

‘LaRouche Doctrine’ Is the Key To Peace in Southwest Asia

Democratic Presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche gave this videotaped interview to Hussein Askary, Arabic correspondent for EIR, on April 24, 2004. The interview is currently in production as a DVD, in both English and Arabic, and will be available soon from the LaRouche in 2004 campaign committee.

Askary: Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, the Democratic Presidential candidate and prominent economist and statesman of the United States, has put forward a proposal to salvage the situation in Iraq and the Middle East in general, which he has called “The LaRouche Doctrine,” and which is being circulated inside the United States and internationally—that, in the context of his proposals for the reorganization of the international financial and monetary systems. So, we are going to ask Mr. Lyndon LaRouche to elaborate on these proposals, and explain the way his initiatives could work.

LaRouche: Well, what I did was, among other things, I made a ten-point argument, in order to have it in the point form, which is more easily understood, and divided into three sections the ten points. The first is to emphasize that the present view of the strategic situation in the Middle East is wrong, and can not possibly lead to a successful result. Therefore, we have to redefine the question on all sides; various proposals from all sides, will not work, as previously established. For one reason, the situation [in Iraq] has gone much too far. We’re now in advanced asymmetric warfare, and the United States could not stay in, and the United States could not simply get out, without leaving chaos behind. And therefore, some completely different approach has to be taken to the situation.

The first thing is to recognize that we have to create a zone of security, which is accepted among the countries of the region, and deal with the problem of reconstructing Iraq, in the context of an agreement within the region. Now, the zone I defined is as follows: To the north, you have Turkey; next to it, you have Syria, and you have Iran. You have also at the corner, of the intersection of Turkey and Iraq and Iran, you also have Armenia, and you have Azerbaijan, where there are also problems. If someone is to destabilize Transcaucasia, including the problems between Azerbaijan and Armenia and Iran, then you could not possibly maintain a secure Middle East security policy.

So therefore, there has to be a sense of a primary policy, which, on the north, is Turkey, which is a strong nation-state,

with a very definite perception of what the Middle East problems are, for it. You have Iran; whether you agree with Iran or not, it’s a major factor in the region, and has to be consulted and brought in on the agreement. Otherwise there is no secure agreement. You have Iraq itself, but Iraq doesn’t have power now. So, Syria has a sense of being a Middle East power; that is, it has a sense of power as an integrity of a nation, and its own policy. You have Egypt, which is the keystone nation from the other side. You have various other nations that can be brought in, including Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and so forth, but they can not actually function, unless there is a framework in which they can efficiently function within the region.

So that’s number one. So we have to say, “Take the British term ‘Middle East,’ and scrap it.” There is no Middle East, there’s Southwest Asia. And people who want peace will stop using the term “Middle East” and say “Southwest Asia” instead.

Askary: What is the significance of that?

LaRouche: Well, the British invented the term “Middle East,” which goes back to the beginning of the 19th Century in the course of the Napoleonic Wars, when the British decided that the Ottoman Empire was going to be in trouble. And they were going to be on the inside, and they were going to make trouble. So, they planted the first Jewish settlement, under British direction, in the Middle East, and also picked up some of the Jews who were there, who were bankers, in Syria and so forth, and picked them up and tried to play them as factors in the grain trade and other things which were inside the Ottoman Empire, and play this.

So, all during this period, from 1763 on, in particular, we’ve had a British Empire in fact. Beginning with 1763, with the Treaty of Paris, all of Europe had been involved, by the British, in attacking Prussia, and during this period, the British had exploited this war, the so-called Seven Years’ War, in order to gobble up India, and to gobble up North America, from France. At that point the Treaty of Paris established the British East India *Company*—a *company*—as an empire. And later, this became, formally, the British Empire. But all during this period, from 1763, Europe had been dominated by a group, based in London, which, in fact, is a British Empire. It still exists today, except today, the difference is, the United States was picked, as an English-speaking country, to become a kind of Big Brother, on doing errands for the British masters