
Interview: Lyndon LaRouche

Sovereignty of nation-states coheres with natural law

On Jan. 7, the Croatian weekly cultural and political magazine Hrvatski Rukopis (Croatian Handwriting) carried an interview with imprisoned U.S. statesman Lyndon LaRouche, conducted in December by political and military analyst Srečko Jurdana. Hrvatski Rukopis is published by the same companies that own the main Croatian daily Vecernji List, for which Hrvatski Rukopis had been the weekly literary and cultural insert, until recently when it began independent publication. Its current circulation is about 15,000, with a great influence in the intellectual and political layers of the country, and the appearance of LaRouche's interview sparked an intense discussion in Zagreb and elsewhere in the country. The two leading national dailies, Vecernji List and Vjesnik, have announced the intention to excerpt the interview, and other papers are demanding more interviews and exclusive commentaries from LaRouche on the Balkan situation.

Q: After having spent five years in prison for political reasons, under what juridical and political circumstances would it be possible to obtain your release? Also, how do you comment on the fact that the prosecution of the members of your organization continues (again four of them have been convicted to up to 39 years of jail)?

LaRouche: On this question, as is probably known now, a parole has been granted by the National Parole Commission which will keep me under probationary restraint for a period of up to ten years, perhaps less.

This occurred I think, in large part, or was assured at least in large part, because of the massive international as well as national support for some form of relief for me from incarceration. That's all to the good. It should have been better. I should have had a hearing which would have resulted, in all reasonable expectation, in a complete vindication; but the strength of my political adversaries is sufficiently great that I think that those who might have granted me this relief in the current administration, were not yet impelled to do so. It would have involved the wrath of my enemies at least, I think, in their perception. That's what I get, the best information I have.

To understand this, let me give an answer which antici-

pates in part the basis for responses to the following questions.

There is a long battle in Europe. If you date modern European history from the 15th century, events leading up to and through the 1439-1440 Council of Florence, there has been a continuing battle between two tendencies, one of which is based on wealthy family foundations and trusts which careen across the political landscape like self-esteemed, quasi-immortal gods of Olympus, and those contrary forces which have tried to fulfill the Christian proposition, the notion of a Christian republic, as also defined more rigorously around the time of the Council of Florence, as a part of those proceedings.

I represent the latter view. The powerful, would-be immortal gods of Olympus, through their own folly, are bringing the roof of the world down upon the heads of us all, including themselves. At the time when a ruling power sees itself collapsing, at the time of the *Götterdämmerung*, the Twilight of the Gods, of the Olympian gods, the gods tend to be more ruthless. More ruthless dictatorships emerge at times when ruling forces are weak and require, in their own view, the ruthlessness of dictatorship to retain their power, and to wreak vengeance as it were upon any hostage they can whom they see as a representative of the forces which imperil their power.

We did represent a great peril to their power, on two points.

There are two issues in which the Anglo-American oligarchy, my opponent faction, has been absolutely determined, throughout particularly the postwar period—since Versailles as well. One is to keep the southern part of this planet, which now includes the Balkans and southern Italy and Turkey, and so forth, in subjugation; not to allow these portions of the planet to have equal access to means of technology to sustain themselves. Many of these people speak of condemning 80% of the planet to an age of barbarism while only 20% in the northern region especially, would survive that—they would hope.

The second aspect of their policy since Versailles, but essentially since World War II and Yalta, has been the view that if the Anglo-Americans can establish certain kinds of an



In this televised broadcast during his presidential campaign on Oct. 31, 1988, broadcast, Lyndon LaRouche warned of the danger of war in the Balkans, with Russian backing for Serbian conquest of the other Yugoslav republics.

agreement with their putative adversaries in Moscow, that between these two forces, they represent such force, that whatever these two adversarial forces agree to, becomes law for the rest of the world. It's a view which has been expressed by Henry Kissinger, for example, in telling the people of the Third World, that when Washington, London, and Moscow agree, the rest of the world will jump, and nobody else should try to make policy.

