

# Dialogue Continues by E-Mail After Berlin

*Of the many questions and comments that came in to the Berlin webcast both before and during the Sept. 6 event, from international scientists, political leaders, and others, the following were answered by Mr. LaRouche after the webcast, by e-mail, as of Sept. 12.*

## Russia

**Yuri Krupnov**, chairman of the Organizing Committee to Prepare, Convoke, and Conduct a Constituent Congress of the Party of Development; chairman of the Supervisory Council of the World Development Institute Moscow, Sept. 5 (translated by *EIR*):

Dear Mr. LaRouche,

First of all, allow me to express my gratitude for your tireless work in the interest of all humanity, on organizing world development. Today Russia knows you well, as an outstanding economist and political figure of our day, a genuine leader for mankind. We wish you strong health; in Russia we often talk about a "Siberian constitution" and the longevity of the Caucasus.

We fully share your concern over global deindustrialization, and we believe that it is necessary to organize a world coalition for industrial development, right away. Only through the decisive development of advanced industry, together with the development of education and science, will it be possible to save the world from a fatal global monetary and financial crisis, and from permanent world war, and provide a decent life for the peoples of the world.

The Party of Development, which is currently being created in Russia, has begun to organize a Russian coalition for industrial development. What would you think about our organizations, yours and ours, jointly undertaking to create a world coalition for industrial development?

Respectfully yours,

Yuri V. Krupnov

**LaRouche:** I welcome your suggestion of cooperation. I illustrate my view of that matter by the following observations.

The mission, as I see it presently, has the following principal parameters.

1. National sovereignty as the cultural foundation of the development of the creative mental powers of a people through use of the shared ironies of their cultural legacy.

2. Understanding of the functional distinctions of, and interconnections among the abiotic, Biosphere, and Noösphere domains of physical action.

3. The related present division of labor defined by the

uneven and unequal developments among various sections of the planet, up to the present time.

4. The understanding of the role of, and need to foster, the development of those potentials of the human individual which are lacking in the lower forms of life. The role of cultures and their development in seeking a state of parity among cultures of differing prior histories of experience and related development. The promotion of the sense of an immortality unique to the members of the human species, as the motivating impulse for progress in mankind's role in the universe.

5. The mission of increasing the physical well-being and productivity of successive generations of populations, as measurable per capita and per square kilometer of area.

6. The presently urgent necessity of seeing man in his emerging creative role in the Solar System and beyond as the destiny of our species.

7. The mastery of the theoretical and practical function of the conception of dynamic processes in life in general and in the appropriate management of economies and their development.

8. The clarification of the respective, interdependent roles of capital improvements in basic economic infrastructure and of production of particular goods, in the management of the boundary conditions within both national economies and life on our planet as a whole.

When those and related considerations are taken into account, it appears to me that the proper orientation for relations among nations and peoples of our planet is, at least approximately, the following.

There are three principal zones of close cooperation among sovereign nation-states of the planet. These are, principally, the obvious, functional categories of Eurasia, the Americas, and Africa.

The pivotal feature of mission-orientation among the regions within those continental systems is very long-term physical-capital investment in essential basic economic infrastructure. This provides the stimulant and basis for development of industries around the realization of the needed development of infrastructure. These two considerations provide the platform on which the increase of the physical productive powers of labor through scientific and technological progress may be organized efficiently.

The cooperation of the developing continents of Eurasia and the Americas in providing necessary assistance for the equitable development of the presently raped continent of Africa, affords mankind in general a sense of both a moral and a practical goal for the participating role of development within all of the continents and comparable smaller regions.

The essential moral issue posed to statecraft today, is the need to rise above negative definitions of rival self-interests, to the Westphalian Principle: the urgency of satisfying the meeting of the interests of the other. It is not relief from pain which motivates the human personality, but the joy of participating in promoting a better quality of the outlook and conduct of future generations within our species at large.



Courtesy of Yuri Krupnov

*Yuri Krupnov proposes that the LaRouche movement join with his Party of Development “to undertake a world coalition for industrial development.”*

We have come to the end of a time when warfare was considered a standard for crafting strategy. Today, when the sheer destructive effect of asymmetric warfare destroys so-called conventional warfare practices, prevention of avoidable warfare is the obvious priority. Better than preventive action of such obvious forms, is changing the physical-economic and cultural environment through intended effects upon the passions of high rates of scientific-technological progress, especially fundamental scientific progress: a complementary way of expressing the “Westphalian Principle.”

The points so arrayed are intended to suggest the needed rich opportunities for change in the prevalent strategies of our planet.

—Lyndon

**Prof. Yelena Borisova**, Moscow, coordinator of the Anti-Globalist Resistance, Sept. 6 (translated by *EIR*):

The Second All-Russian Forum of Anti-Globalists adopted the Leningrad Charter, “An Answer to the Challenges of the 21st Century.” It includes a call, based on the works of Mr. LaRouche, to restrict the sale of financial derivatives and change the world monetary system. Also included are points on the need to ban advertising (except in specialized publications), and several others. How realistic do you think it is for your and our proposals to be implemented, under current conditions? How can this be accomplished?

