

prime mover and ground of all things," Leibniz says, and he quotes: "The first principle of the Chinese is called *Li*, that is, reason, or the foundation of all nature, the most universal reason and substance; there is nothing greater nor better than *Li*. From *Li qua Li* emanate five virtues: piety, justice, religion, prudence, and faith. For the Chinese just as *Li* is Being *par excellence* so it also possesses truth and Goodness *par excellence*. . . . Should one after all not say that the Chinese came very close to that absolute substance which we pray to under the name of God?"

*Li* is not the material cause of things, as Father Longobardi had assumed, nor a world soul in the sense of Spinoza or Averroës. (Spinoza reduces everything to a single substance, of which all things are only modifications.) But *Jovis omnia plena*—God fills all, that is, He is in all things and all things are in Him. The second principle, *Ki*, corresponds to matter, just as it corresponds to the instrument of the first principle which moves matter. "In consequence of this production of prime matter by the primary principle, or primitive form, by pure activity, by the operation of God, Chinese philosophy more closely approaches Christian theology than the philosophy of the ancient Greeks. . . . Admittedly, it appears that the Chinese believed that the *Li* first and always produced its *Ki*, and therefore one is as eternal as the other. But there should be nothing surprising about this, since they were apparently ignorant of the one 'Revelation' which can explain to us the beginning of the universe. St. Thomas Aquinas and other great doctors have claimed that the dogma could not be demonstrated by reason alone. . . . And there are those who believe that because the beginning of the Chinese empire occurred during the time of the Patriarchs, they could have learned about the creation of the world from the Patriarchs."

The third principle, *Xangti*, and *Li* are the same thing, Leibniz says. One has every reason to give to God the name of *Xangti*. What we call the light of reason in man, Confucius calls the commandment and law of Heaven: "To offend Heaven is to act against reason, to ask pardon of Heaven is to reform oneself and to make a sincere return in word and deed in the submission one owes to this very law of reason. For me, I find this quite excellent and quite in accord with natural theology. Far from finding any distorted understanding here, I believe that it is only by wrong interpretations and by interpolations that one could find anything to criticize on this point. It is pure Christianity, insofar as it renews the natural law inscribed in our hearts—except for what revelation and grace add to it to improve our nature."

Leibniz conceived his idea of an ecumenical alliance between Confucian and Christian thinking from the standpoint of *bona opera*, that is, a method to transmit, assimilate, and generate new discoveries. For him, there was no difference between any nation or party, as he said in a memorandum to the czar: "That country in which the sciences will best flourish, will be the most loved by me, because all mankind will profit from it."

## Zhirinovsky echoes British geopolitics

by Mark Burdman

While Vladimir Zhirinovsky is being described as the "new Hitler" and "a fascist," the essential point has been altogether missed by the international media and the vast majority of "Russia experts." He is a man of the Russian military-intelligence establishment whose declarations are, in part, made for domestic Russian political consumption, but, more fundamentally, are designed to put forward the *geopolitical* views characteristic of the Russian "Third Rome" world view. In this respect, Zhirinovsky's pronouncements are often a Russian *mirror image* of the geopolitical outlook of spokesmen for the Anglo-American geopolitical establishment. He is only more brutal, in projecting mass devastation in the South in the coming years, than those western geopoliticians who are revered by the same media that are quick to call Zhirinovsky a fascist.

During 1993, one line of thinking that became prominent in Washington and London is the idea that future wars will be "clashes between civilizations," with "the West" pitted against "the rest" of the world. This idea was put forward by Harvard University professor Samuel Huntington, in his article entitled "The Clash of Civilizations?" in the Summer 1993 New York Council on Foreign Relations' magazine *Foreign Affairs*. The terms are borrowed from British Middle East specialist Bernard Lewis, an architect of Anglo-American destabilization strategy vis-à-vis the Third World.

In Huntington's view, "Conflict between civilizations will be the latest phase in the evolution of conflict in the modern world." In this "conflict between civilizations," NATO planning must be "increasingly directed to potential threats and instability along its 'southern tier.'" . . . In the post-Cold War world the primary objective of arms control is to prevent the development by non-western societies of military capabilities that could threaten western interests." The West, he says, must "limit the expansion of the military strength of Confucian and Islamic states; to moderate the reduction of western military capabilities and maintain military superiority in East and Southwest Asia; to exploit differences and conflicts between Confucian and Islamic states."

One finds here the kernel of the policy of "technological apartheid," the idea developed during the Persian Gulf war,

of denying advanced technologies to developing countries. According to Huntington, "Differences among civilizations are not only real; they are basic. . . . These differences are the product of centuries. They will not soon disappear."

