

LaRouche called for a 'New Marshall Plan'

In a strategic policy document published in the Sept. 12 and Sept. 19, 1986 issues of EIR, Lyndon LaRouche analyzed the currently circulating proposals for a "New Marshall Plan," from the standpoint of the Soviet threat to the region represented by Syria's President Hafez al-Assad. Titled "Proposed U.S. strategic doctrine for the contingency of a Syrian war against Israel," the article stressed that an end to the "grisly past state of Middle East conflict has been made a realistic option by the simultaneity of 'New Marshall Plan' proposals issued from Israel and Egypt." Although Prime Minister Shimon Peres was the initiator of the proposal from Israel's side, support for such an approach was much broader at that time. LaRouche called—unsuccessfully—for the United States to promote such a policy, thereby virtually assuring a favorable outcome. We publish here an excerpt from LaRouche's lengthy document.

The strategic importance of the plan

All the most essential strategic objectives of a New Marshall Plan, are summed up as of two types, material and spiritual, respectively. Materially, we must foster an unending increase in the productive powers of labor, to foster stronger economies, and to provide the economic-technological basis for an adequate defense. Spiritually, we must defeat the current rise of cultural pessimism, and irrationalism, among the peoples of the region. Cultural optimism is fostered, by embedding a credible, and sound hope of a better life for grandchildren in the daily practice of nations. Rationality is fostered, by the experience of the benefits of scientific and technological progress in the practice of daily life. . . .

It is not the desire of the U.S.A., that Israel's military forces should go forever rampaging victoriously throughout the region: directly the contrary. Our policy must be a durable peace between Israel and the Arabs. Nor is it our proper desire, that the cultural discrepancy should be maintained, or widened. It must be narrowed, not by lowering the standard of Israel, but by encouraging the Arab nations to raise the level of education and technological practice of their populations. . . .

The possibility of such a new order of peace, is conditional upon practical steps toward resolution of causes for a continued conflict between Israel and an autonomous agency representative of Palestinian Arabs. That bone in

Such is the condition of the infrastructure for the Middle East, including Israel. Israel cannot accommodate its new, augmented population without a major transformation in infrastructure—it just is untenable. You cannot solve the problem with only housing; you need new infrastructure in the form of transportation, energy, water management, and so forth. For Israel and for Jordan, what comes to mind immediately are such projects as the Dead Sea development. A channel from the Mediterranean into the Dead Sea, which performs the function of being a new industrial center, for the obvious mining and metal processing and other industry, which is based on a combination of water and nuclear energy as the basis for an industrial boom in that region, shared among the peoples who live from Jordan, and the Dead Sea, all the way down to the Gulf. The production of so valuable a commodity as water, by means employing, as its energy basis, or power basis, high-temperature gas-cooled nuclear reactors, is the obvious central proposition for that region, which could be the beginning of a greening of the Middle East on a larger scale. By entering into cooperative agreements on economic development, with a group of local powers in the region, we create an economic common interest on which political agreements may be premised.

The other aspect to be considered in an Oasis Plan for the Middle East, is that unless we provide rational solutions, particularly those based on the wonders of science and technological progress, then the result must be mass insanity. If the rational world is not provided to the desperate, then they will seek solace and power in the ultimate irrationality. That's the lesson of history; that's the lesson of what is happening in the Arab world from the Atlantic outposts of the Islamic world, toward the East. Unless we change the course of events, we go down.

As part of the same package, therefore, such projects as, say, a high-speed rail project between Dakar, Senegal, and Djibouti, along an old project—over 120 years old in design—could be implemented, changing the prospects for the Sahel region, the sub-Saharan nations, and so forth, and make possible the otherwise impossible: The reversal of the expansion of the Sahara desert and the beginning of development. The opening of large-scale water projects in Africa, including the rational use of the excess of rainfall upon Zaire, for the nations to its north—these kinds of things must be done. Even though these are somewhat beyond the range of the Middle East per se, they are nonetheless part of the project which immediately affects it.

the throat must be removed.

