

LaRouche E-Mail Dialogue Continues On Eurasian Peace, Development

On Sept. 6, Lyndon LaRouche held a webcast in Berlin, with a videoconference link to a Washington, D.C. audience, and many “satellite” viewing sites around the world. LaRouche’s speech and a portion of the conference dialogue appeared in EIR of Sept. 15, and papers and e-mails submitted by international dignitaries were featured in last week’s issue. Here, we publish more e-mailed questions and comments, along with LaRouche’s answers, as he makes his way through the hundreds of responses his webcast provoked.

LaRouche’s next Berlin-Washington webcast will be on Oct. 31 at 10:00 Eastern Standard Time.

Iran

These questions were submitted by Abbas Bakhtiar, an Iranian national and journalist, operating out of Scandinavia.

Leading Question: The nuclear weapon states have had over 30 years to comply with the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty) and they haven’t disposed of their nuclear arsenal. How can we force them to comply?

“Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty.”

LaRouche: In addressing the matter of the NPT, it is important to take into account the issue which the original NPT addressed, and avoid seemingly literal interpretations which do not coincide with the original and continuing issues posed in the period of the 1962 missiles-crisis confrontation between the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union, and, also, the role of the British Empire, as represented during 1945-1963 by Bertrand Russell, in setting up the circumstances under which the relevant expression of the 1962 missiles-crisis occurred.

The original development of nuclear weapons, by, principally, the U.S.A., was prompted by the belief, by President Franklin Roosevelt and qualified scientific advisors, that Nazi Germany had the scientific capability and intention to develop nuclear weapons. That capability did, in fact, exist. Both Germany and the Soviet Union had the scientific and related technological capability for development of nuclear weapons at that time. The Hitler administration, for its own

ideological and strategic reasons, scrapped the development of nuclear weapons; the Soviet Union did not have the supporting economic capability to actually develop the nuclear arsenal which was within the scientific capabilities which had been organized by the Academy of Science’s V.I. Vernadsky.

However, the death of President Roosevelt resulted in a radical change from Roosevelt’s post-war policy, a change to British-directed imperial perspectives, pushed by Winston Churchill and his successors, and adopted by the pro-British Liberal financier establishment who controlled Roosevelt’s corrupt successor Harry S Truman. The U.S., under the direction of the British policy crafted by Bertrand Russell, adopted Russell’s perspective of a “preventive nuclear” aerial attack on the Soviet Union at a time prior to the Soviets’ assumed capability for the actual development of nuclear arsenals. The purpose of this British policy was, and remains today, what Russell described publicly, in September 1946, as the intention to conduct an airborne nuclear attack with the purpose of compelling the Soviet Union, and the world, to accept a form of global, post-nation-state imperialism, which Russell identified repeatedly as “world government,” or, the same thing called “globalization” today.

The Soviet development of nuclear weapons, prior to the state of Anglo-American readiness for the planned attack on the Soviet Union, the failure of the Anglo-American intention of the Truman government in Korea, and Soviet priority in developing a thermonuclear weapons capability, led to the dumping of the depraved Truman, and his replacement by U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower, who successfully avoided the new risk of war which arose as a potential during the 1950s. However, a new Russell policy, called later “mutual and assured destruction (MAD)” led into the 1962 missiles-crisis, and the subsequent adoption, and further elaboration of the NPT treaty.

The intention of the NPT, as installed over the body of the assassinated President John K. Kennedy, combined with the Anglo-American launching, in late 1964, of the U.S. war in Indo-China, created an order, called “détente,” an order based on the concept of mutually assured destruction (MAD), a policy based on the principal nuclear-weapons powers. However, the intent was not to prevent “peaceful development” and use of nuclear technology.



Institute for Science and International Security

Uranium enrichment plant at Natanz, Iran. "The U.S. assertion that the issue of 'nuclear weapons' is the current U.S. issue with Iran," writes LaRouche, "is a fraudulent piece of U.S. propaganda. The Bush Administration's belligerent policy toward Iran is based on that Administration's policy of 'regime change.'"

