

---

## Interview: Laith Shubeilat

---

# Usurious policies of IMF are the most hideous policies enslaving mankind

*Laith Shubeilat, an Islamist and an independent member of the Jordanian Parliament since 1989, is one of the most popular political figures in Jordan. He was the subject of a sensational trial last autumn (see EIR, Oct. 23, pp. 53-55; Nov. 6, pp. 42-43; Nov. 13, pp. 38-40; and Nov. 20, 1992, pp. 32-39). He gave this interview to Muriel Mirak-Weissbach during a recent visit to Germany.*

**EIR:** Islam is being presented as the new “enemy image.” What is this all about? Where does it come from?

**Shubeilat:** It is a long tradition, unfortunately, among the prevailing forces of the West. There is an important book on the subject by Edward Sa’id, a very academic book, which proves beyond doubt that the whole orientalist movement, with a very few exceptions, emanated from and served the colonialists’ plans to control the world, and especially the Third World, the most important part of which is the Muslim world. Unfortunately, it is a very ancient tradition, not only by the mass media, but also of so-called important scholars who planted the seeds of hatred. For example, it is very important to note that the first people who called the others “infidels” and “idolaters” was the West—the West, the western orientalist called the Muslims “infidels,” while it is being portrayed very wrongly that Muslims do not tolerate others and that they call everybody else infidels and idolaters. Historically, it’s quite the contrary. So, it’s a very old tradition, 200-300 years old, which paved the way for controlling the Orient. Now, since the world order has reformulated its leadership—nothing has changed, nothing is “new” about the new world order, no new ideas, new laws; the only new thing is that a single power is trying to control this order which was reformulated at Yalta after World War II. It has not been reformulated today in new institutions; the institutions are the same, but are controlled by a single power.

So now, this single power, leading the whole colonialist camp, wants to control its own camp, the industrialized sector, as well as the Third World. You know what they are doing to control their own camp, like targeting Germany and Japan, hitting any economic power that would challenge them, that’s something you are very well aware of. And the other, is targeting *any* movement, any philosophical tradition that could be the source of a movement that could challenge their plans. And Islam definitely is one of the most important candidates to lead a movement, or to join the leadership of

such a movement for justice and a just world order.

**EIR:** Why is Islam so dangerous to their plans?

**Shubeilat:** Because the controlling faction of the oligarchs, who are designing these plans, do not base their ideology on anything human. They’re anti-human, gnostics, pagan, actually, and there is nothing Christian about their worldview, although they use Christianity in the same way that the Crusaders used Christianity, to mobilize people. People wouldn’t fight then for merchants, or today, for oil companies, for Texaco; they would fight for a noble cause. So for those controlling forces, it is a matter of getting their people aligned to fight for *their* cause, for *their* interest. They have to arouse these sentiments: that the Third World is an enemy, that they are subversive, dangerous, terrorists. So this thing is being played, now, especially after the collapse of communism, which was leading the Third World—the underdeveloped sector used to look to the U.S.S.R. as their counter-leverage, to prevent the full control of imperialism and capitalism, or, as you call it, monetarism.

Now Islam is a philosophical tradition based on humane principles, on an understanding of the universe. It is identical to the Christian origin of thought in its concept of man, the universe, and God, that man is created in the image of the Lord, that he is worthy of respect, that his dignity should be preserved. The whole universe is at his service. He is ordered to subdue nature, to subdue the universe at his service; that he should develop and multiply. He can only multiply by developing. Which is basically what interested me in your movement: I saw that these are exactly the same ideas, in their origin. So that’s why Islam is being targeted.

Christianity is being targeted, too, although many Christian leaders do not admit that it is being targeted, as they did in the past. A lot of them, as an Arabic proverb puts it, “only want safety,” they just want to get away with their skins, though they are being attacked by pagan cults, and their doctrine is being attacked. They’re trying to change the well-established Christian doctrine.

**EIR:** How do you see the possibility that Islamic doctrine may be attacked?

**Shubeilat:** This is a problem for the common enemy. The holy book of Islam is completely immune to such attack. Usually the easiest way to have full control over populations

is to tamper with their doctrine, that is, how they target Christianity, that's how they target any other culture: trying to change its origins, to say this is wrong, that is originally right, so that a whole people may be "re-programmed" at their service.

