

The first stage in the coup plot, was to shut down 18 newspapers. The second, was to tap phones of reformers, disrupt the seminars and bazaar in the capital, to “incite senior clerics,” and deploy forces to the countryside, to intimidate reform supporters. The final move, according to the tape, says the *Guardian*, would be to stage a coup, “on the grounds that some [reformers] could be foreign agents or spies.”

That there may be those on Iran’s conservative right wing, who would contemplate such an adventure, is not to be excluded. However, the prospect of actually staging a coup, and succeeding, are dim, given the obvious fact that the overwhelming majority of the population stands behind the elected President and Parliament. Any open confrontation in the streets would lead to civil war, of uncertain outcome. What is more likely to happen in Iran, is that the forces of the Khatami reform camp, and the conservative faction, which looks to Khamenei for backing, will find an agreement, for some sort of power-sharing arrangement, albeit informally. The reality of the political process in Iran, is that the conservatives, though numerically in a political minority, still wield power in the non-elected institutions of the judiciary, intelligence, and security, power which they will not give up.

The question facing President Khatami, is how to shape this *modus vivendi*, without halting the momentum toward reform. The fact that the maximum authority of the nation, Khamenei, spoke out in explicit support of President Khatami on April 26, indicates that some form of agreement may be in the works.

The International Context

It is to be hoped, that foreign forces will stay out of the fray. Any intervention from, for example, the U.S. State Department, like the one made by spokesman Jamie Rubin, who expressed his concern over “a threat to the freedom of the press in Iran,” will not be helpful. Considering the fact that the U.S. press is controlled top-down by Wall Street interests, such sanctimonious concern for press freedom is hypocritical, to say the least. And it will backfire in Iran, feeding into the conservatives’ argument, that the liberal press are merely the “mouthpiece” of the United States, etc. A *Tehran Times* article on April 22 warned of this. Those in Washington desiring improved relations with Khatami’s Iran, according to reform forces inside Iran, would contribute more by refraining from comment.

The Iranian government, in the meantime, has not allowed the internal debate to deter it from several important international initiatives. First, it is continuing with dogged determination, to move Pakistan toward enabling a political solution to the Afghan crisis. At the same time, Iran has been further developing its ties for economic cooperation, with the Central Asian republics, and took part in the Eurasia 2000 conference held in Kazakstan, in late April.

LaRouche Discusses in Russian-Language

On April 12, the New York-based Russian-language Express Weekly dedicated its issue to Israel, interviewing experts and activists from Russia, Israel, and the United States, including Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Express Weekly is the largest Russian-language newspaper in the United States and Canada, and is also published inside Russia and Israel.

Editor Dimitri Klimentov published a full-page interview with LaRouche in the last issue in 1999. Both his questions and LaRouche’s responses were submitted in English, which we reprint here.

Q: On the current situation in Israel: Who’s to blame and what should be done?

LaRouche: What is urgently wanted is an open-ended Middle East peace and cooperation agreement, modelled upon the lessons of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. On the positive side of negotiations for such a goal, there are two chief impediments to success of such an effort. First, without a large-scale desalination program, there will not be sufficient water available among all of the relevant nations to ensure a durable and stable peace. Second, integral to that agreement on large-scale desalination and water-management cooperation, there must be a wide-ranging policy of increase of the physical productive powers of labor through a region broadly defined as “Israel and the Arab World.” On the negative side, there are powerful forces opposed to such a peace, forces which exploit the Middle East as a cockpit of conflict, according to the desires of parties from outside that region.

Q: What grounds are there for pessimism?

LaRouche: On the matter of reasons for pessimism: I am optimistic about the choice of the current Prime Minister of Israel, Ehud Barak. I am doing what little I can, from my corner, to foster his success in this endeavor. However, I also recognize how difficult his situation is, how many enemies, operating from inside and outside Israel, are working to prevent his success. I also recognize, that while President Clinton has made a serious commitment to bringing about Middle East peace, he is either unable, or unwilling, so far, to undertake certain measures, such as supporting large-scale desalination programs, which are indispensable for success of ongo-

Prospects for Israel Magazine

ing negotiations. It is extremely difficult for President Clinton to promote a successful approach to Middle East peace-negotiations while also supporting a Presidential pre-candidate, Vice President Al Gore, who is rather fanatically opposed to some of the measures, including large-scale desalination, which durable peace requires, a Vice President who is a fanatical advocate of those forms of globalization which would render a successful Middle East peace agreement impossible. The breakdown of negotiations with Syria's President Assad, over access to the shores of the Sea of Galilee, typifies that contradiction.

Q: What grounds are there for optimism?

LaRouche: The most important new factor in the search for Middle East peace, is the fact that Prime Minister Barak represents the legacy of that great Moses Mendelssohn, whose rigorously reasoned ecumenical policies are a perfect model for a Jewish approach to the kind of comprehensive Middle East peace which matches the lessons of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia. As we see, he has support from all the key figures who, to my knowledge, have a record of commitment to such efforts during the past, circles with which I have been more or less actively allied to this purpose since the middle of the 1970s. In addition, every sane and literate Israeli leading figure, especially those in the military, have understood, that Israel no longer has the possibility of dealing with the Middle East situation by force, as it has done often in the past decades. The roles of Arafat and the recent intervention for ecumenicism by Pope John Paul II, are also factors of the relatively greatest importance in supplying the opportunity for peace and security at this time.

Q: What influence does the U.S. have on the current events in Israel: positive, negative, or none? Please, explain.

