on the Syrian. After the failed attempt to reopen the wounds in the internal Lebanese situation, it has become even clearer than before, that there must be negotiations with Syria on returning the Golan Heights. It is good that even a member of the Israeli government is talking aloud about this. That has never happened before.

Fourth reality. Unless the Middle East conflict is settled, it will become more dangerous, taking into account the Iran factor, not only for its immediate participants, but also for the main players in the international arena, including the U.S.A.

Fifth reality. It can be presumed that the United States, and not for the above-cited reason alone, will be more interested in a Middle East settlement; and such a settlement is practically impossible, without the United States. Despite the upcoming elections, which do, of course, reduce Washington's room for action to influence Israel towards compromise, there is such an interest, based on the fact that the U.S.A. has gotten bogged down in Iraq, and is rapidly losing its authority in the Arab world. A settlement of the Middle East conflict could compensate for many U.S. losses in the Middle East.

Sixth reality. In the multipolar world that is taking shape, Europe, China, India, and some others, which are clearly inclined to favor a Middle East settlement, are acquiring ever greater possibilities for influencing the world situation.

Lastly, I do not see any insurmountable obstacles to finding solutions for the problems that would represent the basis of a settlement.

Borders. They could be defined, including through a certain adjustment of the cease-fire lines, and even some small territorial exchanges.

Refugees. The right of return does not mean that they all will want to return. A majority may prefer financial compensation, which will enable them, finally, to stop living in the Palestinian camps, and to settle either in the Palestinian state, or in some other Arab country. Incidentally, my book mentions that Gamal Abdel Nasser, already, wrote to Israeli Prime Minister Sharett about such compensation, in one of his secret letters. The topic of separating the right of return, in principle, from the mechanism—including compensation—was discussed fairly recently during informal talks between former Israeli minister [Yossi] Beilin and member of the PLO leadership Yasser Abd Rabbo. The conversation partners agreed.

Jerusalem. We should remember, at the very least, that none other than American President Clinton, in his settlement plan, proposed the division of Jerusalem into two parts: an Israeli and a Palestinian.

Of course, these are all difficult problems. Nonetheless, I still advocate, first, that the Quartet [Russia, United States, European Union, United Nations], bringing in other participants, work out a compromise settlement plan; and, secondly, demand that it be accepted by the parties to the conflict. After all, we have the precedents that Israel came into existence, and Palestine was partitioned, not as the result of Jewish-Arab negotiations. The convocation of an international conference, with the active participation of Russia, the U.S.A., Europe, and the UN, could be a way to implement the ideas I have indicated. . . .

Support for LaRouche's Long-Term Perspective

by Prof. O.L. Kuznetsov and
Prof. B.Ye. Bolshakov

Professor Kuznetsov is the Rector and Professor Bolshakov is a professor, at the Dubna University of Nature, Society, and Man, in Dubna, Russia. They were long-time collaborators of the late Dr. Pobisk G. Kuznetsov (see a commemoration in EIR*, Dec. 28, 2001). Dr. O.L. Kuznetsov is also president of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences. They sent this paper to the Berlin conference (translated from Russian by* EIR*). Mr. LaRouche's comments on this and related contributions were published in last week's issue.*

Lyndon LaRouche is well known in Russia as a major scientist, an outstanding economist, and a distinguished American political figure, one of the most important and prominent partisans of the idea of cooperation between the U.S.A. and other countries on the economic development of Eurasia, in the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt.

Russian Academy of Natural Sciences

Prof. O.L. Kuznetsov hailed LaRouche's ideas as the basis for analyzing man's strategic perspectives for the next 50 years.

The fundamental ideas of L. LaRouche's physical economy are consonant with the ideas of such scientific luminaries as G. Leibniz, V.I. Vernadsky, and P.G. Kuznetsov. They are the basis for a profound analysis of the global monetary and financial system, and the strategic perspectives for mankind's next 50 years.