I'll give you a small example. Look at how the history of Europe has been changed, how Judaism has been targeted, how it was looked at unfavorably, until recently; that was wrong, but look at how this attitude flipped over, completely. There are complete Christian sects, 40-60 million people in America belong to them, but they believe that Jews are the chosen people and that Israel should be established, and you find over a century that a whole flock of people who are not Jews have been "Zionified." So Zionism has infiltrated a large number of sects of Christians who believe that they are at the service of Zionism, believing that—and they are very naive—in the end, Israel is established and all the Jews go to Palestine, and after Armageddon will happen. They all *want* to instigate a third world war so that Christ will come, and then the Jews will convert. So why don't they go directly to the Jews and try to convert them, instead of destroying the world to convert? This puts a lot of question marks over what happened to the doctrine of certain sects.

Now, coming back to Islam, it is very difficult to tamper with the Koran, impossible, or with the Hadith [the sayings of the Prophet], which are ordered in a very scientific matter. There are rules and regulations regulating how a true hadith will be accepted, and according to the level of authenticity it may or may not be accepted for dogmatic issues. Some reach the level of being accepted only on issues of moral guidance, and so on. That's why Islam is a challenge; although the Muslim population is very weak, there is no Islamic power actually in existence, yet the colonialist forces see that this doctrine can not be tampered with, and that could lay the ground for challenging the future adversary—which is not Christianity, it is the plans of the imperialists. They see that it could lead the whole Third World, including, for example, the Catholics of South America, who are in exactly the same plight as the Muslims. They are not allowed to unify, just as the Arabs are not allowed to unify. There are very similar conditions; what happens in South America is very similar to what is happening in our countries. So these traditions, which base their philosophy on humane thoughts, are a challenge to the new world order. That's why they are targeted.

**EIR:** Obviously, your approach is not one of confrontation, but one of dialogue.

**Shubeilat:** It is very unfortunate that both religions have a lot of backward, or not very creative minds, who do not see what is happening, and are affected by the brainwashing, leading them to confrontation by what they should identify as a common enemy, which only serves the new world order. Because the new world order, as I see it, this pagan, usurious cult, had to target Christianity as well as Islam. They have been targeting the Vatican for a long time. From the outside,



*Jordanian parliamentarian Laith Shubeilat*

I see the Vatican shaken a lot by the prevailing movements in the world, very much on the defensive, yet, unfortunately, when it comes to Islam, you see a lot of persons, even in the Vatican, and in other churches, rallying with the pagans against Muslims; or you find the Muslims rallying with the wrong side against the western Christian world.

This is incorrect and I think the main thrust, the knockout blow that could be given to this fiendish plan of the new world order, is dialogue, an honest dialogue between Christians and Muslims. Every Christian and every Muslim who is God-fearing and really believes in the Lord, should feel targeted whenever his colleague is being attacked. We are in the same camp, we are a camp of elites, because of our philosophical conception of man as being in the image of the Lord. We have a lot of differences in detail of thought, but the basis is the same: Man is the master of the universe, with nature at his service. This is the main thing from which socio-economic laws branch out, the worldly laws governing our lives do not branch from the *details* of monotheism; those details affect our final destiny in the hereafter, whom will the Lord select or say is right in his monotheistic view. But, no matter how much we differ, there are no general laws affected by this difference. All the laws that govern our existence branch from the same origin—we respect man, this view of the creator man, master of the universe. And unfortunately, with regard to the targeting of Islam, when it is said that we want to go back to Islamic laws, people are scared, they fear that this means forcing everyone to be a Muslim, and to be a good Muslim. It is very wrong, the notion is very wrong.

Islamic law is like Natural Law, that is, based on the correct religious outlook, which is the Islamic outlook, which is the true Christian basis. But it does not affect others' religion, it does not tamper with beliefs of others. Justice, the message of justice it carries, emanates from this religion.

It is not imposing this religion that we work for, rather it is struggling to establish the just order that is based on this religion, which is—should be—synonymous to and not contradictory to the just laws based on Christian religion, which goes back to the pure origins, to the view of man in the image of the Lord; it is anti-slavery, anti-usury, forbidding man to dominate or enslave man.