The interpretation of the NPT, and of its promises, must be limited to those general constraints which I have just summarized in their historically defined setting.

The issue today is the continuing intention of those Anglo-Dutch Liberal circles of Europe and North America, to carry through the British imperial intention adopted by the U.S. Truman Administration and its accomplices under the 1940s-1960s auspices of the nuclear-warfare policies of Bertrand Russell et al. The continuing intention of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal financier establishment is the early elimination of all sovereign nation-states, including the U.S.A. itself, in favor of a global imperialism, called "globalization," which is a modern resurrection of the policies of the Crusader alliance of Venice's financier-oligarchy and the Norman chivalry during the so-called medieval period of European history extending from about A.D. 1000 to the collapse of the Venetian financier system during the so-called New Dark Age of the Fourteenth Century.

Take, for example, the targetting of Iran today.

In response to the appointment of the U.S. British intelligence asset Henry A. Kissinger to the positions of, first, National Security Advisor to the Nixon Administration, and later, Secretary of State, the British intelligence services assigned its Arab Bureau chief, former Glubb Pasha associate Bernard Lewis, to a U.S. posting, for the purpose of shaping the policies of the U.S. Nixon Administration. Lewis has shaped the U.S. Middle East and related policies of three most

notable, British-intelligence-trained U.S. figures, Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel Huntington. All three were among those trained by British Intelligence in a special, London-directed unit at Harvard University under William Yandell Elliott. All three have shared a common principal interest in the region of Southwest Asia associated with the Anglo-Dutch and Czarist Russia (Nicholas II) interests in the relevant area of Southwest Asia since the days of British asset Al-Afghani and the evolution of the Sykes-Picot agreement, through to the present day.

All of the questions, restated below, which you have placed with me, must be understood in no other way than in the strategic context which I have just described.

Bakhtiar: How can a country like Iran have an "inalienable right" under the NPT to research, develop, and produce full-cycle fuel enrichment and yet be threatened with sanctions and war? What do you think about this problem? . . . Do you think the U.S. will attack Iran? What would the consequences be for the U.S. and the region? What are the politicians in the U.S. thinking about? What is your opinion on Iraq?

LaRouche: At the present moment, the Anglo-American interest expressed in part by Vice-President Cheney and his wife's long-standing connections to British intelligence circles associated with the like of British Baroness Liz Symons, is committed to either a medium-term (e.g., February 2007) or an earlier, mid-October 2006 heavy aerial assault on Iran. The high risk that the already prepared assault might be launched without warning during the second half of October 2006, involves issues of both the November 2006 general mid-term election, and the extreme likelihood of a general financial-chain-reaction collapse of the world's present monetary-financial system during the weeks immediately ahead. Therefore, the "worst case" assumption of a mid-October assault must be the standard point of reference.

Bakhtiar: What are your views on Israel?

LaRouche: Israel has been a key Anglo-Dutch/American puppet-entity during virtually the entire sweep of the existence of the state of Israel. During the Ba'ath celebration which I attended in Iraq during April 1974, I had the occasion to warn my hosts and their relevant guests, that Henry A. Kissinger was behind the intention to launch a civil war within Lebanon during the immediate period ahead. Within a week, my warning had been realized. The sustained disruption of the entire region of Southwest Asia, has been the policy of the Anglo-Dutch Liberal faction, including its U.S. agents, consistently over the entire period, especially since the assassination of U.S. President Kennedy.

All sane figures of importance in the region, have understood that an Israeli-Palestinian agreement, whether as a matter of one, or two states, is a prospect on which the possibility of stability of the entire region continues to depend. The assass-

sination of Israel's Prime Minister Rabin may have been conducted by a homicidal lunatic, but that action, and its immediate aftermath, expressed a long-standing policy defined for the region, a policy crafted by the Anglo-Dutch Liberals of Britain, but supported by their collaborators inside the U.S.A.