In the past half-century, a yawning gap has been steadily growing between the real value of the total world product, and its nominal (speculative) value, which is not backed up by any real power. During that period of time, the gap has grown from U.S.$2 trillion, to $450 trillion, threatening to cause a global catastrophe. One of the consequences is hyperinflation, and the inappropriate policy of spreading asymmetrical warfare throughout the world.

All of this goes to confirm L. LaRouche's conclusions concerning the crisis of the global monetary and financial system, and the necessity of adopting positive measures to avert catastrophe and create a new system.

In our view, a new monetary and financial system should include key elements of the original Bretton Woods system, as well as kilowatt-hours as a universal measure of value.

We share L. LaRouche's position, that work to develop a new system must rely on the principle of "the benefit of the other," formulated in the spirit of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia.

Respectfully,
Prof. O.L. Kuznetsov
Prof. B.Ye. Bolshakov

Nuclear Energy and Sustained Development

by Dr. Stanislav Subbotin

Dr. Subbotin is from the Kurchatov Institute in Moscow, an associate of Academician Ye.P. Velikhov. The full title of his paper, submitted to the Berlin conference, is "Nuclear Energy As the Basis for Transition to a Sustainable Development Trajectory" (excerpted here and translated from Russian by EIR*). His remarks were summarized at the conference, and Lyndon LaRouche's comments appeared in last week's issue.*

In the 21st Century, mankind will be faced with practically all of the consequences of that large-scale experiment in increasing "one's own" wealth, by utilizing "cheap" sources of energy, namely extracted organic fuels.

It should be realized clearly, that we currently have a civilization, whose viability is based on non-renewable processes, and cannot be separated from the rising production and consumption of electricity and various types of fuel for various possible means of transport. The raw materials resources from which these are derived (oil, gas, and coal), no matter how great they might now seem, can provide for the existence of this civilization for no more than 20-50 years, without serious political and economic disturbances; not to mention unpredictable changes in the functioning of the biosphere as a whole, local ecological disasters, and climate change.

No political and economic reforms will solve the oncoming problems, unless they have at their disposal a functioning power industry, which is a kind of core of any economy. It is necessary to develop and implement new principles and methods of obtaining energy, without large-scale intervention into the cycles of the biosphere. There must be a change of values, in order to stop taking resources from the Earth and from future generations, virtually without payment, for the sake of enriching individual countries and people.

Based on the unrestrained consumption of "cheap" energy resources, the modern economy is ignoring the laws of development of the biosphere, leading to the degradation of humanity as a biological species.

It is evident that the efforts of science to find new fuel resources ought to be accompanied by efforts to limit the use of them, at least by forecasting the consequences of these processes. It is necessary to expand the resource base, not so much for the sake of expanding the production of all sorts of "goods," as to increase the depth of reliable forecasting and planning for the further development of mankind. "Use, but do not abuse: Such is the law of wisdom. Neither abstinence nor excess bring happiness."—Voltaire.

The various energy technologies that use renewable energy resources, organic, and nuclear fuel, and thermonuclear fusion, should be seen not as competing, but as complementary in the creation of a harmonious structure of power production, capable of satisfying all of society's needs for different types and qualities of energy. Only if the composition of power production is harmonious, multifunctional, and multicomponent, will it be possible to spare society the effects of inefficient energy use, premature exhaustion of energy resources, and the need to use expensive energy resources, and thus to prevent the unjustified increase of the cost of producing energy and the attendant decline in social prosperity.

The definition of a society's sustainability is based upon its attitude toward resources. A society can be sustainable, if the rates of consumption of renewable resources do not exceed the rates at which they are replaced.

Of course, the utilization of renewable energy sources will develop during the 21st Century: wind, rivers, and tides, as well as non-renewable, non-traditional energy sources such as geothermal energy, etc. But it should be kept in mind, that there is nothing superfluous or unharmonious in the biosphere. These sources are renewable, only if the functioning