**EIR:** Are you thinking in terms of a theological dialogue with Christianity?

**Shubeilat:** No, I wouldn't suggest that. The dialogue is very important. If you go into a theological dialogue, Muslims would differ in 70 directions, Christians would differ in 100 directions! It is a philosophical dialogue, but not a dialogue which affects the way we live. A philosophical dialogue is something that you may have at leisure, sit down and knock each other out with back and forth dialogue, but it does not affect our lives. On the contrary, it would affect our lives adversely because we would only see our differences and we might translate our differences into hatred, into not accepting the other's well-being.

The way I see it, the dialogue should be apt to unify all the good forces of the world; we, especially as monotheists, are bearers of a message of justice for all mankind, even toward those who do not believe in our monotheism. We respect man because the Lord had chosen to create him in this dignified form; even though man himself might behave in a manner that does not respect his own dignity, yet we respect his dignity for the Lord who has endowed him with this dignity, and by respecting his dignity, we are respecting the Lord's creation.

So we go from that to identify the enemy. Who is our real foe, the foe of mankind, who is trying to destroy mankind? It is these pagan cults, these usurious policies, it is the most hideous policies enslaving mankind, which go hand in hand with military intervention. For, when people fail to honor their usurious contracts, it is military occupation that comes to settle the matter. When we identify who the enemy is, then we find that we are forced to be so close, because we represent the opposite to this pagan, we are the contrary, both of us. And this is the real foe, not us. This foe is playing on our differences, so that he reigns and will eventually suppress us, tamper with our doctrines, and perhaps annul all religions. The way we have seen in the last 20-30 years, they really have the upper hand and are saying so outright.

So when we identify this, we have to identify the instruments of the enemy. Both economic systems are against mankind. Capitalism, or as you say, monetarism, is endangering mankind. Communism, which presented itself as a driver to stand against this oppression, has deprived man of his dignity and respect, in favor of the collectivity. Then there is the "third way," which is in between, whereby man's dignity is preserved and society is preserved; there is a balance between society and man. The economic theories that arise from this,

the importance of developing science and technology, of developing man and distributing wealth, would have to be found. This is why I find the work of Lyndon LaRouche as very, very close to Islamic thought. I was not surprised when I read the roots of his thinking, because I found it was based on the noblest of Christian ideas. So there is no surprise that we find a lot of what he says identical, not only very close, but identical to the Muslim tradition.

So both religions have to be clear where we stand. Both have to understand the institutions of the oppressors of mankind—the United Nations, the Security Council, the International Monetary Fund. Are they friendly to nations, are these institutions in the true tradition of Christianity, of Islam, of monotheism, or not? And this is a very big question to ask two large congregations infiltrated by the culture of the enemy. Once you pose these questions, you find members of the Christian clergy or Muslims, say, "No, no, no, what's wrong with the IMF?" And then you enter discussion with them, and start exposing them. "Look at what the IMF is doing, creating so much misery, how can you relate your belief in the Lord, in Christianity, to this?" You start exposing him, and if he is honest, he will repent and say, "All right, I accept that this is an instrument of satanism, of paganism." And you would sift the true Muslim from the untrue Muslim tradition, you would sift the true Christian from the untrue Christian position, and the true in both would come very close in an alliance against the untrue in their own camps and against paganism.

And this is very, very important, because, for example, now, the Islamic movement is being targeted. If Christians, in the Vatican, were to defend against any attack on Muslims, and the Muslim would defend against an attack on the Vatican, saying these attacks are against two sides of the same coin of the monotheistic tradition, this would defuse the largest bomb being set to explode. Those oligarchs, the pagans, would lose the main instrument that they have to rally populations and the fighting doctrine of their soldiers, because soldiers will fight only if convinced of the noble cause of the struggle. If the Church takes this stand, if Muslims take this stand, you would defuse the ability to pit soldiers against each other in this useless struggle. It is an unreal struggle, against a fictitious enemy, because nobody can annihilate the other, even if they planned it. We are talking about billions of people, a billion here and a billion there. None of these religions has this genocidal, cleansing ideology, the mainstream does not have it. Okay, they clashed in the Crusades, but, you know, our ancestors did not call them the "Crusades," they called them the Wars of the Franks; on the other side they were called the Crusader wars.

