

anarchy from which the invading country may not easily be able to distance itself—neither morally nor legally or politically, not to speak of the heavy burden on the occupier's economy. Unfortunately, the entire world has now been drawn into that confrontation, and the United Nations Organization is being used as a tool of legitimization.

As explained earlier, because of the course of events on the global level, the Arabs have become victims—and to a certain extent, this is a predicament of their own making—of an imperial policy of *divide et impera*. According to my rather pessimistic assessment, it may take a rather long time until they will be able to overcome the state of re-colonization under which they now have to exist.

Another Victim: Europe

But there is another, unexpected victim of that policy of *divide and rule*, and that is Europe: As far as the war against Iraq is concerned, we Europeans—and that relates to the member states of the European Union—were not able to speak with a unified voice. Some of the major members of the European Union have sided with the United States of America and have joined the “Coalition of the Willing,” undermining all efforts towards a joint European foreign and defense policy. For that reason, I am personally not very optimistic about the prospects of a cohesive foreign policy of the enlarged European Union, which is now being envisaged within the framework of the very ambitious project of the European Constitution. It may take a rather long time until we here in Europe will recover from that set-back.

Irrespective of this rather bleak assessment of international relations at the present stage, I do share the values which have been pronounced in this meeting, in regard to peaceful co-existence between states on the basis of sovereign equality and mutual respect among all nations. The International Progress Organization, which I represent here, has rather similarly spoken of the idea of progress in its founding declaration of October 1972. We understand progress not merely in the sense of material advancement, but as being based on enlightenment through the broadening of one's intellectual and spiritual horizon, which will in turn pave the ground for genuine open-mindedness towards other civilizations, cultures and religions.¹⁰ We have understood this kind of intellectual advancement, in terms of an awareness of common human val-

ues, as the basis of progress also in the fields of economy and politics.

I thank you for your attention.

Dialogue With LaRouche

Anglo-Dutch Liberalism Is the Real Problem

During the afternoon panel of Jan. 12, the discussion included the following remarks by Lyndon LaRouche, on the role of the United Nations. The panel was moderated by Michael Liebig.

Michael Liebig: There have been two questions from German representatives here, who ask, “On the role of the United Nations, how to improve it, how to redefine it, and what your thoughts are?”

Lyndon LaRouche: Well, let's take the UN first, because it's rather simple. The definition of the UN was originally prescribed by President Franklin Roosevelt—before the thing was actually convened. Now, the intention of Roosevelt, was to extend the Westphalia principle to really what I would call today, a “second Westphalia principle.” Which means, that the world's peoples, each represented by their own nation-state, independent nation-state, should undergo a period of cooperative development to the benefit of the world as a whole; that each nation should commit itself to that development. And there should be an institutional framework for coordination among independent nations. Not a world government, as Russell and others proposed.

But, a concert of nations, a forum—the weakness in that, in my experience, is the typical case, as my indirect role in the Colombo, Sri Lanka [Non-Aligned Movement] conference in 1976, in which something for which we'd been campaigning for two years, happened. And in the closing part of the resolution, on economics, there was a resolution passed by the great majority of the members as the Colombo conference. By the time the subsequent UN meeting occurred in the Autumn, Fred Wills, then the Foreign Minister of Guyana, was the only person who spoke in defense and support of a Non-Aligned nations resolution which the great majority of the members had previously voted for, enthusiastically.

The weakness of the UN, is that, with the Security Council system, it became a failure. Now, you do need, in a sense, a security agency like the Security Council. It should, however, be more representative, and not like what it was there—what it has been up to now.

But the problem is, that the weaker nations, the smaller nations, are inefficiently represented in respect to their own

10. Cf. the definition of “progress” the Founding Declaration of the IPO (Innsbruck, Oct. 30, 1972): “Progress means striving to perfect human nature in such a manner that man would be enabled: a) to attain the greatest possible insight (reflexion); b) to meet his fellowmen with tolerance in the realms of the theoretical (ideology) as well as the practical (politics). This tolerance would have to be born out of the theoretical knowledge and perception that should be achieved to the greatest possible degree; c) on the basis of this knowledge man should be enabled to form his physical surrounding in such a manner that the biological assets may be safeguarded not only for the survival of mankind but would be equally apt to form our world in such a way that would give happiness to the individual as well.”

interests, in the proceedings of the UN as a whole. It is not really the body of independent people it should be.

The problem here, is not a problem with the UN. The UN conception, I think, was an excellent one in the beginning. It was frustrated by the shift to the Cold War by Truman and company. This is what ruined it.