There can be no political solution to that problem, without something akin to a New Marshall Plan. There is too much silly chatter these days, about “political freedom,” and sundry “political rights,” without taking into account that rights without material substance, are no rights at all. There are those impassioned by the mere name of political rights for black Africans, and whose policies consign these rights to be celebrated in a vast cemetery, of famine, epidemic disease, petty tyrannies of unimaginable brutishness, and strife like that which Uganda has already suffered, stretching from sub-Saharan Africa to the Cape of Good Hope. Our hysterical liberals scream to award political rights—but only to dead black Africans.

It is a not-uncommon, but foolish proposition, that “political solutions” for such Middle East problems as the Palestinian Question, could be, or even should be found, without considering agreements on programs of adequate economic development. Or, we hear the objection: “First we must solve the political question; then, we shall begin to discuss economic development.”

Mountains of bodies of black Africans are piling up; possibly, soon, half or more the population-level of black Africa entirely. It would be an hypocrisy worthy of Adolf Hitler, to say that the present spiral of genocide in black Africa, is the result of anything but the wickedness of

combined practices of commission and omission by international financial agencies and OECD governments. However, African governments and political movements have contributed to the success of this genocide, by failing to ally around the issue of economic development, as primary; failing effective cooperation on the issues of economic development, all “political solutions” remind one of a desperately hungry family demanding the right to order food from the waiter in a high-priced restaurant, when that family has no means to purchase such nourishment.

The central issue of political affairs in the Middle East, is the positive spiritual impact of economic development. To reach a rational political solution, the two or more parties involved, must each be rational.

In dealing with governments, it is not sufficient that those governments’ representatives be rational. If large, insurgency-prone political forces menace the stability of a government, it may be the case that the government will behave irrationally to placate such a movement within its own nation; or, if the government behaves rationally at the bargaining-table, defying an insurgent irrationalist force in its own nation, that irrationalist force may become the government. If an agreement is reached with a rational government, and that government is soon toppled by an irrationalist political force, the agreement is predominantly a failure.

The economic road to peace

These kinds of things should be done, things which I’ve proposed over the years, from 1974 all the way to the present, as Middle East solutions. I say again, that I’ve been told, repeatedly, that an economic-based solution is not possible, that you must have a political solution first and then bring in an economic-based solution. My experience of the past 16 years in particular, and my study of the experience of the years before this, says: Those who have insisted upon a political solution first, before considering an economic alternative, have failed. That experiment has failed.

We must have the economic basis established, and establish the political agreements on the basis of those political agreements being imperative to establishing the necessary economic cooperation and to achieving the benefits of that economic cooperation.

Therefore, I would say in summation, that we must have these solutions as the alternative to the kind of malthusian, neo-malthusian Dark Age solution imposed as the so-called peace plan by the superpowers—the Anglo-Americans and the Soviets—upon the Middle East. Otherwise, we get hell for all concerned, and because of the follies of the parties in the Middle East which reject this alternative, which accept

the Anglo-American-Soviet peace plan, they will find themselves with the same fate as the brave leaders of the forces which sank in the swamps of the Thirty Years’ War. We must have it.

The opposition to an economic solution comes mainly from two sources: from the environmentalist fanatics—the Nazis of the 1990s are the environmentalist fanatics, including their animal rights fanatics, who are determined to destroy Judaism and Christianity for the sake of the pagan Mother Earth goddess whom they worship. That is the Nazism of the 1990s. The other opponent is Adam Smith and his kind: the assumption that we must maintain, perpetuate the present monetary and financial structures which ought to be swept from the face of the Earth in mass bankruptcy.

The very fact that mass bankruptcy is erupting, in the existing monetary institutions, creates the opportunity for establishing alternatives, in the form of Hamiltonian, shall we say, national banking. So, therefore, if we are sufficiently determined, and as determined as fear of inaction motivates us to be, then we shall move seriously on an Oasis Plan for the Middle East, and use the Oasis Plan as the basis for a political solution, a political solution as an alternative to a new Thirty Years’ War, a new Dark Age, in that region.