**EIR:** How do you evaluate the possibility that this dialogue can succeed? Are you optimistic?

**Shubeilat:** Yes, I am optimistic. Wherever there are sane people, there's reason for optimism. Take, for example, your movement; although it is not a religious movement, it is a

movement based on proper religious grounds, and is a very, very important movement, it could help in such a dialogue. Although you are not clergy, I said it at your Berlin conference; what interested me in your movement, was I noticed that it stems from the noblest of Christian ideas and this is very close to me as a Muslim, it's as simple as that. You see, what is very important, is that we should not open our discussions and debates by referring to labels, we should begin by the content. What are you delivering? You are delivering a plan or a product, and when I see that product, without a label, and see that it is very close to what I deliver, I get through the barriers of brainwashing and preconceived ideas about others. "Muslims, oh I don't want to have anything to do with Muslims," or "Oh, this LaRouche, I don't want to hear anything about him." If you bring out the content first without the identification label, you get through to the general public, which includes a lot of so-called intellectuals, for only true intellectuals who are real truth seekers (with their small number) don't allow labels to stop them from exploring with their own intellect and their own brain what the other side has, and take what is good and leave what doesn't fit. This is an exchange of culture, that's how knowledge in the world advances.

Strangely enough, in our modern universities, it is always taught that in the Middle Ages, the Church was persecuting knowledge and science, which may be true, but what is also true is that the new priesthood in the "democracy" of today is doing exactly the same thing now. I do not see the existence of a democracy in the West, as is being claimed. Democracy is when everyone can explore and express his own ideas without being subjected to violence, violent attack by others. I know that you cannot go to some universities and talk because some extreme leftists or extreme rightists might attack you. Take this scientific breakthrough in cold fusion, for example, how it is being attacked by the establishment. So, whoever is established, unfortunately, attacks the new development.

So whatever we criticize in the Middle Ages, although we look very advanced, we have the same fault, by not allowing any breakthrough, by running witchhunts against ideas that are not established. So how can you claim that we are liberated, now that it's the age of democracy, etc., different from the Middle Ages? The only difference is, there is a lot more reading material, but it is not affecting the attitude of people, there is no respect for people, for their ideas. We all have a right to talk, and a right to be heard. You feel, I am sure, targeted, in this "open" society; you see how your leader is put behind bars in the most atrocious manner, in a "legal" manner and how the brainwashing machine is controlling the ideas of people about this great thinker and true lover of humanity. . . . How does this differ from the attitude toward Galileo? Democratic instruments (a corrupt judiciary) were used to impose such authoritarian fascist decisions. . . . This is the culmination of injustice.

## News of Russian SDI offer hits S. America

by Cynthia R. Rush

In the early 1980s, American statesman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., the intellectual author of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) proposal subsequently announced by President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1983, elaborated how Ibero-American countries, especially those with more advanced scientific infrastructure such as Brazil and Argentina, could benefit from collaboration with the United States on SDI and related technological and scientific projects. These projects, LaRouche emphasized, could act as a "science driver" for an economic and technological renaissance in these countries.

The Russian leadership did not accept Reagan's offer of joint development of the SDI; in fact, Russian President Mikhail Gorbachov demanded that LaRouche be imprisoned, while all of Ibero-America suffered a decade of economic devastation as a result of its submission to the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) austerity dictates.

But now, ten years later, political, military, and scientific circles across Ibero-America are again showing keen interest in the implications of joint U.S.-Russian development of the SDI, following news that Russian President Boris Yeltsin had made such an offer during his April 3-4 summit with President Bill Clinton in Vancouver.

Most international media have deliberately blacked out all coverage of Yeltsin's offer for joint development of anti-ballistic "plasma weapons," first reported in the Russian newspaper *Izvestia* on April 2. If accepted, the offer represents an opportunity to completely alter the world's strategic geometry, which has produced genocide in former Yugoslavia, as well as worldwide economic devastation and growing violence and regional warfare. Most important, the offer can lay the basis for real economic and scientific development, with crucial implications for the Third World.

### Anglo-Americans worry about LaRouche

This realization, and LaRouche's role in promoting such development, has unnerved some among the Anglo-American policymaking elite. On April 18, a slanderous article under the byline of Marcelo Helfgot appeared in the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín*, hysterically charging that LaRouche, together with jailed Argentine Army nationalist Col. Mohamed Alí Seineldín and Venezuelan Col. Hugo Chávez, were planning to hold a May meeting in Buenos Aires of *carapintadas*