I threatened that policy first of all with my commitment, which was first rooted in me from what I saw during World War II in India and Burma, for justice for the so-called Third World; and that has put me at odds with the Anglo-American establishment. I also have considered an abomination the notions of Yalta, New Yalta, and similar agreements, global imperial agreements between the Anglo-Americans on one side and Moscow on the other; and I fought to replace those agreements by a new basis which is more in keeping with a moral standpoint.

In succeeding in presenting the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) and in finding a precise echo of my proposal to Moscow coming as official policy from President Reagan, I made myself the object of the most intense hatred imaginable from both the Anglo-American and Moscow forces which were committed to that agreement. They were out to kill me,

but it was too risky, they didn't wish to make me a political martyr, so they sought to defame me and defame my associates, and hoped that the movement associated with me would go away under those circumstances.

That hatred, once set in motion, continues; and I think that explains the circumstances which surround me and my associates at this time.

Q: You have been frequently emphasizing the danger of Europe falling into a "Thirty Years' War" pattern. First: Whose benefit would this pattern serve? Second: After almost four years of war against Croatia and Bosnia, do you see the chances for a Thirty Years' War all over Europe growing or diminishing?

LaRouche: I would say, take the second part of the question first, that after almost four years of this Balkan war launched from London with support from other quarters, including [former Secretary of State Lawrence] Eagleburger, Brent Scowcroft, and forces in Moscow, the likelihood of a Thirty Years' War all over Europe is greatly increased by this continuing Balkan war.

Whose benefit does this serve?

Let's take the case of the insane man who *believes* he will benefit when in fact he will not; and we should speak of

benefits to London and so forth in those terms. They have spread a disease for which there is no cure, so to speak, in their Balkan policy.

The policy under which the Balkan war was unleashed by Mrs. Thatcher's government and continued by the Major government, that policy, if continued, will destroy them all. So the benefit which motivates them, *is an illusory one*.

What they are attempting to do—and this has been increasingly the commitment of the British Foreign Office since the coming to power in England during the 18th century of William Petty, the Second Earl of Shelburne, the major-domo, so to speak, of both Barings Bank and the British East India Company. Remember the British East India Company *ran* England through the work of Shelburne and especially Shelburne's chief of intelligence, Jeremy Bentham, from at least 1783, when Shelburne dictated the terms of the Treaty of Paris, to the present day. The dominant force in British policy is the *imperial policy* developed under the direction of Shelburne and institutionalized around Jeremy Bentham, who is the predecessor for the James Mills, the Castlereaghs, the Cannings, and most notably, Lord Palmerston, and after Lord Palmerston, the British liberal imperialists typified by the Fabian Society.

These fellows have had the view that to establish a British Empire, or a British hegemony over little empires (which would in fact amount to a British Empire worldwide), they had to play contending forces against each other. They saw continental Europe and continental Eurasia, if unified, as the major threat to the existence of a British Empire, as they saw the United States, as long as it remained a true republic, a threat to that Empire; and therefore, from the time of the French Revolution—from the time of the American Revolution, in point of fact—the British imperial faction which controls the Foreign Office, has moved on a policy of divide-and-conquer to set forces which should be allied in cooperating with one another for peaceful economic development to mutual benefit, to set them against each other in bloody warfare and thus to perpetuate, by divide-and-conquer, the potential for either a British Empire or some kind of one-world system which in effect would be the same thing.

And that's our problem here, that, as Mrs. Thatcher's government said, and as she has emphasized in her recently published memoirs, her concern was that the unification of Germany, and she, together with people under British control like the Bronfmans, directly attempted to try to keep the Iron Curtain up. As Mrs. Thatcher said in her memoirs, and as she said at the time and her spokesmen said at the time, she was taking all measures to try to preserve the Iron Curtain, to prop up the Bolshevik regime in Moscow; to prevent the unification of Germany, to prevent Germany from taking a lead in rebuilding Europe along the lines proposed by me and by Alfred Herrhausen, the Deutsche Bank banker who was assassinated on British orders.

