, at the preparation of so-called “parliamentary elections” in Iraq. However, in my analysis, those resolutions (in particular resolution 1483 of 22 May 2003) have not given legitimacy to the war of aggression against Iraq.⁴ As far as I see it, the presence of foreign troops on the territory of Iraq

3. For details see “Memorandum by the President of the International Progress Organization . . . on the legal implications of the 2003 war against and subsequent occupation of Iraq and requirements for the establishment of a legitimate constitutional system in Iraq, including measures of criminal justice,” in: Hans Köchler, ed., *The Iraq Crisis and the United Nations. Power Politics vs. the International Rule of Law* (Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2004), pp. 65-71.

4. For a complete documentation of Security Council resolutions on Iraq, see the documentation of the IPO: *The Iraq Crisis and the United Nations*, pp. 79ff.

has by no means been made legal by *ex post facto* resolutions of the UN, concerning *administrative matters* of occupation, which is in and of itself an illegal act. *Ex injuria jus non oritur*.

The basic problem faced by the “international community” in Iraq lies in the United Nations Organization having been side-lined, even “subjugated” for the purposes of a unilateral agenda that is in no way compatible with the organization’s multilateral mission. In that regard, the principal cause of the organization’s predicament is related to the fact that even the veto power of the other four permanent members of the Security Council is not any more an adequate guarantee that the most powerful player does not violate the rules.⁵ If one country alone possesses such power that it can afford to ignore the decisions, or attitudes and interests, of the permanent members of the Security Council (not to speak of all the other member states) without fear of repercussions, we have a situation of international anarchy. In the absence of a balance of power, “anything goes” as far as the global hegemon is concerned.

Impact on the Arab World

Regrettably, the Arab world has been one of the first victims of this new global constellation. Shortly after the Second Gulf War,⁶ in the Spring of 1991, I diagnosed that the project of re-colonization of the Arab world had been set in motion.⁷ In the post-colonial period, and particularly in the course of the ’70s—since the events following the “October War” of ’73—the Arab countries had obtained some leverage in international affairs; as far as the issues of Palestine and Jerusalem were concerned, they have been able, to a certain extent, to assert their interests, and to mobilize support of United Nations member states, particularly from the ranks of the Non-Aligned Movement. Iraq, at the time, was one of the major players in the Arab region; there was some sense of belonging to one “Arab nation,” an attachment to national identity that was nurtured and consistently emphasized by the leadership of Iraq and other Arab states (such as Syria, Yemen, Libya, originally, in the time of the United Arab Republic, also Egypt) in their pan-Arab discourse. (For those Arabs who were conscious of their regional as well as international role in the post-colonial period, the American terminology, speaking about “Arab nations” in plural form, did not make sense. For them, there existed only *one* Arab nation in the form of more than 20 different states.) All of this awareness and commitment to a common Arab destiny has been lost in the course of events that culminated in the

invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2003.

In the framework of a bipolar world order, or more precisely, as long as there existed “a Soviet Union,” the Arabs had weight in international affairs, in so far as they were able to maneuver between the two power blocs. Arab politics lost its relative strength and independence as suddenly as the Communist bloc had disintegrated and the Soviet Union had collapsed. In the absence of a balance of power, the international role of the Arabs simply vanished; and this development towards marginalization has now even been accelerated.

I agree with Mr. LaRouche in that the main motivation for the United States to undertake the invasion of Iraq was to effectively ruin the political order of that country. The U.S. strategy has been to “neutralize” Iraq as a factor of Arab politics, and take the Arab world out of the regional and international power equation—so as to facilitate the implementation of an essentially non-Arab and non-Muslim agenda for the greater Middle East.

Apart from the legal facts and the realities of power politics I have referred to above, and in addition to the state of international anarchy resulting from the system of self-help now having been re-established in international relations, I would like to emphasize one more aspect as far as the future, particularly of our European continent, is concerned: We have been dragged into a confrontation, which we, as Europeans, feel is not *our* conflict. This confrontation between the West and the Arab and Muslim world has rapidly acquired the dimension of the long-feared “clash of civilizations.”⁸ Whether we like it or not, the conflict in and around Iraq has gained a global dimension: the violent occupation and ongoing war on the territory of Iraq have increasingly alienated the West not only from the Arabs, but from the wider Muslim world. This development has nurtured hostile emotions on both sides which it will be difficult to contain, and it has reinforced age-old enemy stereotypes.⁹ In spite of all the lofty declarations about dialogue and a “new era” in the Middle East, there will be no easy way out of this confrontation.

As far as the “facts on the ground” in Iraq are concerned, I do not see how the occupying power, in cooperation with the United Kingdom and a few “lesser” and less motivated allies, will be able to restore order and security on the territory of Iraq. I do not envisage how they will be able to guarantee elections under orderly conditions—so that they might be qualified as “free and fair.” In view of this incapacity of restoring order, political stability and the rule of law in occupied Iraq, it may be almost impossible for the United States of America to find a face-saving way out of the self-inflicted quagmire. The illegal use of force against Iraq has destroyed the political stability of the country, and resulted in a state of

5. See Hans Köchler, *The Voting Procedure in the United Nations Security Council* (Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1991).