The view of Huntington and other leading Anglo-American policymakers converges on what French author Jean-Christophe Rufin has described, in his book *The Empire and the New Barbarians: North-South Rupture*, as the evolution of a Roman Empire-modelled "Limes" strategy, whereby the North effectively builds a wall (a "Limes" line) to separate itself from the instability in the South. As Rufin, who is now a consultant to the French Defense Ministry, correctly points out, there is a powerful trend of thinking in Russia which subscribes to such an idea.

### A new 'Berlin Wall'

From this standpoint, the view put forward by Zhirinovskiy in an Aug. 28, 1993 feature in the Russian daily *Izvestia* takes on greater relevance. There, Zhirinovskiy says that Russia, in the future, should avoid repeating the historical error of the Bolsheviks of "helping the peoples" in various southern regions of the world that are "as far away from us as the moon." Interventions in the South, as in the case of Afghanistan, should only be undertaken for "geopolitical" reasons.

What Russia must do, he writes, is to "move away from the Caucasus, *build between it and us a Berlin Wall*, and confine ourselves to observing, to selling arms to each side. . . . Today, we don't need the Caucasus. Let them sort things out by themselves, under the remote control of our diplomats and intelligence agents." The highest priorities for Russia are to "get our troops out, and to bring the Russians out of this boiling pot. . . . We must bring back all those who want to leave, in a rapid and organized manner. . . . The Russians will leave, and there will not be, in their place, either engineers, nor doctors, nor skilled workers." The Russians should no longer have the "Cominternist" concern for uplifting the lives of peoples in these regions, but will leave these people to raise their livestock and cultivate vineyards. They don't need institutes, space rockets, noisy factories. "Better to build mosques in Tashkent, and evacuate back to Russia its aviation factory," i.e., technological apartheid!

According to Zhirinovskiy, "we will leave Central Asia and the Caucasus, leaving all that to the local chiefs and to the mullahs. And, in some time, it is they who will come to us. More exactly, *they will crawl toward us, beaten down, starving, sick, some on their crutches, others on a stretcher*. . . . I repeat, there is no question of engaging ourselves in conflicts. Let Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan do that. The result will be, for these countries, the loss of their state. The miasma of instability in the South will absorb them. And then they will come. Our soldiers will wash their boots in the warm waters of the Indian Ocean, the local inhabitants

will welcome them with flowers, as saviors, as those who will have saved them from hunger and mutual annihilation. But, while arriving in the South, we will not construct cosmodromes in the steppes, as the Bolsheviks did, we will not reclaim the virgin lands, we will not start irrigation projects. We will leave them in the state that the local inhabitants want to be in: the herds, skewers of meat, pure air, and the pilgrimage to Mecca—a pilgrimage on foot, not in a Boeing jet.

"Knowing that a zone of instability is developing on the frontier, we will have to reinforce the effectiveness of our defense. It is best to create a mobile presidential guard, equipped with all types of armaments, composed of elite professionals and capable of undertaking, in an hour, combat actions in any point of the globe whatsoever. It is necessary to create several new intelligence services, under the direct control of the President, not linked to the ex-republics. Any neighbor, even if he possesses a hunting rifle and hates you, will not risk attacking if he knows that you have in your house a mortar, that the top mafioso on the corner is your friend, that your brother serves in the OMON [anti-riot forces], and that your wife is the daughter of a general in the security service."

### The 'partition of the world'

In his book *Last Push Toward the South*, which he says contains "the quintessence of my philosophical and geopolitical opinions," Zhirinovskiy calls for a geopolitical deal with other northern powers to carve up spheres of influence in the South: "The United States was trying to exercise its influence on the entire world. But the idea of world domination has been vitiated. It would be more valuable to move toward a form of regional cooperation, toward a partition of the world into several regional blocs, along a North-South line. Japan and China will go toward the South—the Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Australia. Russia itself toward its south—Afghanistan, Iran, and Turkey. And western Europe, the African continent. As to Canada and the United States, they will have all of Latin America."

This echoes Rufin's contention that Russia would seek "means to, at one and the same time, continue to stabilize the southern zone and defend itself from the South. By integrating this policy in the global problematic of the North-South Limes, [Russia] can hope to find external support to realize these two objectives. Already, very already, at the moment of the American operation in Panama, one could see a symmetry being established: The Soviets intervened in Azerbaijan without generating any reactions. Each was defending his portion of the Limes. Later, during the negotiation on conventional disarmament, they were authorized to subtract a part of their forces by sending them beyond the Urals: as it was acknowledged to be necessary was acknowledged for them to defend themselves against the danger to the South of these eastern regions."