Bakhtiar: How can the U.S. and Iran solve their existing problems?

LaRouche: The replacement of both President George W. Bush, Jr. and his Vice-President, simultaneously, is the only hope for a durable peace, and, indeed, the only hope that the entire planet will not be plunged into a prolonged new dark age by the presently onrushing general disintegration of the world's present monetary-financial system as a whole.

Bakhtiar: How do you see the U.S.-Russia relationship will develop over the next ten years? And with China?

LaRouche: My prospect, as set forth summarily in my Sept. 6th international webcast, is the adoption of a reform with two principal elements: a.) The early replacement of the present, hopelessly bankrupt, present world monetary-financial system, and b.) A new system of long-term cooperation in the scientific-technological development of Asia through cooperative efforts from western and central Europe.

Bakhtiar: How soon do you think the economy will collapse, and why?

LaRouche: It is presently in an advanced phase of an already ongoing general, global collapse. The relevant developments which have broken out, as I had warned, during September, signal this collapse as already ongoing. The collapse, unless reversed, will pass through several successive phases of a general breakdown of the entire world economy, with no part of the world an exception to this.

Bakhtiar: Who is running the show in the U.S.?

LaRouche: The Anglo-Dutch Liberal system which came to power as an empire of Lord Shelburne's British East India Company in the Paris Treaty of February 1763. This Liberal current, organized in the semblance of what biologists recognize as a slime-mold, a form copying the characteristics of the medieval Venetian financier oligarchy, is also the presently hegemonic political power over the U.S.A. Only if the U.S. frees itself from the grip of that financier oligarchy, is there a chance of survival for civilization anywhere on this planet during the period of successive crises immediately ahead.

Bakhtiar: How can the U.S. cope with mounting social security/pension debt?

LaRouche: Only by changing the current U.S. system as I have specified this in considerable detail. Otherwise, the entire U.S. system will spin into a prolonged general state of financial chaos.

Bakhtiar: Can going back to the gold standard be a way out?

LaRouche: "Gold standard" is an unfortunate term. The proper concept is the Bretton Woods "gold reserve standard," based on a bullion reserve, not a gold-currency system.

Bakhtiar: Considering the fact that six companies have monopolized all media access, how can you (we) get your message to the people?

LaRouche: That is an obstacle, but you greatly overrate its power.

Bakhtiar: How can we reduce the power of people such as Rupert Murdoch?

LaRouche: By ridicule, as, perhaps: the Australian, who like a bad kangaroo, picks other people's pockets.

Bakhtiar: The politicians need money for elections, the money that they have to pay the media, etc. The current system is based on whoever spends more will win (3 out of 4). A two-party system with a monopolized mass media and rich lobbying groups is not a democracy. It is the dictatorship of the rich. How can this be changed, since it needs the very same people who are part of the problem, to change the system?

LaRouche: The only remedy is that prescribed by the intent of the U.S. Federal Constitution, by political parties which keep faith with the majority of the American people and their posterity, as the ruling political parties have not only failed, but continue to refuse to do over the course of the recent thirty-odd years.

Mr. Ebrahimi, Islamic Republic of Iran Broadcasting (IRIB):

What do you think about Iran's nuclear energy program? Which country in the Persian Gulf region should play a leading role?

LaRouche: Without the proliferation of nuclear-fission and, beyond that, thermonuclear fusion technologies, there is no adequate long-term solution for the oncoming problems of any nation.

We require a regional agreement which eliminates all traces of the legacy of Sykes-Picot from the region as a whole. This means, primarily, a system of cooperation of the sovereign nation-states of the region, built around the cooperation of Iran and Turkey, but with equitable roles assured for the Arab peoples. This must be an economic development perspective, to assure that the family's children and grandchildren will live better and in a better world than their ancestors have lived before.

Man must see himself in the likeness and as the servant of the Creator. To this end, he, or she must serve the process of continuing creation. We, who are mortal, must fulfill the mission of a better world for our descendants.