But the other part of the thing, is that, today, since 1971-72, the world has lived under an Anglo-Dutch Liberal tyranny. I mean, this is the elephant in the middle of the bedroom, right? In the middle of the bed. There *is* no independent government on this planet! None. The governments are controlled by independent central banking systems, which in turn are controlled by an IMF system. They run the world. You have the case of the European Union, the European Central Bank: You don't have independent governments under the European Union today, because governments are not able to exert their sovereign powers.

Take the governments of continental Europe: A simple creation of credit, of the type that was used in the immediate post-war period with the help of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau in Germany—that type of credit today, could save Germany from the disaster which it faces! It would have eliminated the Hartz IV problem. Wouldn't have existed. You have similar things throughout Europe. Europe has plenty of major projects which have long-term value, which are viable projects, but you need a postponement of payment on capital account. Therefore, you have to create capital credit for large-scale infrastructure projects, which will immediately increase employment, expand production, raise the tax-revenue base—and you don't have a problem!

Germany, in its relationship with China, is a success. Germany is increasing its exports into Asia. But, it is not making enough money, at home, to sustain the economy at home. Why not? Because it's not allowed to. By whom? By the central bankers, as represented by the crazy Maastricht agreement.

So, you have a *supranational* power, an *empire*: What you are looking at, in Europe today, and the world as a whole, is like the Middle Ages! We have a *medieval system*, under which a Venetian financier-oligarchy, with military forces like the Norman chivalry, are terrorizing the world, and destroying all forms of representative government.

There's where the problem lies on this UN thing. What we need to do, is destroy that! And this system is crashing: Either the world has the *guts* to put the IMF into receivership *as bankrupt*, and have the nation-states take over, in a cooperative way, by treaty-agreement, to manage the IMF and other central banks in receivership. Under those conditions, to freeze things, to ensure that the economies go: to launch large-scale infrastructure projects which are useful, they're not make-work projects.

Look, the United States, for example. The typical life-span, physical life-span, of basic economic infrastructure is 40 to 50 years. Water systems: Now, Germany, for example,

where we are, has a lot of water systems. Those things have a life-span; they're valuable; they're essential to Europe. This thing which Charlemagne started, is essential—but it has to be renewed. Large-scale mass-transportation systems, like efficient rail, which is much better than jamming up the highways with trucks. It's cheaper; it's better; it's cleaner; it's more efficient. But, it's a 40- to 50-year investment. Power stations: power stations, a 40- to 50-year investment. These things are all useful. They change the environment. They make it possible to increase employment; the employment is not wasteful. You get an income flow into the economy from it. And you get an asset which increases the productive powers of the people in the economy. You can easily pay for that, over a 25- to 50-year period, in capital cycle.

So, governments are denied, what would be, in a rational system of sovereign nation-states, the ability to get out of this crisis. But, they're denied that, by whom? The government doesn't *dare* overthrow the tyrant, the so-called independent central banking system. Hmm?

So therefore, we're dealing with an international system, which is centered in the IMF; it is a group of private financier-oligarchs, who, in concert, control the IMF today; who commit most of the assassinations that are committed against important people in the world, using their thugs. This is the problem.

So, you talk about the problems between nation-states—the problem is not between nation-states: There's something *above* nation-states, to which nation-states are submitting in their relations. So, we need to re-establish the sovereign nation-state. And on that basis, re-establish a kind of community, like a new Treaty of Westphalia kind of agreement among nation-states. Then define, put on the table commonly, the list of projects which are needed; get nations to agree that they share agreement on these projects. Create the long-term international capital through a national basis, for these projects which are 40-50 years, largely—those are the leading projects. Hmm? And then, we can move!

Now then, you take that kind of program. You put *that* into the United Nations. Make the United Nations General Assembly *efficient*, as a mechanism in which small nations can be heard, and in which there are mechanisms for dealing with them. At present, the United Nations is a vehicle for *suppressing* the revolt of the smaller nations! Or the weaker nations. They say, "Don't put it through. Don't do it! Don't do it!" "Look, Brother, kill your project. We know you need it, but kill it. We want to have unanimity here. We want to get this regulation through, we want to get this agreement through."

And, as I say, I go back to 1976 to this experience, where the Non-Aligned nations group, in majority on the initiative of India, actually, adopted a resolution on a just new world economic order. *Nothing was done about it!* It was *suppressed* on the floor of the UN in the following September. And *that's* what's wrong with the UN.