The Balkan war was unleashed by Britain *openly*, with

the support of the Gorbachov faction in Moscow, which backed the Milosevic Serbs, with the idea of creating a bloody situation in southeastern Europe which would prevent the realization of a unified Europe unified in East-West, North-South development.

That's the motivation, and that is Mrs. Thatcher expressing the unbroken tradition from the evil Lord Shelburne and dirty Jeremy Bentham to Major, Hurd, and others in Britain today.

Q: Why were Britain and France so effective in imposing their chosen arbiters (Carrington, Vance, Owen, Stoltenberg) in the conflict? Why is it that they face practically no resistance to their policy of spreading the war—first all over Croatia and then all over Bosnia—and of establishing the “Serbian gendarme” in the Balkans? And second, can you explain what seems to be the ambiguity of the United States concerning Balkan affairs? One part of the administration follows almost blindly the British policy—division of Croatia and Bosnia and reward for Serbia. The other part opposes this policy—personified by Owen—and seems inclined toward Germany. What is exactly the position of the United States?

LaRouche: You have two phenomena here. You have a kind of British or Anglophile, Anglo-American, a transatlantic Anglophile establishment dominating the United Nations and other institutions. The illusion that the United Nations is anything but an instrument of Anglo-American policy has been blown aside by these recent developments. To the degree it existed, it was essentially always an illusion.

Now, there is another factor besides this influence and power of this particular faction, the Anglo-American faction—the one that killed President Kennedy, to put a fine point on it. That is, as we see clearly, in almost every government in Europe except France, which is only a partial exception, and in the United States itself, we see that those elites, these entities associated with the so-called gods of Olympus, that is, the powerful trusts and foundations which are quasi-personalities with a quasi-immortal existence which have cumulatively vast financial and property powers and which control most of the elite outside of government and even to some degree inside government; these elites who rule the society, *are decayed*; they are decadent, they are corrupt.

In Germany (whatever comes in Germany), the moral and intellectual quality of the elites, scientific, military, and so forth and so on, today is far below the moral and intellectual quality which existed as recently as the 1970s; and those of the 1970s were weak relative to those of the Adenauer period.

We see in Italy, that Italy has been dismembered, by capitulation beginning 1976, to the IMF conditionalities. We see that France is preserved because of peculiar circumstances centered around such institutions as the National School of Administration, which produces a great deal of the

The Balkan war was unleashed by Britain openly, with the support of the Gorbachov faction in Moscow, which backed the Milosevic Serbs, with the idea of creating a bloody situation in southeastern Europe which would prevent the realization of a unified Europe, unified in East-West, North-South development.

intellectual-administrative elite of French business, banking, and government.

Thus, under these circumstances, with weak, vacillating governments, governments which are unwilling so far to face the reality that the entire policy of the Anglo-Americans is bankrupt, tend to coast; that is, the United States government, for example, refused to buck the British on this issue of the Balkans. Thus, there was no military action as tentatively promised in the period of the late winter-spring of 1993 to stop the fascist genocide of Milosevic's allies—just as there was no intervention earlier in the atrocities against Croatia.

Therefore, the combination of policy and the *weakness*, the moral-intellectual weakness and decadence of the leading elites of these nations, is a key factor which must be taken into account.

This moral weakness comes in part from the adoption of the so-called post-industrial, neo-malthusian policy typified by the Club of Rome. This has resulted in a moral corrosion of the institutions of learning, of the education of the elites, and of the policies and moral impulses of leading institutions. This has been accompanied by a *secularization* in western Europe.

European civilization is based on *Christian republican principles*. When you secularize in the way which has been done by certain freemasonic factions led from London, with the purpose of destroying the Vatican and also of destroying Judaism as a religion and Christianity, and then turning around to destroy Islam at the same time; this revolt against monotheism, means there's an affirmative, satanic impulse against monotheism which has cut the umbilical cord of the baby in the womb; and the baby is threatened with dying, therefore. That is the general picture you have to see before you can explain what seems to be the ambiguity of the United States concerning Balkan affairs.