Egypt

Dr. Mahmoud Khallaf, retired general, Cairo:

The problem of any attempt to build peace in the Arab-Israeli conflict is that Israel and the U.S. understand only one language: using force to terrify the Arabs, “shock and awe” strategy. Then they think they can reform the Middle East however they want. They never learned any lessons from Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, since the neo-cons believed in unilateral power to solve political problems. Yet, they have had bad results so far. On top of that, the U.S. is losing the hearts and minds of the Arabs and the Islamic world. I believe that none of the neo-cons understands what the meaning of this is, and what kind of threats lie ahead against U.S. interests in the Middle East.

What is the meaning of “Islamofascist”? How is Mr. Bush thinking? Who can trust him as a founder of peace in the Middle East? I think the first step in talking about peace in the Middle East, is to start with confidence-building measures. That is the only start which works, before thinking of Madrid (II) or stabilizing Iraq.

LaRouche: Bush is, in fact, insane. His mental condition, always bad, has been deteriorating recently at an accelerating rate.

As for the opinion of the world, the so-called neo-cons do not care in the least. They are like an infestation of rodents, which we must expel from our houses out of consideration for the future of our children and grandchildren.

Poland

Boguslaw Zeznach: Hello, Mr. LaRouche. Best greetings from Poland, and even better wishes in your search for sanity, common sense, and basic ethical principles in today’s crazy and declining “Euro-Atlantic” world. Here is my contribution to the online debate:

1. Poland, my country, should naturally benefit from your idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, as we are directly on its way from Berlin to Moscow. Yet, the example of the Baltic Gas Pipeline, which is being built between Russia and Germany, so as to omit Poland, for outlays 6 times higher than if going on land through Poland’s territory, shows that strategic thinking is still far away from that idea in both Berlin and Moscow. True, it is in part meant to punish the present, very short-sighted and primitive Polish (rightist) government for their pro-U.S., anti-Russia, anti-EU stance. Anyway, that is a fact proving that rulers of the world prefer to invest *against* someone rather than *for* something. Which means that the real battle is not for money, but for people’s minds and souls, which you rightly emphasize in your teachings, too. I would suggest that you use also this example, when skeptics ask you how to get money for the Eurasian Bridge itself.

2. Poland as a nation-state is among the most homogenous nations in the world. Ninety-six percent of citizens claim Polish ethnicity; 93% have been baptized in the Roman Catholic Church; the Polish language has virtually no local dialects—

i.e., you cannot tell whether a speaker comes from Wrocław, Warsaw, Lublin, or Gdansk. And that is good, as it spares a good deal of tensions, friction, and internal conflicts. However, the EU laws and propaganda are telling us that we have to abandon that homogeneity and open ourselves to newcomers who come with their money to buy land and houses here, whereas young Poles should rather go and look for jobs elsewhere. More than 2 million young people and skilled hands have done so over the last few years. I know that, while coming from the multi-ethnic U.S., you’re also a strong defender of a sovereign nation-state. In view of the above, do you think that EU membership is any good for Poland?

3. Recent developments in Mexico, building parallel structures of power, seem particularly interesting and politically promising. Unlike revolutions in Venezuela and Bolivia, which I also welcome, but which come as a top-to-bottom initiative by populist Presidents and are enthusiastically but passively received by their respective peoples, the softer leftist current in Latin America, represented by Mercosur leaders (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay) and Mr. Obrador in Mexico is—I believe—by far more reasonable and promising, as it is rather an evolutionary bottom-up process, actively involving citizens into a better understanding of their rights and in defense of common good. Here I would also expect your comments.

God bless you, Mr. LaRouche. Many people wish that you live long, keep healthy, and never stop sharing your thoughts with us.