LaRouche: At the moment, apart from the positive efforts by President Clinton in a number of areas, including the Middle East, the U.S.A. has become, increasingly, a self-crippled political power, now gripped by the onrush of an unavoidable, world-wide financial debacle. Since the period of the 1996 U.S. general election, the U.S. has suffered an increasing loss of the combined will and capacity to exert a positive influence in developments outside the U.S. itself. U.S. policies toward Southeast Europe, since the commit-



A desalination facility in Kuwait. Without a large-scale desalination program for the Mideast, writes LaRouche, there will not be sufficient water available among all of the relevant nations to ensure a durable and stable peace.

ment to war against Yugoslavia, by Britain's Blair government and the U.S. State Department, beginning late 1998, for example, are only typical of the increasing hostility toward U.S. policy-making from around the world, including inside continental Europe itself. So far, a President Clinton greatly weakened, since Summer 1996, by attacks from outside his administration, and subversion from within, often lacks either the ability or the inclination to take actions which would be needed if he were to assume a more effective role in world affairs.

Q: Is there a chance the Russian Jewish community in the U.S. can have a certain impact on the course of events in Israel?

LaRouche: As you know, the Russian Jewish community in Israel is of increasing relative importance there. I would therefore think that the Russian Jewish community inside the

U.S. today, if it is well informed, is a factor of more than a little significance in this situation. In the practical measures which Israel must adopt for improvement of its economy and the related promotion of the economic foundations of Middle East peace generally, I estimate that the Russian Jewish community inside the U.S. would be able, if adequately informed, to lend the kind of encouragement which would be most helpful in influencing both U.S. policy-shaping and the Middle East situation.

Q: Aren't you under the impression that the key world leaders as well as major shadow power figures, "puppeteers" of the world, so to speak—including people of Jewish origin—are turning a blind eye to what is happening in Israel, having left it in the hands of fate and circumstances?

LaRouche: As we see in the U.S. population itself, there has been a decades-long increase of combined political and general relative illiteracy, and shrinking of the moral faculties of the relatively more influential strata of the population of most nations: a deep cultural pessimism. As in tracing the roots of the rise of fascism in Germany, from the early 1920s, we see a parallel, perhaps even more ominous process unfolding in the U.S.A. and elsewhere, especially among the relatively most influential upper 20% of the family-income brackets in the U.S.A. itself. Here, the lower 80% of family-income brackets has become more and more pessimistic in its own ways, withdrawn, resentful, sensing its own political impotence, fleeing into small-mindedness about local, selected issues, fleeing from an intolerable reality, into the escapism of entertainment, a situation which should remind historians of the bread-and-circuses trends in behavior among the Roman population during the rule of Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, et al. Only a shock, comparable in effect to that caused by the bombing of Pearl Harbor in Dec. 7, 1941, is likely to shake the present U.S. population out of its present, predominantly pessimistic behavioral tendencies.

Q: What are, in your opinion, the ways left to save the existence of the Jewish state?

LaRouche: In my view, the answer to this question is to be reduced to a single central theme: the possibility of a comprehensive, Treaty-of-Westphalia-like, establishment, of a system of sovereign nation-state partners among a region inclusive of Israel and the Arab World. Only with the affirmation of the unique role of the power of a sovereign nation-state to create economic-protectionist forms of long-term credit and trade agreements, can a durable peace be established; to make such benefits possible for each among such parties, there must be economic cooperation for increase of the physical productive powers of labor as measured per capita, and per square kilometer of land-area. Only with the large-scale development of basic economic infrastructure among the nations of this area, is a durable common-interest agreement possible

among those who have been bitter adversaries for much too long. This means, first of all, massive programs of desalination coupled with water-management systems. It means a massive infusion of power, especially in very high energy-flux density modes. It means the development of efficient systems of mass-transit of goods and passengers, utilizing the natural characteristics of the entire region for this purpose. It means the development of entire new urban-rural, industrial-agricultural complexes, from Morocco eastward, and southward to locations such as Sudan and across the Sahara to Sub-Sahara Africa, where the world's greatest under-realized potential for increments to the world's food production lies. It means long-range such economic cooperation, premised upon long-term, low-cost state-to-state trade credit, and trade agreements of up to thirty years maturity. In such a setting, the future of the state of Israel is secured by the self-interest of its partners.

Q: What is your opinion on the historic fate of Jewish statehood and people?

LaRouche: The state of Israel was created, in effect, by what the Nazis did, both inside Germany, and in eastern Europe. Although the axiomatic commitment of the Nazis was to eradicate Christianity, as Nietzsche would have desired, once Hitler had won the war, the first target of this campaign was the legacy of Moses Mendelssohn, both among German-speakers, and in the related development of the Yiddish Renaissance in Poland, Russia, and the Ukraine. It is relevant, that as part of our researches into the virtual holocaust of silence against the leading figures of victims from among German and Eastern European Jewry, one of our investigators notes that in the former Jewish cemetery associated with the great Berlin synagogue, only the name of one, Moses Mendelssohn himself, is celebrated in stone. Not that he was not great, but there were many families associated with his own, which made some among the greatest cultural contributions to the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and early Twentieth Centuries in Germany. The same is to be said of similar contributions in Eastern Europe. For me, the mass killings stun the conscience; but, the world's holocaust of silence against the living memories of the Jewish contribution to modern European civilization, as typified by Moses Mendelssohn, is the most hideous. What was done to the bodies, is dwarfed in enormity by the indifference shown to those souls. It was this brutish indifference which drove so many into search for a place of Jewish national refuge. Now, the Jewish state so established, the question is, what does it do with itself in the history of the world? Its continued survival depends upon the answer to that latter question.

Q: Do you have any friends or relatives in Israel?

LaRouche: I have numerous, valued acquaintances, and a few who are to be considered in the strictest sense, as long-standing friends.