

How peace could have been established in the Mideast

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

This statement was issued by the candidate on Jan. 14.

I'm speaking in light of the past weekend's events, on the subject, implicitly, of how peace could have been obtained in the Middle East, and in terms of events of more than 15 years ago in which I was directly involved.

I refer to my discussions with Mr. Haider of the Iraqi National Command, and my discussions with Palestinian and Israeli representatives immediately following those discussions in Baghdad back in 1975. My case to Mr. Haider and to the Iraqi command generally, was as follows:

It is necessary to understand the deeper interests of the Israelis, in order to find there a common interest upon which genuine peace between Israelis and Palestinians immediately, and the Arabs generally, may be developed.

I pointed out to the Iraqis what was obvious to them, that among Arabs they were not unique, but distinctive in their emphasis upon the right to, and importance of, scientific and technological progress in national economic development. And I indicated, of course, my strong sympathies for that policy for the Arab world as a whole.

Then I said to Dr. Haider, "Well, the Israelis essentially have the same view, from their own standpoint. They are a people largely representing Western European culture, on a small piece of land, whose very existence in sustaining their population depends upon scientific and technological progress. The Palestinian people are an Arab people which is much attuned to scientific and technological progress, and thus, all these forces in the Middle East (those who share this interest in scientific and technological progress), have a common interest in furthering that, against those who wish to keep the Arabs in the darkness of the past. And we must understand that we cannot find a political basis for a solution, unless we find a deeper, common self-interest among all of the parties involved."

Dr. Haider was sympathetic, and indicated why the Iraqis could not make such a declaration themselves, but would be happy to observe the results of my effort to establish that, and would indicate happiness and an appropriate response should the Israelis voice such opinions, or indicate their interest in it.

I said the same thing to the Israelis, and to Palestinian representatives, in the same period, beginning late April 1975, that I had said to Dr. Haider. And, over the past 15 years, I have worked consistently for that approach to peace in the Middle East, and for that cause, for the Arabs and Israelis, independently and combined—as I have for all developing nations.

The right to scientific, technological progress


This dedication, which has been my dedication virtually all of my adult life, that is, scientific and technological progress as a right of the so-called developing nations, is the issue which has most sharply brought down upon me opposition from the friends of Henry Kissinger and his British masters, among others, and which has been at the center of sometimes mortal differences with the Soviet government: the equal right of all peoples to the benefits of scientific and technological progress. That has been my policy, that continues to be my policy, and that issue is the point of reference for all my differences with Henry Kissinger and President George Herbert Walker "Hoover" Bush.

I want to emphasize something two-sided in this connection; one more obvious, pragmatic side, the other the deeper side.

Obviously, this policy, which I have advocated for the Middle East, among other locations, is in the vital common interests of both the Iraqis and the Israelis, and also the Palestinians. Without this policy, *there is no other visible basis for a common interest among those three named, and other relevant parties*. There is no political solution possible unless that political solution is based upon a declared common interest in the benefits of scientific and technological progress. Every person, and every force, which had disagreed with that, which has sought a political solution without this kind of economic basis, has contributed to the folly which made it possible for George Bush and the British to set up the present threatened war in the Middle East.

The deeper philosophical issue

That should be obvious. But there's a deeper aspect to this issue, a deeper philosophical aspect. And, *despite the*



Lyndon LaRouche (foreground, in light suit) with an interpreter at the tomb of Atatürk in Istanbul in summer 1987. During his visit to Turkey, he again laid out the need to base peace in the region on scientific and technological progress, in discussions with Turkish government, labor, and political leaders.

Rolf Pauls

preference for pragmatism among my American fellow citizens, it's time they stopped being stupid, and woke up, and learned a few of the rudiments of serious philosophy. Because if they don't, they're going to find the United States as an empire brought down, and as a nation brought into ruins, to a large degree not by foolish and dangerous leaders such as George Bush and Henry Kissinger, but in a very large degree by their own stupidity, in tolerating the processes which led to the establishing and maintaining of such leadership in Washington.

There is a fundamental difference between man and the beast. The practical expression of this difference, is located in the human being's capacity for fundamental scientific discoveries and the equivalent, creative discoveries, which are consistent with the lawful ordering of the universe, and which result in what we call scientific and technological progress. Without scientific and technological progress, and the other classical humanist types of activities which characterize this creative potential of man, man *descends* to the beast in his mode of existence. And, having descended to the beast, tends often to fall into a state which we consider lower than the warm-blooded mammals in general. That is the issue.