LaRouche: The problem has been the trends in the policies of Poland’s recent governments, but not only Poland’s governments. Throughout eastern Europe’s former Comecon economies, the price of relative political freedom from Soviet domination has been a collapse of the physical economies of those nations to levels far below those of 1989. Under the Maastricht Treaty and its principal effects, as dictated by the Thatcher-Mitterrand government, the former Comecon region of eastern Europe, has been degraded, together with Germany and Italy, to levels of economy below that of 1989, while those states have also been pushed into participation in NATO.

As for the economic problems of Poland now: They are virtually all the result of the chain-reaction effects of the Maastricht and ECM systems.

This is also the state of affairs in the region of what was formerly known as the D.D.R. All of western Europe is now virtually bankrupt, and sinking into a pit which leans toward a plunge into a new dark age. Without breaking free of what the now archaic NATO system represents, there is no hope for any of the present nation-state economies of western and central Europe. All arguments on matters of the type to which you refer are rooted in that single issue. If Poland had not been raped, as it continues to be raped by European Union and related policies, the inequities to which you refer would not exist.

Eurasia: Main Routes and Selected Secondary Routes of the Eurasian Land-Bridge



Hence, my current approach to these ironies in Poland is currently trapped, as I have laid this out in my Sept. 6, 2006 Berlin-D.C. webcast, and will resume the discussion of that in my new Berlin-D.C. webcast being scheduled for the last week in October. We must change the system, and then many of the predicated problems of the present system can be removed.

—Lyndon

Jerzy Czeszko: Mr. LaRouche, how should we deal with the divisions resulting from different religions and cultures between nation-states, especially in the context of the Mid-east conflict, where Islam is *wrongfully* blamed as a source of war and terror? Also, I would like to hear your thoughts about the cultural dimension of the cooperation within the Eurasian Land-Bridge. Thanks and looking forward for your answer.

LaRouche: Ecumenical policy, as adopted by Charlemagne, by Cardinal Mazarin's initiative in the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, and by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa's *De Pace Fidei*, must be premised upon the concept of natural law.

I have been explicit on this in my treatment of the issue of the conception of the personality of the Creator of a continuing universal Creation. Whether persons and states accept

my knowledge of the subject of the Creator as defended by Philo of Alexandria, for example, or not, the natural law, as Johannes Kepler understood this correctly, like Cusa before him, is the principle upon which urgently needed cooperation among nations depends absolutely. I ask nations to agree to that conception of natural law, and of man's unique nature under natural law, and no more than that on theology.

The evidence that all mankind is trapped in a single, presently leaky boat, creates a situation comparable to that which Cardinal Mazarin and others faced in 1648. Men and nations sometimes agree only because there is no other visible choice. The chance that they might agree to needed changes in principled relations among states now, is premised on the sheer awfulness of failure to come to such working agreements, as in the situation of the Westphalian Treaty.

Prof. Dr. Janusz Czyz, Warsaw, mathematics professor:

1. Mr. LaRouche, in his recent government declaration, the new Polish Prime Minister, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, spoke about the need to develop energy alternatives for Poland—among them nuclear energy. A commission has been created in the Economics Ministry which is studying the question of nuclear energy. What do you think would be the impact if Poland would go with nuclear energy?

2. What do you advise the Polish authorities to do, so as to protect themselves against the attacks which are coming from Western mass media against the present government?

LaRouche: I would hope that notable private personalities from Poland would become participants in the attempt to define agreement on perspectives of cooperative development which I am pressing with the initiative around the Sept. 6, 2006 webcast. What is needed is deliberation among leading scientific and other relevant representatives of their respective nations, representatives whose participation in these discussions would provide their respective governments with evidence of existing alternatives for governments to examine, and, hopefully adopt.

The best way to remove a nagging conflict among nations, and also others, is a clear vision of a desirable common benefit in some form of cooperation over one or two generations to come.