I think I just have stated it. You have special factors included, the fact that Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger were key in shaping Bush administration policy toward the Balkans.

Now, it must be recognized, that both Brent Scowcroft and Lawrence Eagleburger are *nothing but* assets of that section of the British Foreign Office which is called today Chatham House, for which Henry Kissinger has worked all his life, and on whose behalf Kissinger Associates functions. Kissinger Associates obviously functions as an instrument of

greed for the interests of Henry Kissinger and other persons. But it's controlled, axiomatically, by its master, which is the British Foreign Office—the Chatham House vehicle. These people are agents of Britain, just as certain forces in France, which tend to cooperate with them, are also, de facto, agents of Britain in the tradition of the fact that Napoleon III was nothing but a political catamite for his master, Lord Palmerston of Britain.

The United States, under these influences, *has no policy*, except this lunatic policy set up under the Bush administration, that is, the policy of so-called democracy and free trade: to set up a world empire, crushing all opposition under this strategic policy of democracy and free trade. Until that changes, that will be the situation.

Q: What does the term "united Europe" mean under the present circumstance of genocide going on undisturbed in its core? Is a united Europe—the result of divergent interests—possible at all?

LaRouche: The term "united Europe" in general is a farce *unless*—and I say unless with emphasis—France succeeds in drawing Germany, however reluctantly at first, into unity with France in opposition to GATT. GATT will destroy the human species in its present form. The resistance to GATT, initiated from France, if it succeeds in drawing Germany in to that policy and drawing other countries into supporting that policy, *will create* a positive united Europe, not of a single nation, not a one-world united Europe, but a united Europe of the nations. In that case, it would be a very useful development.

Q: If we agree that the nation-state concept is being threatened by the actual geostrategy, can you exactly define what powers, and for what precise reasons, are threatening it? Can you describe the position of the nation-state in relation to "united Europe" and to "Euroasian continental development"?

LaRouche: The idea of the nation-state, the modern republican nation-state as prescribed implicitly by Nicolaus of Cusa in various writings, is implicit all along in the very essence of Christianity.

Once we raise the question of man—individual persons—as in *imago Dei* by virtue of the capacity for creative reason, which sets mankind apart from all animal life, we

invoke the issue of *capax Dei*, that the individual is not only in the image of God, but he must participate in the work of God, in God and in God's work. This idea of the *participation of a people as a group of individuals in God's work*, involves language.

Of course, I am the first to emphasize that language does not contain *literal* ideas but rather that language is a medium by which we generate, in a lawful way, certain paradoxes by which creative discoveries from the mind of one person are transmitted as *paradoxes* to others who, by attacking the paradox with their creative faculty, generate a replication of that idea. Thus have the great discoveries of mankind over many thousands of years been transmitted to the children and youth and so forth of each generation in this paradoxical form. But nonetheless, the literature, the education, the organization of the family, of a nation, is the means by which the individuals may participate *together* in the administration of their affairs and in the administration of the role of the individual as *capax Dei*. That requires the nation-state.

For a long time, medieval Europe relied upon Latin as a *lingua franca* for western Christianity. That was an attempt to realize the requirements of *capax Dei* through a common language, i.e., a literate form of Latin. However, this language did not reach down to the majority of people as such; and thus it was important, as Dante Alighieri and others emphasized, to use the spoken language of the people, to bring that language up to its literate level for communication of ideas, and to build nation-states, republics, under natural law—each under natural law and all together as a community of nations—through the use of a literate form of language used by all the people for their participation in their society.

When we look at matters from this standpoint, *there is no conflict between the idea of a nation-state and Eurasian continental development*. In truth, if we understand ourselves, our problems, and our principles, it is necessary that each nation-state be *sovereign*. However, insofar as the nation-states are *under natural law in their internal affairs and regulate their affairs with one another according to natural law*, they thus reflect the principle of *imago Dei* and of *capax Dei*; and thus all great works are better accomplished precisely because the individual member of each nation-state is efficiently participating.

