

# LaRouche to the Arab world: how U.S. Mideast policy can be transformed

*The following interview with Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., conducted by Khaldoun Shamaa, was published on March 20 by the London-based Arabic magazine Ad Dastour:*

**Ad Dastour:** You have always followed events in the Middle East and in Iran in particular with great interest. Years ago, Kissinger elaborated the concept of a fundamentalist "arc of crisis." What was the rationale behind the present administration's following such a policy?

**LaRouche:** This is an example of a U.S. policy-area over which no postwar President has exerted any significant control. During Kissinger's period, under Nixon and Ford, this was known as the "Bernard Lewis Plan." Brzezinski named it the "Arc of Crisis"; President Carter called it "The Islamic Fundamentalism Card." Inside the United States, the policy is run from Princeton's Arab studies center, Georgetown, and the Aspen Institute, with operations run jointly by the Mossad and the Kissinger-Haig-Brzezinski faction inside the intelligence community. Although President Reagan has been manipulated into supporting secondary features of the policy, I doubt that the President has ever been informed of the existence of the policy as a whole.

Every report indicates, that the President's conscious role in this connection is limited to three particular considerations: 1) saving the lives of U.S. nationals taken hostage, almost at any price, as he was blackmailed by Moscow in the Daniloff case; 2) maintaining the special relationship with the Israelis; and 3) doing nothing to prevent his reaching what he would view as a successful summit agreement with Gorbachov before the end of 1988.

Kissinger's "rationale" is clear. Kissinger's controllers intend to disengage the United States from strategic commitments outside the Americas, and therefore see it as convenient to destroy the value of many among those regions of the world being abandoned, step by step, to Moscow's spheres of influence.

**Ad Dastour:** Doing so, the American administration has followed two policies at the same time, saying one thing publicly, doing something else through covert operations. As

a result, the United States did not win friends, but lost friends. What does that mean for a power like the United States? What will be the consequences of "Irangate" crisis?

**LaRouche:** I am cautiously optimistic about the "Irangate" crisis. It has already weakened Kissinger's apparatus inside the U.S. intelligence establishment, and has begun to chew away at the dirty apparatus around the AFL-CIO's international department and the Mossad-allied Heritage Foundation. Without crippling the power of these and allied power-blocs within our government, no significant degree of positive changes in policy-shaping could be expected.

**Ad Dastour:** One day the media are mobilized against Libya, while Syria is the actual culprit; another day Syria is accused, while Iran is responsible. How should international terrorism and the hostages-takers be dealt with?

**LaRouche:** To define the problem, we must first put the PLO to one side, as a special case. Israel has so far maintained a continuing state of war against the PLO, and insofar as PLO-related actions are addressed to that continuing state of war, such actions belong to that state of warfare, whether the actions are wisely selected or not.

"International terrorism," including that directed by Syria, Iran, and Libya, is primarily a Soviet-coordinated covert arm of irregular warfare against the United States and its allies. I say "primarily," because there are many complications in secondary and tertiary aspects of this general phenomenon. The Western European and U.S. governments are generally well aware of this set of facts, at least the higher levels of the intelligence services are. However, just because it is Soviet-directed overall, these governments treat terrorism as an area of "crisis management" relations with Moscow and its surrogates, rather than actually attempting to crush terrorism.

The way in which the United States reacts at any point in time, is partly a politically cosmetic action, designed to please angry public opinion in North America and Western Europe, without actually going far enough to damage current U.S., Western European, or Israeli back-channel and other negotiations with Moscow and Moscow's surrogates. That is the

chief reason for the inconsistencies.

As President, my response to terrorist actions against the United States or its citizens would be a crushing retaliation.

However, anti-terrorist actions must be situated in a clear and positive policy toward each and all of the nations of the region of North Africa and the Middle East. The effective use of the punitive instruments of justice, requires that the United States be demonstrably and consistently a trustworthy instrument of justice in its dealings with other nations. If the United States would take a consistently positive attitude toward the issue of securing justice for the Palestinian Arabs, and pressuring Israel to follow that course, and would strengthen the position of Islamic nations against the menace which Khomeini typifies, it would become much easier to deal with terrorism.

**Ad Dastour:** Do you think that there can be a push toward a settlement of the Palestinian question in the near future, such as through the forum of an international peace conference? The United States is not considered as an independent partner, but as part of the problem. How do you see the solution to that problem?

**LaRouche:** Until the 1973 war, an international peace conference might have had a useful impact, provided that the PLO and Israel were both brought to the conference table. Probably 1976, prior to the Likud victory, was the last actual opportunity for success in such an approach. In the context of today's East-West negotiations, and the deterioration of the quality of the situation inside Israeli politics, I have no confidence in such a conference's being proposed. Were I U.S. President, with my known policies, that fact alone would make things possible which have not been possible since the defeat of the Rogers Plan by Kissinger and his cronies.

The United States bears much of the blame for the degeneration of Israel's political life. Since Kissinger's role under Nixon and Ford, and through special agreements between President Carter and Israel, we have made Israel a creature of its international weapons-trafficking and related sordid trading abroad, to the effect of destroying the internal productive sectors of Israel's economy. The Israeli arms-trafficking interest would never make peace with the Palestinian Arabs. Therefore, as long as Israel's national income depends chiefly on the income of this interest, the likelihood of a peace process is at a minimum.

If the United States were to take Israel out of its arms-trafficking role, and promote a healthy internal economy in Israel, that would change the political potentials inside Israel for the better. That, combined with firm U.S. backing for a just peace, would provide some of the most essential preconditions for a negotiated peace. If the United States would commit itself to an effective form of what former Prime Minister Shimon Peres called a "New Marshall Plan," the prospects would be greatly improved.

