

Editorial

LaRouche: World Needs a New Treaty of Westphalia

Speaking in Berlin on Jan. 12, before an audience of 75 scholars, politicians, and government officials from a score of countries of Eurasia, Africa, and the Americas, the American political economist Lyndon LaRouche issued a call for a new Treaty of Westphalia. In his keynote remarks at a two-day seminar addressing the Eurasian crisis, LaRouche warned that the planet faces a plunge into a New Dark Age, unless governments can reach a new set of strategic agreements, premised on the need for cooperation to lift the world up from the current poverty. LaRouche concluded his opening speech with the following profound call to action:

“So therefore, my view is, that the way we can get at a Eurasian culture, is take this crisis, right now—the system is coming down; the American System, or a return to a Bretton Woods-style of fixed-exchange-rate system, is feasible. But this time, as an integral part of that, we have to recognize, we’re up against the point which, without development of the management of natural resources, we’re not going to be able to meet the needs and aspirations of the peoples of the world, as a whole.

“And therefore, we must take the fact, that we’re at a boundary condition. The planet is being strained by a lack of development. We have population growing, but a lack of development. . . . Russia is a key part of the Russia-India-China partnership for Asia. Russia is a partner, with Western Europe, in these enterprises.

“Therefore, is there not a common interest which has several features? Do we not require, that western Europe—say, typified by Germany, where we’re standing here, today—must go back to becoming a high-technology exporter of goods, high-technology goods? Because *Asia needs that technology*. Why should Europe try to compete to get back markets from Asia? It’s crazy! Why does not Europe, as the United States, take the responsibility of developing *its people*, and its capabilities, for the kinds of technological *frontier development in technology*, which are needed for the peoples of the world as a whole?

“Why not think of a constructive, mutually benefi-

cial *division of labor*, rather than competition? Why not recognize, that in contributing to the common good, to the general welfare first, as the Treaty of Westphalia prescribed, that we find a greater advantage for ourselves than in trying to compete, in competing advantages *against* one another in a world market?

“Why can’t we learn to cooperate?

“This means, of course, a change in the way that we look at the individual in society, today. It means the death of what has been called ‘environmentalism’ . . .

“We have to now think in terms of what is good for the planet, from the standpoint of the working scientist, who says, we must develop the means to cope with any problem which presents itself to us, or to humanity in general. If we are willing to dump this mysticism, this crazy Satanic cult of ecology, and get back to becoming what Europe was at its best, a repository of technological and scientific progress, then we can educate our populations accordingly—and we can do things: We can create new industries.

“What we need now is, of course, a series—in this new period—of treaty agreements among nations, long-term treaty agreements of 25- to 50-year duration, for capital formation. And the way we can muster the capital, is by creating long-term loans, with the aid of governments, to fund, to provide credit to entrepreneurs and others, who will produce what is needed, as capital goods. This must be at low rates; it must be a fixed-exchange-rate system—you can’t do it otherwise. If you have a floating-exchange-rate system, you can not engage in long-term treaty agreements. You must have state treaty agreements, state-to-state; or multi-state treaty agreements, 25 to 50 years’ term, as blanket agreements which cover a lot of smaller agreements, smaller projects.

“These treaty agreements then become like a banking facility: They issue loans, which they think meet the purpose of their institution, in assisting the progress of this enterprise, that enterprise, and so forth, which they think is going to fulfill the purposes of their agreement.”