**LaRouche:** The excitement of the creative potentials of the generation which must carry the mission of the coming two generations—of the coming fifty years—is crucial.

Since the death of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, the dominant trend in the Americas and Europe, in particular, has been a post-1945 cult of Sophistry akin to that which led the Greece of Pericles into its self-destruction, through its crimes against the people of Melos, into the full spread of the Peloponnesian War. We must reverse that kind of effect which

has ruined the hopes we had at the close of the defeat of Hitler’s forces.

Presently, I am pushing for the immediate reproduction of the Sept. 6th event, including a DVD. The point is to promote the discussion of that event and its preparations, in preparing for a new Berlin-Washington, D.C. event for very late October, or very early November. I hope to foster the growth of the discussion process to the degree needed to make this useful for discussions within and among governments.

—Lyndon

**Sergei Usoltsev**, Moscow Ye.L. Shiffers Institute for Advanced Studies, Sept. 6 (translated by *EIR*):

Dear Mr. LaRouche,

A key point of your program for a way out of the systemic world crisis is the world infrastructure development project, known as the Eurasian Land-Bridge. John Perkins’ popular book, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*, however, makes clear that infrastructure projects may act not only as a means of developing a country, but sometimes rather as a way to loot and enslave a country. In this connection, I would like you to explain your position on the following questions:

1. Do you think that the strategic partnership between the U.S.A. and Saudi Arabia ought to be taken as a model for international cooperation?

- If yes, what are the benefits that will accrue to each side in the long term (25-50 years)? Won’t the result be, that a country entering into partnership with the U.S.A. will end up with no means to pay for maintaining its infrastructure, such that it will be forced to bargain, using its long-term capabilities (i.e., to make decisions favorable for the U.S.A., though they harm the partner country’s ability to develop)?

- If no, then what are the fundamental flaws in the “U.S.A.-Saudi Arabia” model of international cooperation and in the infrastructure projects that have been built within the framework of this model? How does your alternative propose to eliminate any shortcomings that you would identify?

2. Does your long-term economic development program necessarily presume the continuation (for natural reasons, or political ones) of U.S. and Western European technological leadership (i.e., that these countries will possess the most advanced technologies, in the historical long term) and technological domination by these countries (i.e., that these will be the countries that determine the rules and procedures for other countries to have access to various technological packages)? Or do you, rather, allow for the possibility that other countries will achieve technological leadership positions? If so, then what do they need to do, to make this happen? How do you propose to solve the problem of the uncontrolled emergence of superpowers (like the U.S.S.R., thanks to American aid in the 1920s and 1930s, or China, thanks to Soviet assistance in the 1940s and 1950s)? Or do you not see this as a problem?

**LaRouche:** Thank you for the questions.

1. I am treating the entire region affected by the legacy of

the Sykes-Picot arrangements (Southwest Asia) as a single phase-space now being plunged into a spreading form of escalating asymmetric warfare. No ordinary diplomatic negotiations, nation by nation, will accomplish much of durable value. There must be an approach to the entirety of the region; but, that must be situated within the global realities of the present threat of a mixture of terrible warfare and a general economic-breakdown-crisis planet-wide.

2. The emergence of modern European civilization, which occurred during the first half of the Fifteenth Century, produced both the commonwealth notion of the sovereign nation typified in practice by France's Louis XI and England's Henry VII, but also the forces of the reactionary Venetian financier-oligarchy that launched the Grand Inquisitor Tomás de Torquemada, and a virtually global form of anti-Semitism and killing of Muslims like that which Venice and the Norman chivalry had launched in the effort to uproot the civilizing legacy of Charlemagne's system.

However, the included net result was the eruption of modern experimental science by Nicholas of Cusa and such of his professed followers as Luca Pacioli, Leonardo da Vinci, and Johannes Kepler. Since the religious wars of 1492-1648, European civilization has been internally divided between, chiefly, the neo-Venetian followers of Venice's Paolo Sarpi on the one side, and the legacy of Kepler, Leibniz, and the American Revolution on the opposing side. Nonetheless, despite that awful division within European culture, the progress of science and technology in the Cusa-Kepler-Leibniz-Gauss-Riemann tradition, as coupled with relics of the anti-oligarchical commonwealth conception of the sovereign nation-state, has given European culture a superior capacity for scientific and technological progress, a capacity which must be reawakened and harvested today.

On this account, Russia's development as a Eurasian culture with the attributes of the scientific development from Peter the Great's visits to Freiberg Academy through the role exemplified by Vernadsky, qualifies Russia to play the role of a Eurasian link between East and West. This link's development now, is crucial for the survival of civilized life on this planet today.

—Lyndon

## Belarus

**Yuri Tsarik**, Minsk, chairman of the "Arks" Intellectual Club at Belarus State University, and an associate of the World Development Institute in Moscow, Sept. 5 (translated by *EIR*):

Since LaRouche's ideas, and especially the key questions of this conference, are of critical importance for Belarus, we decided to organize a Round Table on "New Opportunities for Russia's World Policy: the View from Berlin, Moscow, and Minsk."