The general need for certain changes in economic policies of, and among nations, points to the role of general cooperation in the nation's shared use of nuclear-fission and future thermonuclear-fusion technologies, as a fulcrum on which to lever cooperation in many other important areas

India

Prof. Lokesh Chandra, *historian, and former Member of the Indian Parliament, Sept. 6 (five questions, with answers from Mr. LaRouche interpolated):*

Mr. LaRouche, you have proposed both the construction of the Eurasian Land-Bridge as a way of integrating Eurasia economically and infrastructurally, as well as a 50-year perspective for a new Peace of Westphalia agreement for the development of existing raw materials, as well as the creation of new raw materials in the spirit of the Russian scientists Mendeleyev and Vernadsky.

Could the Shanghai Cooperation Organization become the vehicle for this, or how do you see the future role of the SCO? Do you think that the SCO could be an option to get the world out of the crisis, without an induced change of U.S. policy?

LaRouche: It could be an included vehicle. One among the essential arrangements required for long-term financing of development will be packaged treaty-agreement arrangements with ranges of between a quarter- and a half-century maturities. These will often be of the character of multi-national agreements. The fact that the SCO is already developing its role as a multi-national form of cooperation in development assures its potential role as a large factor in Eurasian development.

Chandra: Given the danger of geopolitical conflicts in the future, what in your view would be the best way for the SCO to relate to the U.S.?

LaRouche: It will be necessary to bring about a rather radical change in the current foreign-policy orientation of

the U.S.A. The orientation must be toward those forms of cooperation which would have been launched in 1945, had President Franklin Roosevelt's death not brought Winston Churchill's accomplice, President Harry Truman, into the Presidency. Without such a change from recent decades' trends, especially since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and, more emphatically, the anti-progress aspects of the 1968 youth tumult, the world as a whole were already doomed to the new dark age implicit in the current international monetary and financial systems.

Chandra: Many people in India have a completely different explanation for the origins of terrorism, than that presented by the United States or Great Britain. For example, there is the view, that a lot of the problems in the region from Southwest Asia to South Asia come from the colonial policies at the end of the Second World War and the division of India. Earlier the Sykes-Picot Treaty created the seed of future problems.

Given the fact, that some of the countries in the region have severe economic and social problems, which help to nourish terrorism, how could the Eurasian Land-Bridge contribute to the stabilisation of these countries?

LaRouche: The view of the problem as rooted in "colonial policies" is too simplistic and diversionary. Among the Marxists, Rosa Luxemburg was right in defining "imperialism," where Lenin and the German Social-Democracy were absurdly wrong. The U.S.A. veteran diplomat Herbert Feis's studies of imperialism confirm Rosa Luxemburg's derision of the German Social-Democracy and Lenin's mechanistic views precisely.

The present system, since the Paris Treaty of February 1763, has been the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of imperialism crafted by the British East India Company's Lord Shelburne and Shelburne's Jeremy Bentham. The Anglo-Dutch Liberal system which has dominated the world, but for relatively brief periods of U.S. leadership, and which has ruled the world since August 1971, is modeled on the Venetian ultramontane system of empire during the nearly four centuries of domination of medieval Europe by the alliance of the Venetian financier oligarchy and the Norman chivalry. The system of submission of governments to the authority of so-called independent central banking systems, not colonialism, is the core of modern imperialism. The attempted imposition of "globalization" would mean both the perfection of the neo-ultramontane system of Anglo-Dutch financier imperialism, and also the virtually immediate general, chain-reaction collapse of the present world society into a prolonged new dark age, planet-wide.

International terrorism is an instrument of policy of the present form of the Anglo-Dutch-Liberal system. Its present goal is the breakdown of governments to the extent needed to eliminate the nation-state as a power-factor in society everywhere.

Chandra: Mr. LaRouche, given your love for India, which goes back to your presence in 1946 in the struggles in Calcutta, and the fact that you worked in 1979 on a 40-year development plan for India for Indira Gandhi, many people in India think that you are an American they can trust. So what would be your suggestion to emerging Asian countries in this perilous world situation?