The problem today is that these concepts of republic have been replaced by democracy. We have today a rule not only by Locke, who is in practice a satanic figure in his influence but more specifically, from the British side, British liberalism derived from the same principle as Locke but based on and flowing from Bentham's *Principles of Morals and Legislation*, which makes so-called free trade and democracy a substitute for natural law, in fact uses chaos theory—which is what free trade really is—as a substitute for natural law. Under those conditions, you can have no good society but only chaos and man against man.

Locke produces a society which corresponds to Hobbes's

“each in warfare against all,” because *there is no moral principle which governs society. The nation-state republic depends upon the existence of a moral principle, natural law; a notion of the sacredness of the individual, of the family as an institution, and of the importance of the state as protector of the family and individual and protector of the good works of the family and individual to the benefit of all.*

Those notions are the notions of the nation-state. To the extent we have tried to substitute a Locke—or shall we say a Hobbes-Bentham-Locke—order of society in opposition to Christian society, we get this kind of hell which we're getting today.

So in response to this question of the nation-state, one must understand the nation-state from a Christian standpoint. That's where it was created, it did not exist before then. Yes, we had nationalities, we had empires; but the idea of the nation-state is a *Christian development*. Even though it occurred late in the history of Christianity, 1500 years approximately after the birth of Christ, nonetheless, it is a fulfillment of a Christian principle; and it is on that principle that the state stands. As long as the state is formed on that basis and that principle, and relations are so ordered (as Augustinus attempted to define that), then we have the kind of world order in which the nation-state is an essential furtherance of the goal of the broader development of mankind as a whole.

Let me add to what I've already said. On Eurasian continental development, look at Russia; and I'm sure that some people in Croatia, for example, have a little better insight into Russia than some of the ideologues in particular from western Europe and the United States.

The Russian people have never recovered fully, culturally, from the scars left on the culture by the long Mongol occupation. The result is what we call the Third Rome paradigm after Philotheus of Pskov (1510), who pronounced that on the basis of the corruption of the first Rome and then the second (Constantinople), that Russia must protect Matushka Rus from the corruption of the world around it, by establishing a new Rome, a Third Rome of Muscovy, which must be a world empire *forever*.

This is an *instinctive feature* of certain parts of the Russian population, in that we have institutions such as the military and the military-industrial complex in Russia, the only physically, objectively unifying institution in Russia at the present time. If that institution were to *blindly* respond to the present crisis by trying to reunify and hold together and defend Russia, then you would have nothing but a Third Rome imperialist dictatorship coming up in Moscow, something which is already quite visible.

It is possible that sections of the Russian intelligentsia can introduce into the situation a new conception of Russia as a nation-state republic. My efforts and my advice to people is to focus on that; not to interfere in the internal affairs of Russia, but to provide what is necessary in terms of proposals, discussions, and so forth, to catalyze that latter process

into being—with the view that through large-scale infrastructure-building programs done in cooperation among sovereign nation-states, we can rebuild the Eurasian continent as a center of peace and peaceful development for the globe.

Q: It has been claimed very often that Germany was a “primary target” of the new British-French “Entente Cordiale” and of a catalyzed process of continental destabilization through the war against Croatia and Bosnia. Yet, can you define the policy of Germany itself? In some respects—like the Juppé-Kinkel letter to the European Community—Germany seems merely to conform with the dominant way of thinking, and this is hardly an adequate position for an economic superpower and “primary target.” Germany seems to be rather satisfied with its present position within the EC, not wanting to disturb it by accepting “distant” challenges. Is Germany really capable of playing a strategic role, or has it been—in a post-World War II world—definitively transformed into a political “paper tiger”?

LaRouche: One has to go back, in France, to the case of [Giuseppe] Mazzini. Remember we had, in addition to all the other things that happened in the 19th century, we had the rise of Mazzini as a British agent; and that has to be emphasized, and people have to stop blocking on that.

Mazzinian freemasonry in all its forms is an outgrowth of British intelligence’s subversion of the nations of Europe and elsewhere, including the Balkans. The Balkan war can be traced back to the interventions of British Mazzinian freemasonry.

