

Current History as Tragedy Russia and Iran on Strategy

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 34, Number 14, April 6, 2007. [View PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

Just as the stubborn incompetence shown by nearly all of the world's economists today, is a reflection of their reliance on Cartesian mechanical-statistical methods, instead of competent, Riemannian principles of dynamics: a similar problem often infects the foreign-policy and related strategic outlooks of most nations of the world, still today. The failure of some influential Iranian circles to understand the irritation shown by Russia's President Putin, is an example of that same, currently prevalent problem of reliance upon mechanistic thinking, rather than dynamic conceptions, in strategic matters. That represents the same type of error in method which is presently common to failed economic forecasting.

Observers have noted a certain strain in the relations between Russia and Iran, over the issue of Iran's rejection of Russia's flexible response to the current Anglo-American use of Iran's alleged nuclear-weapons-program provocations, as a pretext for escalating the already ongoing spread of generalized asymmetric and other warfare within the Southwest Asia theater.

There are two points which President Putin's Russia seems, clearly, to grasp, but which some influential circles within Iran, as also elsewhere, have, unfortunately, missed. Iran is not to be singled out on this problem of method; what passes for strategic thinking in most circles in western and central Europe, as in most relevant leading circles in the U.S.A., reflects the exact same error of method shown by some important circles in Iran.

To restate the point just made: The marginal error expressed, on this account, by the views of some Iranian factions, is part of a mosaic of what are, otherwise, similarly dangerous errors of assumption by representatives of many nations. This includes, most emphatically, the cases of some relatively simplistic parodies of so-called "strategic thinking" among relevant leading professional politician circles, such as within the U.S. Congress, and among the leading Presidential candidates, within the U.S.A. itself.

The first of the points to which I refer: is that *a prudent commander must always understand who the real enemy is*. The real enemy is often the clever one, the one often disguised as an ally.

So, Bismarck rightly fought a war of defense against the aggression of British puppet Napoleon III, but, rightly opposed, if unsuccessfully, the Prussian monarchy's foolish refusal to end the war at the point of Napoleon III's defeat. The Kaiser's error was in thus committing a fully enraged, future France to play the role of London's puppet in geopolitical warfare, World Wars I and II, against continental Eurasia.

So, Germany's foolish and duped Wilhelm II and the other nephew of Edward VII, Czar Nicholas II, allowed themselves to make war against each other, at the pleasure of a decadent Austro-Hungarian Kaiser, all this in service of London's intention to have Russia and Germany destroy one another, and themselves, in geopolitical World Wars I and II, organized from imperial London. To bring about the calamity called "World War I," the Kaiser himself cleared the way to war with Russia, through dumping the Chancellor Bismarck who was opposed to Germany's being trapped into supporting Habsburg follies in the Balkans.

The second of the two points, is that *a prudent commander never permits his enemy to lure him, half-wittingly, into taking ground at a place and time which the adversary has shrewdly chosen for his relative advantage.* For example: The only important, true enemy of Iran resides both in London, and, therefore, also, among the London-steered allies of former U.S. Vice-President Gore. Prime Minister Tony Blair's London is also, the actual enemy of the U.S.A. in Southwest Asia. What is now behind Blair is the actual enemy, of us, and of the people of Southwest Asia; Tony Blair's faction is the force either to be defeated, or made peaceful by gentler means.

On these two accounts, President Putin's policy respecting Iran's current response on the issue of Anglo-American efforts to extend the already ongoing general warfare in Southwest Asia, has been prudent, and some Iranian resistance to President Putin's counsel has been a potentially ominous, tactical blunder, the error of overlooking the dynamical character of the relevant, global strategic situation as a whole.

I explain, beginning with a presently still very relevant example from recent history.

Franklin Roosevelt's War

Adolf Hitler had been brought to power under the sponsorship and direction of the British monarchy and its Anglo-Dutch Liberal and French Synarchist accomplices, including leading pro-Mussolini and pro-Hitler financier circles within the U.S.A. President Franklin Roosevelt, understanding this to be the global strategic situation, played upon complications affecting Britain, to draw relevant earlier, British and other backers of Hitler, into the most difficult wartime alliance of Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin,

and others, which defeated the Nazi aim at world conquest for a fascist world system under Hitler's reign.

However, speaking historically, the premature death of President Franklin Roosevelt, allowed the balance of power inside the U.S.A. itself, to be shifted away from Roosevelt's intended post-war uprooting of all vestiges of imperialistic colonial submission, toward a resumption of pro-imperialist power which U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower denounced as a "military-industrial complex." The insurrection staged by that "complex" resulted in the 1967–1972 shift of world power from the American System of political-economy typified by the Bretton Woods fixed-exchange-rate system, to a 1971–1981 London-dominated Anglo-Dutch Liberal shift into the ruin of the remains of the U.S. agro-industrial economy, thus driving the U.S.A. into an ultra-decadent, anti-science, anti-technology form of "post-industrial" wreckage called "globalization." That "globalization" is the essential, global enemy of our U.S.A.

