

sources, control population growth, and hold back the increasing income gap between rich and poor.” His views reflect the conditions in China—such as the effects of the use of primitive technology in a poor nation of 1.2 billion persons and the need for powerful government leadership and a strong national industry—in contrast to the insanity emerging from most “advanced”-sector nations’ universities and academies these days which champions primitive technology.

But his view that “science and technology can only gain insight and ideas from practice and by pushing forward economic development,” will not be enough for China to win the battle it has before it. For that, China’s scientists must enter into a dialogue with the western tradition based in the Golden Renaissance, the basis of all great modern scientific discoveries, which also means rediscovering true western history, even if most westerners have forgotten it. Then, the full promise of the National Science and Technology Conference in Beijing could be realized.

Who are the British, to complain of a hungry China?

by Mary McCourt Burdman

Those of us who, in defense of humanity, have had to examine the working of the British imperial “mind” over many years, have come to learn something about this phenomenon: It is extremely nasty, and it never forgets slights. People of other nations, not as willing to be quite so nasty as they are, have lost, time and again in recent centuries, to those who run the British Empire. But there are times when nations do learn, and, in learning, determine not only to protect themselves from these nasty British policies, but to even reject them. Then, the British become *very* angry. So, now, with China.

Graham Hutchings, of London’s Hollinger Corp.-owned *Daily Telegraph*, has been writing a series of articles on China. One exemplary headline on the Chinese, in the June 2 *Telegraph*, was: “Why They Could Devour the World.” He wrote: “There is a potential monster in our midst.” It is not Brussels, the Bosnian Serbs, or Muslim Central Asia, he assures us. No, “the real challenge to the international order comes . . . from the rise of China.” Citing the current reincarnation of the British East India Company’s long-discredited Parson Malthus, the Worldwatch Institute’s Lester Brown, Hutchings claims that China could soon be gobbling up the world’s food and energy.

“The 20th century offers unhappy testimony of the prob-

lems involved in accommodating the rise of a new power,” Hutchings notes. “The search for natural resources, when conducted by expanding, industrializing, fiercely nationalistic powers [meaning, in Brit-speak, Germany and Japan], has often been the cause of war.” But China, Hutchings tells us, is a problem beyond all this. “‘China’ is a great, yet flawed civilization, trying to become a modern state.”

Those British buggers (to use their intimate term of affection among friends, male, of course) are clearly upset. The Chinese—and there are 1.2 billion of them, something which the British cannot for one moment forget—have, for one reason or another, gotten wise to Britain’s plans. The Chinese are not going to go through London’s proposed post-Deng Xiaoping breakup. They do not like this proposal, they do not want it: They have rejected it.

The British are in a sulk, and complaining. The breakup of China, their pet policy for such a long time, might have been somewhat unpleasant, but, they say, that they could have managed. This is far worse, because, now, all those hungry Chinese, with all their problems and all their needs, united in one nation, are going to constitute a strategic threat to the world, on the issues of food, energy, and so forth. Their ilk have been spouting about this for some time now.

But this is by no means all that really upsets the British imperial mind. There is something more. On May 26, the government of China had the nerve to say that the basis for economic growth and profitability, or what Marx and Marxists call surplus value, is generated as the result of science and scientific and technological progress. The government of China gathered the entire leadership of the nation together in Beijing for five full days, and announced that it is going to place the emphasis on science and technology, as the way to increase the productive powers of labor of the Chinese people. They announced that this was their policy for the coming century, and made very clear, in their Chinese style, that this was going to be a turning point in the history of modern China.

Now, this is a policy that goes *directly* against everything that one learns at Cambridge University. It is completely against Cambridge University’s systems analysis, as taught by the late Lord Caldor, who is, undoubtedly, with his same ghastly aspect, still teaching his doctrines there.

It is this, that is really insulting, because it goes to the core of British religious beliefs, called empiricism. How can the British, who have never forgotten how Chinese Emperor Qianlong contemptuously dismissed the Britain monarchy’s envoy Lord Macartney 200 years ago—it slips out every now and again, in their contemporary commentaries—possibly overlook this present insult, this challenge to their religion, empiricism? We cannot wonder they are in such a snit.