There are some organizations which have come out of Mazzini’s work, which have become patriotic and thus, in a sense, have evolved away from their origins. But the principle is that.

Now, what is the Entente Cordiale? The Entente Cordiale was set up in 1898 to 1904 with France’s Théophile Delcassé under the direction of Britain’s Lord Gray. But what was its root?

In 1849, a Mazzinian, a puppet of Palmerston by the name of Louis Napoleon, was made the President of France in a coup d’état against the French monarchy. The same Louis Napoleon, again under the protection of British intelligence, was made Napoleon III.

We have this Napoleonic idea in France, which was Anglophile, and which in the late 19th century was in contrast to policies such as those of [French Foreign Minister Gabriel] Hanotaux, which were policies which were for *independence* of British control. By a maneuver, Hanotaux, who was collaborating with Russia’s Count Sergei Witte for a railway system and other economic cooperation from Brest to Vladivostok, was toppled in 1898 over the Fashoda incident, and the British took over; by 1904, they set up the Entente Cordiale.

The Entente Cordiale, combined with British operations in the Balkans, set off the conflicts which became the First

World War, which were an attempt to prevent continental Europe from developing the kind of unity which Count Sergei Witte hoped to bring about.

So today again, as Margaret Thatcher came to power and reacted as an instrument of British imperialism, the danger in the British view that Germany would draw France into a generalized development of eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, caused the British to activate every asset they had in France in this Napoleon III tradition, in the Théophile Delcassé tradition, this so-called French revanchist tradition, as it was called at the turn of the century, in order to prevent continental Europe from unifying.

The forces which Britain controlled and influenced in France to this effect, were the same forces, the same Mazzinian parentage, which account for the Serbian fascists of Milosevic being deployed to destroy other parts of former Yugoslavia.

Now, as to Germany. It is very obvious to anyone from the outside, as it was to de Gaulle, that because of the blight put upon Germany by the post-World War I and post-World War II occupation, Germany was crippled ideologically by brainwashing by occupation (we might say under Anglo-American *Vergewaltigung* [rape]), from expressing itself in opposition to a specifically British policy. Because this would be to raise the question of Britain’s actual war guilt in World Wars I and II, first for setting up the war and secondly, for putting Hitler into power in Germany (which the Anglo-Americans did, not the Germans), in order to overthrow von Schleicher, to prevent cooperation among France, Germany, and Russia in economic development in Eurasia at that time.

So therefore, Germany, insofar as it submits itself to this so-called collective war guilt, the doctrine of World War I and World War II, is *impotent* to take an intellectual initiative of the type required.

Germany can take such initiative only in a certain form; and that is provided that France (or the United States, but France in particular), do as de Gaulle did with Adenauer, that France take the lead in fighting Britain, and that Germany support France. That’s the formula.

So therefore the Entente Cordiale, by pitting Mitterrand’s France against Germany, prevented Germany from continuing and sustaining a positive politics under the present condition. There only is a minority in Germany which would have the courage to tell the truth about these processes; and without the ability to tell the truth, then Germany is crippled and is prevented from defending its own true interests in these matters. This should be understood.

Q: How do you explain the sudden shift from Croatia to, exclusively, Bosnia? I have in mind the following references: Croatia is a relatively homogeneous nation-state, with great economic and intellectual resources that could transform it into the most prosperous and leading factor of the area, while Bosnia is a practically nonexistent multi-nation state, which

has absolutely no perspective without Croatia. Yet, the preservation of Croatia—with one-third of the territory occupied by Serbs—is not the issue (on the contrary, the military liberation of a territory is strictly forbidden by the Security Council), while the preservation of nonexistent Bosnia seems to be of utmost interest, to the extent that Croatia, the first Serbian victim, is now threatened by sanctions (while at the same time Serbia develops a perspective of getting rid of sanctions). How would you comment on these paradoxes?