Scientific and technological progress has not only the function of meeting human material need—and certainly there's an abundance of human material need on this planet now, including inside the United States—but the other aspect is to activate, to employ, to place social value upon, that aspect of the human personality, which not only sets man apart from the beast, but which, in Christian theology, defines man as in the living image of God. Thus, we must practice scientific and technological progress, not merely because it is a source of material advantage—which in no other way can be realized—but because without that practice,

and without a comparable practice in classical art forms, that which sets man apart from the beast is not emphasized, is not made the centerpiece of the practical, day-to-day value of a human being. In this connection, there's one other point, which must also be made.

Creative processes may reflect the social conditioning of the individual, but the creative act of mind is a totally sovereign act of the individual mind, in the way negatively implied by the famous *Parmenides* dialogue of Plato. Creative processes are a *One*, an indivisible unity within the individual mind. They cannot be divided into parts and shared among other people. They may be replicated in other minds—and should be—but the process of creation cannot be partitioned into separate parts, and brought together, to effect a creative result. Creative powers—artistic creative powers, scientific creative powers—lie within the sovereign processes of the individual mind. It is in that sovereign respect, in respect to the sovereignty of that creative act, that creative process, that the individual is in the living image of God and *in no other way*

Thus, it is only when we recognize that it is the sovereign individual's creative potential which makes that individual in the living image of God, that we can base society on a respect for the sacredness of life of every human individual.

Thus, to find solutions for the political problems, including threats of war which afflict nations, and to lift man out of the barbarism to which the New Age counterculture in the United States has done much to bring us in the recent quarter-century, we must emphasize scientific and technological progress, and classical forms of humanist art, in order that in the practice of day-to-day life—in schools, in the workplace, in community life—that this kind of artistic and scientific beauty, involving the sovereign individual

creative powers of the person, be placed foremost, and that man's respect for the other person, and for the persons of other nations, be founded upon the daily exercise of this which sets man apart from, and above the beasts.

I have proposed this to the Israelis in particular many times. I have communicated and exchanged correspondence with one-time Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres and others on this subject—on the subject, for example, of a canal from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, lined on both sides with nuclear plants, which, among other things, are generating an added source of fresh water. I have emphasized again and again the use of nuclear power to generate new rivers of fresh water the size of the Jordan River, or the size of one of the great rivers of Mesopotamia. And that this added supply of fresh water, with the matching energy, transforms the Middle East as a whole from a desert into a garden. And that the common interest of the Arab and the Israeli, in such a transformation of the Middle East, not only brings them together in a peaceful way, on the basis of a common material interest, but invokes in both that which sets man apart from and above the beast, and causes each to recognize in the other that which sets man apart from and above the beast.

Equal humanity of Arabs and Israelis

Let me speak finally of one problem of Israel, of Saudi Arabia, and of the Gulf states.

In Israel, we have apartheid, against the Arabs. The Arabs are treated as inferior. Fanatic racist—may I say racist-Israelis, who interpret the Eretz Israel in a racist way, do not recognize the equal humanity of the Arab, and therein lie the seeds of war. But among Arabs, we have those who, as in the royal family of Kuwait, hold human beings in chattel slavery, throughout the Gulf states. This was, until very recent time, the *official state of affairs* in Saudi Arabia. *Cultures which allow this kind of chattel slavery or conditions akin to it, which discriminate against the rights of human beings to vote, as did Kuwait—these cultures cannot be allowed to continue*, because in their denial of the humanity of other human beings, they deny their own and degrade themselves as to beasts.

There is a madness which grips Israel, a madness exemplified by the butcheries of Ariel "Arik" Sharon, and others. This madness flows from racism, which flows from beliefs which have nothing to do with God, but have a lot more to do with the satanic.

The practical answer, from the standpoint of politics, is that if we as societies commit ourselves to scientific and technological progress and to the promotion of those forms of art which are akin to the medium of the creative powers of the individual, we lay the cultural basis for valuing other human beings, and ourselves, in the way which leads to productive relations that, becoming good relations, lead thus to peace.