The change in direction which was introduced under British leadership at the moment of the death of President Franklin Roosevelt, was the first crucial step, by the pro-British, London-connected U.S. financier factions, toward an intended return to the domination of the world by the Anglo-Dutch Liberal system of imperial monetarism. That Anglophile faction's intention, then, is expressed today by a system presented under the rubric of stateless "globalization," the system typified by former U.S. Vice-President Al Gore's ultra-malthusian "global warming swindle."

Thus, the trend presently typified by the long-standing, close affinity of folly between Al Gore with Britain's Prince Charles, has now brought the world economy to a monetary-financial and physical-economic breaking-point, at which existing forms of sovereign national government are pitted in mortal struggle, against the combination of worldwide financial collapse and physical economic breakdown, caused by the present spread of the effects of a form of intended global imperialism expressed as neo-malthusian "globalization." The continued existence of the sovereign nation-state as an institution anywhere, now demands a return to science-driven scientific and technological policy of practice by sovereign nation-states, everywhere.

Implicitly, at least, Russia's President Putin understands this. His government's repeated emphasis on the model of U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt, is crucially indicative. The essential enemies of civilization are typified today by the forces associated with the ideology expressed in its disgusting extreme by Prince Charles's Albert Gore. That is the enemy to be defeated.

To bring about that urgently needed defeat of Gore *et al.* now, the U.S.A. must be won over politically to the cause of its return to the policy-outlook represented by former

President Franklin Roosevelt. Under that condition, the possibility of saving civilization during the foreseeable generations to come, demands an immediate, global coalition of forces built up around leading agreements reached among four keystone nations: an agreement on returning to what had been U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt's pre-Truman intention for the post-1945 world: a cooperating system of respectively sovereign nation-states, united by a American-style, single, fixed-exchange-rate system covering, and promoting the development of the entirety of the planet.

Therefore, to put the point in the simplest decent way: strategically, all issues must be defined in respect to the necessary pathways of action through which to reach the point at which that decision, for a just new, world economic system of cooperative development, can be reestablished as the ruling system of relations among nations and peoples throughout the planet. The rallying of the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, as leading sponsoring partners for a true United Nations program, is the indispensable precondition which must not be sacrificed for any other issue.

The Global Economic Crisis

Some leading circles within the U.S.A.'s leadership have repeatedly asked me the following type of question:

“We tend to agree with your strategic assessment of the global economic and monetary-financial situation. However, the situation is not politically ripe for the kind of reforms which, we agree, would be necessary for the future recovery of our economy. Can you not define a more modest, interim step, which we might use as a stop-gap?”

My best-informed questioners of that sort know, in fact, that the present world monetary-financial system is not merely bankrupt, but entering a state like that of Weimar Germany's monetary-financial system of late 1923. Only a new system, backed by U.S. gold, saved Germany (temporarily) then; only an equally sudden and drastic change, would save the U.S. economy from something far worse than an economic depression, a general breakdown-crisis, now. The present monetary-financial system can no longer be reformed; it must be replaced by a system operating as a bankrupt system, under the protection of receivership, under the provisions of the Preamble of the U.S. Federal Constitution.

My questioners' concern is that the political machinery of the U.S. government is “not ready” to accept my leadership in designing and launching such a needed reform, even if there is not an available alternative, even for the continued existence of the U.S.A. as a nation.

The needed political element, on which such a U.S. reform would depend, in practice, is represented chiefly by the prospect of bringing together the governing forces of the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India, to serve as the principal committee of sponsors and initiators, of a general, virtually instantaneous reform of the world's economic system. An agreement of the type I know to be scientifically feasible, among those four leading powers, an agreement to a return to President Franklin Roosevelt's intention for a vigorously anti-colonialist, post-World War II Bretton Woods fixed-exchange-rate system, would immediately rally the principal amount of trading potential of the world, to a sufficient extent, to make necessary interim, emergency steps workable.

We must recognize that the genocidal lunacy of madman Al Gore's "globalization" schemes, can not be tolerated. We must recognize that the use of Southwest Asia as a cockpit for Anglo-Dutch Liberal schemes designed as a factor of strategic disruption, must be shut down, and that in a way in which only a core agreement among the U.S.A., Russia, China, and India could mobilize on short notice.

Thus, bringing the U.S.A. to a posture of immediate back-channel discussions among the representatives of the four indicated powers, and their obvious, closely associated smaller partners, is the essential, urgently needed remedy for both the current global economic-breakdown-crisis now in progress, and for assembling the strategic political will to shut down now all continued efforts at stirring the fires for worldwide war in the London-managed cockpit of Southwest Asia.

Therefore, we must define that historic ground as the choice of the battlefield on which to fight, and the issue on which we are fully prepared to fight to early victory for the benefit of humanity as a whole. In the meantime, avoid all wars which would divert the course of world affairs along different channels of history than that.