

The NPT and Mideast Peace Prospects

The following are excerpts from the discussion following Col. Jürgen Hübschen's presentation to the Berlin seminar.

Q: We heard two very interesting proposals from Mr. Hübschen. One is to offer to Mr. Ahmadinejad, or to Tehran, to enrich uranium, for peaceful reasons, and that the world, or the UN, should have a treaty with Tehran. . . . And the other is to force Israel, Pakistan, and India to sign the anti-atom treaty. I would like to hear from Mr. LaRouche, how highly does he estimate the chance that we would come to a treaty, let's say, first with Israel. They don't even admit that they have nuclear weapons! You can ask them, and you find a big question mark.

LaRouche: Okay. On this question, I proposed at a diplomatic event in Washington recently, that we had to simply recognize that the Non-Proliferation Treaty is *dead meat*. It is a historic part of the situation. It was created in the 1960s, by the help of Bertrand Russell, whose virtues were attested to by the fact that he was the guy who launched the proposal, for Britain, of preventive nuclear war, as a way of establishing world government. And these fellows have not changed their opinion since then, even though Bertrand Russell is dead—that's the best achievement he ever made. But it was too late.

So, the point is, on the question of the NPT, forget it for the time being. Because it's not going to work.

We have to consider the realities of the world. First of all, we're not dealing with an East-West conflict—that's a different position. That's not the problem. That's artificial. What there is, is an attempt to maintain an empire. The empire has existed. We don't have nation-states. We say nation-states, that nation-states negotiate, but that's not the way the world is run. The world is run by financial powers, a system which existed in Europe, which has been run by the British for years. And they still run it. They still coordinate it. That's your problem.

The question is to create again, on this planet, the right of nations to have *true sovereignty*. Now, in consistency with that, Iran does have a right to full access to nuclear development itself. The question is, how can we get it there? On the NPT, no. Not at all. Keep away from it! It's out of date. For example, you can not have an economy in the world today, without high-technology, very intense, nuclear systems. The whole world has to shift to a nuclear system. Take the comparable case, India.

India, rightly, did not get into the NPT, because they knew

how it would be played against them. But India has a problem now. It has the world's largest reserves of fissionable material for their thorium series. In order to run that, thorium reactors, and they need them—you take the water problems in India alone: Without high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, we can not deal with the physical problems of nations and peoples in many parts of the world. *It can not be done*. We therefore must have high technology of this sort, of this nuclear power.

My first encounter with this was a fight back in 1947, in Boston, on this question of insisting, that the issue of nuclear weapons is the issue, not of nuclear weapons, but of nuclear power. Because there's no possible way that you can win a general nuclear war. It was obviously implicit then, it was only implicit—it's now true—you can't. It can't be done. Therefore the issue is, the world needs to go beyond the so-called acceptable energy policies today. They won't work. You will kill more people with Greenies, than you will kill with nuclear weapons.

Without nuclear power, we can not meet the needs of the population today. . . .

The key thing is to shift, and say, we've got to buy time, we've got to get off this thing now. What the Russians are doing, is crucial. Let it work. Buy time. Build confidence. Get rid of Cheney. Get rid of Bush. Build confidence for the future. But then, come in with some positive proposals on cooperation and development. Nuclear power is one of them.

That's where that thing lies. I've been at this for years. I know this stuff. This is fraud. We get this idea we're going to negotiate this treaty, we're going to negotiate that treaty—it's not worth anything. You have to recognize that behind this whole thing, there's a player. The nations are being played. The conflict is not just between nations. The conflict is between the imperial power, sitting in London, or centered in London, which is still controlling much of the world. And if you don't break that power, if you don't break it, you're going to get Hell.

So, in the meantime, with these kinds of things, concrete issues, deal with them. Find temporary solutions which are equitable. Look ahead to the future, on things that we should be doing. But *break the power* that is centered right now in London! Otherwise, if you don't do that, you're going to get Hell on this planet, and all your negotiations are not worth anything. . . .

Israel's Role

Q: . . . To what extent can Israel facilitate the resolution of the current crisis [with Iran], contribute to a peaceful resolution? To what extent can Israel complicate the current situation? . . .

LaRouche: Well, one quick thing: We know that Israel has some nice submarines made by Germans, which are quite convenient for delivering things like that. And if Netanyahu were the Prime Minister of Israel, since he's an asset of George Shultz, who's the controller of Cheney, who is tied to the British interests involved, it could very easily happen.