LaRouche: We must accelerate the rate of development in, most emphatically, basic economic infrastructure, in order to create the platform to defeat the worsening effects of poverty on the lower seventy percentile of the poor of Asia. This requires such measures as a massive development of nuclear power, with the intent to enable a rapid, qualitative uplifting of the potential relative population-density of the whole population over the coming two generations. This will be the means for attacking the deadly water crisis now menacing India, using approaches which increase the potential relative population-density by transformation of the land-areas in which present and slowly improving skills of the poor are working. Power, water, and kindred basics of basic economic infrastructure are factors whose benefits run, initially, way ahead of gains through cultural uplifting of the skills of the population.

Chandra: Don't you think, that the heavy emphasis of the Indian economy on the computer and IT sector, is a vulnerability of India if the system of globalization collapses, and what should India do to deal with that? How can one create productive jobs for millions of people? How can India overcome the poverty, which was a big concern for our leaders Mahatma Gandhi and Nehru?

LaRouche: Reliance on the advancement of such sectors would be dangerous, unless the higher priority were based on development of high-gain potential of basic economic infrastructure. The problem today is that economists generally have no conception of the fact that real economies are physical first, and financial a poor second, and, that economic processes are not mechanistic, but dynamic. The factor of infrastructure is more important than technology, just as sanitation and good nutrition are more significant than medical care in promoting the general welfare of the population as a whole.

Philippines

Ronnie Velasco, *the former Minister of Energy and head of the Philippines National Oil Corporation under the Marcos Administration, who directed the construction of the first nuclear plant in Southeast Asia:*

Iran will not give up its nuclear aspirations. Israel clearly has the bomb. The U.S. took out Saddam, and Iran took over the group. Therefore, Iran believes that it must have nuclear weapons, to counter Israel. Am I reading it correctly?

LaRouche: You misread my statement. The Bush Administration's argument on this account is a lie, expressing a



Press Information Bureau of India

India's first lead-free integrated chip-plating process facility in Chennai. LaRouche warns that reliance on the IT sector "would be dangerous, unless the higher priority were based on development of high-gain potential of basic economic infrastructure."

feature of policy-shaping which is typical of the Bush Administration and Bush himself on virtually every significant subject-matter.

All nations have the natural-law right to access to nuclear technology. However, the state of the world has passed the point at which the NPT agreement on nuclear and thermonuclear weapons is a remedy.

However, the application of this principle is complicated.

For example, I had a mid-1970s meeting, in New York City, with the celebrated, then former Foreign Minister Abba Eban of Israel. The subject of our discussion was the need for an affirmative approach to Israel's relations with the Arab nations, the Palestinians most emphatically. His word of caution was, that it is not so simple: "Some heads of state are clinically insane." He was correct on that point, of course.

The general remedy, without which solutions are not possible, is the modern application of the first principle of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. The prolonged conflict between Arab and Jew, which has been cleverly engendered and nourished by the malignant actions of such typical British agents as the British Arab Bureau's Bernard Lewis, has created a situation comparable to that of the 1618-1648 Thirty Years' War. Without a replication of the Westphalian Peace today, the entire "Middle East" is condemned to a Hellish mutual extinction of Jew and Arab, in which Israel's already existing nuclear-weapons capability is a characteristic factor.

The U.S. assertion that the issue of "nuclear weapons" is the current U.S. issue with Iran, is a fraudulent piece of U.S. propaganda. The Bush Administration's belligerent policy toward Iran is based on that administration's policy of "regime change." The Bush Administration's policy toward Iran is the same as that administration's fraudulent pretext for war against Iraq: "regime change." Iraq had no "weapons of mass destruction" at *that* time, and the lying Bush Administration

knew that. There is no near-time potential of the alleged type in Iran, and the U.S. administration knows it.

The issue is nuclear power, not nuclear weapons.

Without nuclear power, no nation could be sovereign today.

Sen. Nene Pimentel, *leader of the opposition in the Philippines Senate*:

How can a return to the gold standard be achieved internationally, and what would be the effect of that on the world economy, and on developing sector countries in particular?