LaRouche: The Anglo-American forces behind Milosevic, that is, the British faction, British Foreign Office, Thatcherites, plus the Chatham House assets such as Eagleburger and Scowcroft in the United States, were not merely concerned with destroying Yugoslavia; they were concerned with creating a Balkan war climate in Yugoslavia with the purpose of setting up the North-South conflict, the so-called Europe versus Islam, or North Eurasia against Islam, conflict. And to do that meant creating atrocities.

You can see, if you look throughout the Islamic world, including the Arab world, the traces of this consistent pattern. You also have it expressed in policy papers throughout the world. You see it, for example, in the work of Luigi Einaudi, an American of Venetian extraction of the Venetian Einaudi family, whose purpose is to destroy the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking nations south of the U.S. border in the Americas, who has laid out policies to do just exactly that. You see it in the policy of destroying Africa, all of Africa, North Africa as well as black Africa, and also the former Republic of South Africa.

These policies are afoot; and therefore the Balkan policy has been shaped to conform to the emerging global policy of writing off 80% of the world to new barbarism and preserving only 20% of the world as a quasi-civilized region for the next 100 years or so.

The question of Croatia: The British look at Croats and so forth, as Slavs, and therefore expendable. Also they see the fact that Croatia has an economic development potential, a superior one, and therefore they wish to destroy it; because their purpose is to destroy these kinds of policies. One simply has to open one's eyes to the malicious character of the forces in London (and in other quarters working with London) behind this, or such as the Club of Rome, to realize what the motives are and why they really do things. And one must *never* make the mistake of attributing an honorable motive—even a misinformed honorable motive—to any of the forces behind these atrocities. They are evil.

Q: Which world powers might be interested in forming a “new Yugoslavia,” and what would be the consequences of this monster-country?

LaRouche: The British don't care about Yugoslavia any more. They care about Yugoslavia only in a negative sense to create, if anything, an entity which can be used for further destabilization of Europe as a whole. That's its purpose.

They have no intent of building up an entity to the benefit of the peoples of any part of the region.

Q: What is your personal solution—or “grand design”—for the present European and world situation?

LaRouche: I have practical work that I must do toward the ends which were expressed in my 1982 *Operation Juárez* policy paper, for example, implicitly, together with other things I did with non-aligned nations (so-called) over the period from 1974-75 to the present, in order to bring economic justice to the so-called developing nations, which was one of the initial motives which brought me into the political arena in the first place, something from the last war.

It is also expressed, in my responses to the anticipated and actual collapse of the so-called Iron Curtain in 1989. My notion of the great Triangle, the Productive Triangle, the area from Paris to Vienna through Prague to Berlin and back by way of the Ruhr and Lille to Paris, as a productive triangle which has the greatest historic concentration of productive potential of any part of this planet. This potential must be used as a center, a focal point for the radiation of development along lines of transportation and communication to other centers throughout the world, beginning with, of course, Europe and Eurasia.

Thus must be done with a view of delivering justice, economic justice in particular, to the peoples of the so-called developing sector.

I don't view beyond that any perfect model of a planet because I believe that the world is not a *perfectible*, in the sense of absolutely perfectible, domain, but rather as a continuing domain, as Plato would say, a *Becoming*, in which there are certain tasks of ongoing development, not finished perfection, but ongoing development, which are mandatory for the successful continuation of the human species on this planet at any time; and therefore I would say that, to the extent I have a “grand design,” it is of the nature of *Becoming* as exemplified by the *Operation Juárez* paper from August 1982 and from my 1989-90 work in particular on the European Triangle.

I would say also that what I did in connection with the SDI, Strategic Defense Initiative, in negotiating with the Soviet government through the relevant back-channel for the Reagan administration or for the U.S. government during Reagan's period, this also expresses my sense of a *Becoming*; that is, to activate, in the Russian intelligentsia, a sense of a science-driver development program, which I think emphasizes, by bringing to the fore, creativity as the policy on which an economy is to be based, emphasizing what creativity really is. It is the *imago Dei* of the individual.

My grand design, I think therefore, is to realize that science-driver economic programs, together with other things which have the same effect, constitute the basis for building society upon the keystone of the principle of *imago Dei* and the associated principle of *capax Dei*. That is the grand design as I see it.