Hutchings let loose with the worst of insults. He called the leaders of China: “Unclubbable men . . . generally unwelcome in the chanceries of the West.” Unclubbable, indeed. China’s leaders are *not* part of the Club. China’s leaders

are uncouth: They are not buggers; they cannot talk, as British oligarchs do, for hours through stiff upper (and lower) lips. The British know what is, and is not, done. Prince Philip does not talk of science and technology; he talks of "the ecological pragmatism of so-called paganism"; the need to "cull" "surplus populations." Was it not Prince Philip who, the guest of the Chinese government, stood at China's Great Wall and sniggered to some British students about "slitty eyes"? *He* is what the British call a "clubbable man."

British-run famines

Look at this matter, of how terrible famines are. If there is potential famine in China today, is that an indictment of that system of government; does it make that system of government a menace? Let us look at Britain. Look at the writings of James Mill of the British East India Company, and at the British government which took over India in the 19th century. India, when the British came, had been far richer in food and many manufactures than Britain ever was. Just how many famines did the British East India Company and the British Empire run in Britian's imperial colony of India, as a matter of political, social, and population control during the 19th century and later? So many that not a single decade was free of terrible famine during the 18th and 19th centuries in British India. And what caused these famines? There were no *natural* causes. There was never a national crop failure in India; never a year in which the national food supply was not sufficient to meet people's needs. But millions starved because, under the heel of the British, those in one region would be far too poor even to buy food from a neighboring province.

The rule of the East India Company was so rapacious, that after even a few years, the British government had to intervene to prevent the total wasting of the land and people. Under British rule, the famines never stopped. In 1943, during World War II, 1.5 million people starved to death in Bengal alone; yet during the war, British battle dead amounted to only 295,000.

In fact, we would think that one reason for British irritation at the Chinese, among other nations, is the lack of *permanence* of modern-day famines. Despite the devastating famine which killed millions in the Great Leap Forward, the Chinese population has as good as doubled since. This was not what happened after British-run famines. Ireland today has never recovered from the potato famine 150 years ago, during which the nation was robbed of its other rich food produce in the name of British free trade. Ireland's population today is *half* that of 1845. In India, in the last 25 years of the 19th century, many provinces suffered famines unparalleled in contemporary times—while Indian food exports continued. So brutal was the famine and the rent collection, that during these decades the British succeeded in *stopping* the growth of the population altogether. Should, therefore, the fact that the British were spreading famine as a matter of

policy, of mass murder and genocide, have been the cause for the prompt collapse of the British system?

The Venetian system

Let us look more broadly. In point of fact, the British system is a clone of the Venetian system. The English and other people are really like peasants, who are ruled by an overlordship, a bunch of international oligarchs, gathered around the monarchy. They have the social character of a specific type—they are a financier nobility oligarchy. This financier nobility oligarchy, together with its feudalistic competitor, has ruled most of this planet for all of human existence, up until 15th century, the time of the Golden Renaissance. Under this rule, most of humanity was reduced to the most brutish condition, in which over 95% of the people lived as serfs and slaves, like the unfortunate, cannibalized subjects of the Aztecs.

Before the British criticize China—which has its own oligarchical system, which is problematic, but that is not a British affair—they should rather look at their own system. They should realize that if there is famine in the world today, the problem is not the result of the Chinese government, but the result of the world's foolish toleration of the British oligarchical system, and its precedents. The danger to civilization comes not from China, but from those masters, whose lackeys, those scribblers at the *Daily Telegraph*, are.

EIR Audio Report

Your weekly antidote
for New World Order 'news'

Exclusive news reports and interviews
Audio statements by Lyndon LaRouche

- Updates on:
- The Real Economy
 - Science and Technology
 - The Fight for Constitutional Law
 - The Right to Life
 - Food and Agriculture
 - The Arts
 - The Living History of the American Republic
 - Essential Reports from around the Globe

\$500 for 50 issues

An hour-long audio cassette sent by first-class mail
each week. Includes cover letter with contents.

Make checks payable to:

EIR News Service

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Phone: (703) 777-9451

Fax: (703) 771-9492