6. According to my account, the Iran-Iraq war of the ’80s was the First Gulf War.

7. “Die Chancen einer liberal konzipierten Neuordnung der arabischen Welt.” Lecture delivered at the Liberal Club, Vienna, 10 April 1991. See “‘Rekolonisierung’ der arabischen Welt?” *Die Presse*, Vienna, April 12, 1991.

8. See Hans Köchler and Gudrun Grabher, eds., *Civilizations: Conflict or Dialogue?* (Vienna: International Progress Organization, 1999).

9. For a historical overview and analysis see the author’s essay: *Muslim-Christian Ties in Europe. Past, Present & Future* (Penang/Malaysia: Citizens International, 2004).

anarchy from which the invading country may not easily be able to distance itself—neither morally nor legally or politically, not to speak of the heavy burden on the occupier’s economy. Unfortunately, the entire world has now been drawn into that confrontation, and the United Nations Organization is being used as a tool of legitimization.

As explained earlier, because of the course of events on the global level, the Arabs have become victims—and to a certain extent, this is a predicament of their own making—of an imperial policy of *divide et impera*. According to my rather pessimistic assessment, it may take a rather long time until they will be able to overcome the state of re-colonization under which they now have to exist.

Another Victim: Europe

But there is another, unexpected victim of that policy of *divide and rule*, and that is Europe: As far as the war against Iraq is concerned, we Europeans—and that relates to the member states of the European Union—were not able to speak with a unified voice. Some of the major members of the European Union have sided with the United States of America and have joined the “Coalition of the Willing,” undermining all efforts towards a joint European foreign and defense policy. For that reason, I am personally not very optimistic about the prospects of a cohesive foreign policy of the enlarged European Union, which is now being envisaged within the framework of the very ambitious project of the European Constitution. It may take a rather long time until we here in Europe will recover from that set-back.

Irrespective of this rather bleak assessment of international relations at the present stage, I do share the values which have been pronounced in this meeting, in regard to peaceful co-existence between states on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual respect among all nations. The International Progress Organization, which I represent here, has rather similarly spoken of the idea of progress in its founding declaration of October 1972. We understand progress not merely in the sense of material advancement, but as being based on enlightenment through the broadening of one’s intellectual and spiritual horizon, which will in turn pave the ground for genuine open-mindedness towards other civilizations, cultures and religions.¹⁰ We have understood this kind of intellectual advancement, in terms of an awareness of common human val-

10. Cf. the definition of “progress” the Founding Declaration of the IPO (Innsbruck, Oct. 30, 1972): “Progress means striving to perfect human nature in such a manner that man would be enabled: a) to attain the greatest possible insight (reflexion); b) to meet his fellowmen with tolerance in the realms of the theoretical (ideology) as well as the practical (politics). This tolerance would have to be born out of the theoretical knowledge and perception that should be achieved to the greatest possible degree; c) on the basis of this knowledge man should be enabled to form his physical surrounding in such a manner that the biological assets may be safeguarded not only for the survival of mankind but would be equally apt to form our world in such a way that would give happiness to the individual as well.”

ues, as the basis of progress also in the fields of economy and politics.

I thank you for your attention.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Anglo-Dutch Liberalism Is the Real Problem

During the afternoon panel of Jan. 12, the discussion included the following remarks by Lyndon LaRouche, on the role of the United Nations. The panel was moderated by Michael Liebig.

Michael Liebig: There have been two questions from German representatives here, who ask, “On the role of the United Nations, how to improve it, how to redefine it, and what your thoughts are?”

Lyndon LaRouche: Well, let’s take the UN first, because it’s rather simple. The definition of the UN was originally prescribed by President Franklin Roosevelt—before the thing was actually convened. Now, the intention of Roosevelt, was to extend the Westphalia principle to really what I would call today, a “second Westphalia principle.” Which means, that the world’s peoples, each represented by their own nation-state, independent nation-state, should undergo a period of cooperative development to the benefit of the world as a whole; that each nation should commit itself to that development. And there should be an institutional framework for coordination among independent nations. Not a world government, as Russell and others proposed.

But, a concert of nations, a forum—the weakness in that, in my experience, is the typical case, as my indirect role in the Colombo, Sri Lanka [Non-Aligned Movement] conference in 1976, in which something for which we’d been campaigning for two years, happened. And in the closing part of the resolution, on economics, there was a resolution passed by the great majority of the members as the Colombo conference. By the time the subsequent UN meeting occurred in the Autumn, Fred Wills, then the Foreign Minister of Guyana, was the only person who spoke in defense and support of a Non-Aligned nations resolution which the great majority of the members had previously voted for, enthusiastically.