**Ad Dastour:** The United States is a secular state by constitution; how is it that in dealing with the Middle Eastern region, it doesn't do so on basis of relations with states, or nation-states in the European sense, but rather does so on the basis of sectarianism? How can that be explained?

**LaRouche:** Over thousands of years to date, the "magicians" of the Middle East have recognized that the cheapest way to destroy a nation, is to turn neighbor against neighbor, and brother against brother, by exploiting to the maximum the differences among religious and ethnic groupings. That has been Soviet policy since the 1920 Baku Conference of the Communist International; that is also the policy of the "Bernard Lewis Plan."

**Ad Dastour:** You are a presidential candidate. If you were to be nominated and elected, what kind of foreign policy would you follow?

**LaRouche:** As President, my foreign policy is based on three leading considerations. 1) That the Russians are Russians, racists committed by mystical tradition to making Moscow the world-capital of a new, third Roman Empire. This imperial drive must be checked by a build-up of economic and strategic strength among all regions of the world threatened by Soviet imperial impulses. 2) That the combination of prolonged economic injustice for the developing sector, and recent erosion of the material welfare of the majority of people inside the OECD nations of Europe and North America, are the great injustice to be remedied during the decades ahead. 3) The principle that nation-states must be truly sovereign, not subject to foreign or supranational agencies.

My U.S. foreign policy is based upon a revival of the 1823 Monroe Doctrine, as that doctrine was defined by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams. Nations which share the principles of the 1776 U.S. Declaration of Independence, are to be treated as members of a community of principle, in common with the United States. Nations which do not choose to join that community of principle, but wish to collaborate with it, will be extended the benefits given to members of the community of principle. The promotion of the security and material well being of these two classes of sovereign states, is the foundation of the foreign policy and strategic commitments of the United States. Toward the remainder of the world, we proceed according to our notions of justice for sovereign nation states, with the desire to win those nations to choosing membership in our community of principle.

The center of the changes in general foreign policy I will make is twofold: 1) a new international monetary system, designed to promote technology transfer from industrialized to developing nations; 2) general and regional economic cooperation in promoting urgently needed major infrastructural development projects of water management, transportation, energy production and distribution, and urban development, to provide nations the needed foundations for increasing the

productive powers of labor in agriculture and industry.

For North Africa and the Middle East, the key is a large increase in water and very-high-temperature modes of production of industrial energy. With sufficient energy we can develop new water-resources for conquest of presently arid regions, building clean new cities, and building up agriculture to high levels of productivity and self-sufficiency for those nations. By the third decade of the next century, the conquest of the Sahara should be under way, using fusion energy supplies to make this an economical possibility.

**Ad Dastour:** You have proposed several projects for a world reorganization, in favor of a new world economic order on the subject of debt reorganization. Many think that this is utopian and cannot work. Then there have been the steps taken by Brazil. Do you think that such a program can be actualized? Is it realistic?

**LaRouche:** Taking into account the great power represented by those governments which have imposed IMF "conditionalities" upon developing nations, no positive change in monetary and economic relations was likely until the present international monetary system came to the brink of general collapse. In large degree, this is key to the likelihood of spread of the initiative just launched by Brazil; the international financial system is at the brink of a general collapse much more severe than that of 1931-32. Now, my proposed reforms, which have made me such a controversial figure in the eyes of leading bankers, are the only realistic alternative available. Either those reforms are forced through very soon, or the world will be plunged into a general dark age for perhaps a hundred years or more to come.

Ordinarily, governments as well as ordinary persons confuse money with wealth. Wealth is the improvement of the fertility of land, food, clothing, machinery, and so forth. The amount of such wealth per capita is the measure of a nation's wealth, and the productivity of labor measured in these terms, is the economic security of the nation. Money is a political instrument, which appears therefore to have power over wealth. Governments and persons therefore tend to mental habits which confuse money with wealth, seeing money as all-powerful. In a financial collapse, nations and persons are reminded that money is not wealth, but merely a political convenience in the organizing of purchases and sales. Wealth is reality, and money is useless unless there is wealth to buy.

The hysterics of Europe and North America threaten to cut off flows of money into Brazil. Brazil has no need of their money; it can produce and barter, and thus have more wealth per capita, than were it to submit to the creditors' conditions for receiving a variety of money which is falling in value, and too expensive to buy. If the U.S. banks are to be bailed out of their threatened bankruptcy, the U.S. government will have to accept the terms Brazil is offering. In this and related ways, events are demonstrating, that it is my critics who have been unrealistic: I believe in real wealth, and base my policies on that knowledge.

## Who Killed Olof Palme?

A Classical KGB  
Disinformation Campaign:

NBC-TV and the Soviet military daily *Krasnaya Zvezda* both blame LaRouche. . . .

Swedish Police Chief Hans Holmér suppresses major lines of inquiry, becomes a laughingstock. . . .

Twelve Stockholm investigators resign from the case, in protest against Holmér's cover-up. . . .

The British press breaks the story of Emma Rothschild's love affair with Palme—and the possibility that her father is a Soviet spy. . . .

*What's the real story?*

Read *EIR's* Special Report,  
available for \$100 from EIR News Service,  
P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

## Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of  
Executive  
Intelligence  
Review

Order from:  
**Ben Franklin  
Booksellers, Inc.**  
27 South King St.  
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$4.95 plus ship-  
ping (\$1.50 for  
first book, \$.50 for  
each additional  
book). Bulk rates  
available.