Here is a question from conference participants in Belarus, where a round table is taking place at this time, on problems related to building a just world order, and a new



EIRNS/Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

*Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad, former Prime Minister of Malaysia, sent the conference a message, via his aide, regretting that he could not attend due to other commitments. "He sends his apologies and regards to Mr. LaRouche."*

world policy for Russia:

Mr. LaRouche, in the context of the discussion of how to get out of the economic and financial crisis, and how to preserve military and political stability, what economic, social, and political development perspectives could and should be proposed by Russia, as a potential Eurasian leader, as well as by Germany and other leading powers in the region, for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe: that is, Belarus, Ukraine, Poland, Slovakia, the Baltic countries, etc.? Thank you.

**LaRouche:** Let us explore practical ways for accomplishing those objectives in a preliminary way. I have three short-term objectives for movement in that direction.

1. We shall be processing the product of the Berlin conference of Sept. 6th during the present week. This will result in a DVD production, in which the audio-visual product from the Berlin meeting will be supplemented by my response to questions which did not get into the three-hour limit on the Berlin-Washington, D.C. webcast event. That is intended to serve as discussion material for the next event.

2. We are planning a next Berlin event for either later October or very early November.

3. I presume that there will be discussion by mail and otherwise during the month and a half preceding the next Berlin webcast.

4. Also, there are politically tectonic ruptures to be expected planet-wide during this approximate interval.

Therefore, the U.S. participation, in that way, in discussion centered on relevant places in Eurasia, should draw in sufficient participation from various places and institutions, to provide governments with a fresh view of strategic options for this planet during the immediate months and years ahead.

I am most concerned with the development of a generation of young adults, now in the 18-25 and 26-30-year intervals, as the generation to lead over the duration of the coming fifty years. The self-development of leading representatives from that generation should be a focal point of reference. After all,

the purpose is to build the future; this suggests that the people who will be working over that interval are the generation to which the immediate goals, and self-development are assigned.

—Lyndon

Another question from **Yuri Tsarik**, Minsk, e-mailed during the webcast, Sept. 6:

A question from a group of students in Belarus. Mr. LaRouche, what perspectives and projects do you think should be proposed to the youth of European countries, so that the young people, out of a factor of social and political instability, could become a moving force of development of their countries and of world development? And what are the plans of the LaRouche Youth Movement in that connection? Thank you.

**LaRouche:** An actual solution for the presently escalating world crisis depends upon the degree we develop the needed qualities of leadership for the future, now, among the 18-30-year-old generation of young adults. I place special emphasis on a particular approach to mastery of the most crucial of the valid steps of progress in physical science since the ancient Pythagoreans (such as Archytas) and Plato, and approach the continuation of that history as modern science as typified by the span from Kepler through Riemann.

The present world crisis must take into account the deadly threat from the poverty of approximately three-quarters of the people of our planet. This requires a very high rate of increase of emphasis on basic economic infrastructure and production technology. This means that the limited number of qualified scientists working today is a great problem for mankind as a whole. We must build a generation of future leaders in progress from among a large part of the young adults in the age-interval between 18 and 30.

This must be done by placing emphasis on national sovereignty and national cultures, since the culture of a people is the basis on which the development of the creative powers of the great part of the entire population depends. Therefore, the approach must be based upon cooperation in common world goals through the promotion of the development of sovereign nationalities.

—Lyndon

## Armenia

**Hrant Khachatryan**, Member of the Armenian Parliament:

Dear Mr. LaRouche,

Our best greetings to you from Constitutional Rights Union party of Armenia. Regional problems are becoming more dangerous with respect to the war in Lebanon. Your opinion please about future development around problems in the U.S., Europe, Russia, Iran, Syria, and Lebanon in this World-Historical Moment.

Best wishes,

Hrant Khachatryan

**LaRouche:** Thank you for the message. I would hope we

have the opportunity to meet again soon. There is much to discuss in the pursuit of a clearer understanding of the way in which to bring national cultures into the needed forms of cooperation.

—Lyndon

## China

**A Chinese editor:** Since globalization goes so fast and most governments of the world are not fully prepared, would there be a global government in the near future? As I am going to Helsinki for the 6th Asia Europe Summit, I think of the possibility that influential world organizations such as ASEM and APEC would gradually emerge and form a kind of global government. Is it possible? Thank you.

**LaRouche:** It is not possible. “Globalization” is a recent name for what used to be called “imperialism”: the elimination of the sovereignty of the people, and the attempted establishment of a form of oligarchical society under whose rule most of the population is degraded to the life of an ignorant lower form of animal life, as under the ancient Babylonian, Roman, Byzantine, and medieval *ultramontane* forms of a pro-bestial oligarchical culture—in which the sovereignty of a people is outlawed by an empire, an empire such as the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system which came into being as the world-leading imperialist/oligarchical trend with the February 1763 Treaty of Paris.

—Lyndon