The weakness of the UN, is that, with the Security Council system, it became a failure. Now, you do need, in a sense, a security agency like the Security Council. It should, however, be more representative, and not like what it was there—what it has been up to now.

But the problem is, that the weaker nations, the smaller nations, are inefficiently represented in respect to their own

interests, in the proceedings of the UN as a whole. It is not really the body of independent people it should be.

The problem here, is not a problem with the UN. The UN conception, I think, was an excellent one in the beginning. It was frustrated by the shift to the Cold War by Truman and company. This is what ruined it.

But the other part of the thing, is that, today, since 1971-72, the world has lived under an Anglo-Dutch Liberal tyranny. I mean, this is the elephant in the middle of the bedroom, right? In the middle of the bed. There *is* no independent government on this planet! None. The governments are controlled by independent central banking systems, which in turn are controlled by an IMF system. They run the world. You have the case of the European Union, the European Central Bank: You don't have independent governments under the European Union today, because governments are not able to exert their sovereign powers.

Take the governments of continental Europe: A simple creation of credit, of the type that was used in the immediate post-war period with the help of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau in Germany—that type of credit today, could save Germany from the disaster which it faces! It would have eliminated the Hartz IV problem. Wouldn't have existed. You have similar things throughout Europe. Europe has plenty of major projects which have long-term value, which are viable projects, but you need a postponement of payment on capital account. Therefore, you have to create capital credit for large-scale infrastructure projects, which will immediately increase employment, expand production, raise the tax-revenue base—and you don't have a problem!

Germany, in its relationship with China, is a success. Germany is increasing its exports into Asia. But, it is not making enough money, at home, to sustain the economy at home. Why not? Because it's not allowed to. By whom? By the central bankers, as represented by the crazy Maastricht agreement.

So, you have a *supranational* power, an *empire*: What you are looking at, in Europe today, and the world as a whole, is like the Middle Ages! We have a *medieval system*, under which a Venetian financier-oligarchy, with military forces like the Norman chivalry, are terrorizing the world, and destroying all forms of representative government.

There's where the problem lies on this UN thing. What we need to do, is destroy that! And this system is crashing: Either the world has the *guts* to put the IMF into receivership *as bankrupt*, and have the nation-states take over, in a cooperative way, by treaty-agreement, to manage the IMF and other central banks in receivership. Under those conditions, to freeze things, to ensure that the economies go: to launch large-scale infrastructure projects which are useful, they're not make-work projects.

Look, the United States, for example. The typical life-span, physical life-span, of basic economic infrastructure is 40 to 50 years. Water systems: Now, Germany, for example,

where we are, has a lot of water systems. Those things have a life-span; they're valuable; they're essential to Europe. This thing which Charlemagne started, is essential—but it has to be renewed. Large-scale mass-transportation systems, like efficient rail, which is much better than jamming up the highways with trucks. It's cheaper; it's better; it's cleaner; it's more efficient. But, it's a 40- to 50-year investment. Power stations: power stations, a 40- to 50-year investment. These things are all useful. They change the environment. They make it possible to increase employment; the employment is not wasteful. You get an income flow into the economy from it. And you get an asset which increases the productive powers of the people in the economy. You can easily pay for that, over a 25- to 50-year period, in capital cycle.

So, governments are denied, what would be, in a rational system of sovereign nation-states, the ability to get out of this crisis. But, they're denied that, by whom? The government doesn't *dare* overthrow the tyrant, the so-called independent central banking system. Hmm?

So therefore, we're dealing with an international system, which is centered in the IMF; it is a group of private financier-oligarchs, who, in concert, control the IMF today; who commit most of the assassinations that are committed against important people in the world, using their thugs. This is the problem.

So, you talk about the problems between nation-states—the problem is not between nation-states: There's something *above* nation-states, to which nation-states are submitting in their relations. So, we need to re-establish the sovereign nation-state. And on that basis, re-establish a kind of community, like a new Treaty of Westphalia kind of agreement among nation-states. Then define, put on the table commonly, the list of projects which are needed; get nations to agree that they share agreement on these projects. Create the long-term international capital through a national basis, for these projects which are 40-50 years, largely—those are the leading projects. Hmm? And then, we can move!

Now then, you take that kind of program. You put *that* into the United Nations. Make the United Nations General Assembly *efficient*, as a mechanism in which small nations can be heard, and in which there are mechanisms for dealing with them. At present, the United Nations is a vehicle for *suppressing* the revolt of the smaller nations! Or the weaker nations. They say, "Don't put it through. Don't do it! Don't do it!" "Look, Brother, kill your project. We know you need it, but kill it. We want to have unanimity here. We want to get this regulation through, we want to get this agreement through."

And, as I say, I go back to 1976 to this experience, where the Non-Aligned nations group, in majority on the initiative of India, actually, adopted a resolution on a just new world economic order. *Nothing was done about it!* It was *suppressed* on the floor of the UN in the following September. And *that's* what's wrong with the UN.