One of our main concerns, one of the reasons I'm so concerned with getting Cheney out now, is precisely because I don't think anybody else is crazy enough to let that happen. There's a very limited capability of that happening. But the implications of the event are so important, that even though there are strong limitations on its happening, the implications if it does happen, is like setting the fuse to a bomb. And therefore, there has to be grave concern about restraint on this thing.

The Israeli thing is a very complicated mess, because most of what's said about it, doesn't get to the hard truth. There's a real hard truth underneath, and that goes back to the question of imperial powers, of which Israel is a pawn. But in this case, right now, the Netanyahu factor is a danger. If Netanyahu were the Prime Minister, and were in control of Israeli capabilities, it is not impossible that George Shultz would push him to do it.

It's not certain that he would do it. For example, the former Prime Minister of Israel would not do it, for completely pragmatic reasons. Just wouldn't do it: Sharon would not do it. But he's now out of the picture, and this brings Netanyahu, who is a very dangerous character, into the picture.

Hübschen: To make an addition from a military standpoint: We also have to see the difference between theory and practice. Theoretically, Israel is able to destroy nuclear capabilities in Iran, there's no doubt. I think they have basically three options to do it: They can do it with aircraft, carrying the weapons; they can do it, I think, also with missiles. And, as Mr. LaRouche said, that means land-based missiles. And there is talk that they are also able to do it from submarines (I don't know if that is true or not). But that is the theory.

We can not compare the Israeli option in 2006, with the option they had 1981 with Iraq. Iraq, that was a highly professional military action, there's no doubt; but it was not that complicated. You need a couple of aircraft, you can go a direct way, and drop the bomb, and that's it. And as I said, I don't know very much about the Iranian atomic program in details, but I think it is absolutely evident that the installations are spread over the whole country. And it's also evident that they have underground installations, and that is much more difficult to crack. It depends how deep it is, and how thick the concrete is.

So, theoretically, they have the option. Practically, not. . . .

The Hamas Factor

Q: . . . How real is the threat from Hamas and Iran against Israel? . . .

Hübschen: . . . Hamas showed up for the first time, since it came into existence, for official elections. And what they expected was, that they probably could make a coalition with the Fatah, to govern Palestine. And then a big surprise: They won! They won with a majority of two-thirds. And I really can imagine that they were sitting there, saying, "Oh,

my God! How can we manage it? How can we manage it? Who can become Prime Minister? Who will run the Ministry of Foreign Affairs? What about the whole administration?" Because, don't forget, Hamas members are living in exile, for example, in Amman. They are not allowed to come back (that's the guy who's travelling around now to tell other countries what Hamas is really thinking). There are others who are sitting in the West Bank, and they are not allowed to go to Gaza, and the other way around, because Israel can block it.

So, what I want to say is: There is a political program of Hamas. I personally reject that program totally, because they don't accept the existence of Israel, and that is absolutely stupid, there is no doubt. But that is an old program! And remember—the young ones here probably can't remember, but the oldies here, hey, we remember—what about the image of the Fatah, and the PLO of Arafat? The first standpoint was, "No, with these kinds of people, we don't talk! They're all terrorists!" And it ends up in Oslo, when Arafat received the *Friedensnobelpreis* [Nobel Peace Prize].

So, this shows us that it is absolutely stupid, from the first point on, to say, "No, there's no talk." Let them settle themselves down, and then talk to them, and give your conditions, in a way that you say, "If you want to become a member of the club, you have to accept the conditions." And one condition is definitely, that they accept the existence of Israel—but definitely in the borders of 1967, because that is written in UN Resolution 242. And I'm convinced that talks with Hamas are possible. But not in a way that you say, "Okay, before we talk with you, you fulfill first, second, third." That's the way we are definitely dealing with these kinds of countries, and that is definitely wrong.

LaRouche: You talk with them. They're the elected government. You talk with them because they're elected, period. You don't care what their conditions are, you talk to them. Because that's the basis, that's the way you begin. That's the way you get peace.

You know, peace is generally negotiated between enemies; therefore, you're going to meet your enemy. You're going to talk with him. You're trying to get peace. You won the war, you still have to settle it. You have to negotiate with the people who are submitting. You lose the war, you have to negotiate. You have no choice. This is the point where diplomacy comes in. Open the doors, discuss, and have some vision of a long view of where humanity's going. And if it takes 10 years, it take 50 years, you still do it. You do it, because the alternative is terrible.

To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com