LaRouche: We must be precise and accurate in our use of terms such as “gold standard.” The fact that President Franklin Roosevelt proposed the use of reserve gold as a standard for the Bretton Woods system, does not mean that the Bretton Woods System employed a “gold standard.”

The “gold standard” was a standard of imperial policy of the British Empire. The U.S. Constitutional system, which was created and defended against the British system, is a constitutional state-credit system. Under the British system, and present systems of western and central Europe today, governments are not sovereign, but are subjects of control by the private financier interests represented as “independent central banking systems.” No government which submits to the existence of an “independent central banking system” is actually a sovereign.

The British gold standard used its control, since the Napoleonic wars, of the price of gold currency as an instrument of imperial hegemony over the nations of continental Eurasia and beyond. However, in 1931, the British gold standard collapsed, and a period of international monetary chaos persisted until U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt seized control over the gold of the U.S.A. itself. Had he not, Adolf Hitler would have conquered the world.

For example, the collapse of the British gold standard was a part of the process of Britain’s intent, at that time, to bring Adolf Hitler into power in Germany. The crucial event in that attempt was the establishment of the Basel Bank for International Settlements (BIS), which was to serve as the instrument through which its member, London’s protégé Hjalmar Schacht, prepared the arming of Nazi Germany in preparation for the war which Schacht’s patron, the Bank of England’s Montagu Norman, organized through credit made available by operations associated with both the BIS and France’s fascist Synarchist financier houses.

It was Franklin Roosevelt’s intervention which brought Britain into the anti-Hitler camp, despite the massive pro-Nazi factor within the British (and London-linked New York City bankers’) establishment of the 1930s.

The Bretton Woods system was a fixed-exchange-rate system within which gold bullion, not gold currency, was used to settle accounts for the purpose of maintaining that fixed standard of exchange. The British “gold standard” was based on a floating-exchange-rate form of free-trade system.

What is needed is a return to a fixed-exchange-rate credit system, a virtual return to the Bretton Woods system, in which gold bullion at a fixed rate would be a convenient means for managing threatened imbalances in accounts.

The purpose of a fixed-exchange-rate system, such as the Bretton Woods system, is to maintain a supply of international long-term credit at low fixed charges of between 1-2% over a span of a quarter to half century, with credit so extended chiefly for long-term investments in basic economic infrastructure and technologically progressive private enterprises. The British gold standard was designed to loot the world for the imperial purposes set forth under the direction of the British East India Company’s chief thug, Lord Shelburne.

With the events of 1971-1972, the U.S. became a part of what had been established under Shelburne as the British world empire.

Correction

In last week’s issue, page 40, the dialogue between Lyndon LaRouche and Chinese scholars Prof. Dai Lunzhang, Dr. Zhang Yan, and Dai Jun should have read as follows:

Prof. Dai et al., Question 5: Mr. LaRouche mentioned the necessity for the United States to change its present destructive policies, and to support such a development perspective. We know the forthcoming mid-term election of the U.S.A. in November is an important one.

So, my question is, how much will it affect the prospect of a political change in the U.S.A.? And furthermore, what impact will the 2008 Presidential election have on the political landscape of the U.S.A.?

LaRouche: As I have warned my friends and others in leading circles of the U.S. Democratic Party, and also others, the immediate future of politics belongs to the cause of the lower eighty percentile of the income-brackets of the U.S. citizens. In the pattern of results from Democratic primary elections so far, the trend is toward voter preference for the anti-Bush candidates, and for the candidates who are sensitive to the concerns of the voters from the lower eighty-percentile of family-income brackets. The economic and other political shocks to the population are arriving at an accelerating rate. Given the inherent uncertainties which I see clearly as an insider of the political process, unless what I am supporting wins, the situation for humanity as a whole would not be encouraging. However, like a commander, I must fight the battle which is set before me, on which I must act. That is the best that anyone can do at this moment. I estimate our chances of success are good, but no one can be certain at this moment.