



Wolfgang Lillge

Dr. Selim said that with NATO moving into the Gulf region, one of the main strategic alternatives that governments in the region are considering is to hook up with the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

Iran, and Iraq, and was later expanded to linkages with the trans-regional projects, especially the Eurasian Land-Bridge. I have taken part in preparing the final report of the group that assessed the feasibility of Kuwait reaching out to the Eurasian Land-Bridge. The final report recommended to the government that the Eurasian Land-Bridge project represents an excellent opportunity for the Kuwaiti economy. It also recommended that Kuwait should promote cooperation with Iran in the areas of transportation and communication, and should establish a system of national and regional railway connections.

The final report recommended that Kuwait should (i) initiate a multi-modal transport system with Iran between the Port of Showeikh and Iranian ports; (ii) ratify the Arab Railways Agreement between countries of the Arab Orient through which Kuwait could benefit from the projected inter-Arab railway connections; (iii) develop a new port at the island of Bobyan; (iv) develop a Kuwaiti railway network to be connected with Iran and Iraq, reaching to Central Asia; and (v) establish a free zone in the Port of Showeikh.

Kuwait is already moving in these directions in conjunction with other GCC states, as the notion of connecting with the Eurasian Land-Bridge is also being considered at the regional level. The GCC states' summit held in December 2003 requested the GCC ministers of transport and communications to prepare a feasibility study on linking the GCC states with the regional railways network. The reference here is to the emerging Arab railway network and the Iranian one, which could connect the GCC states with the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

As was pointed out earlier, these projects emerge against the backdrop of an uncertain security environment in the Gulf region. The problem is further complicated by the limited ability of the GCC states to resist foreign intervention. The connections between the GCC states and the Eurasian Land-

Bridge require extensive cooperation with Iran, and the Bush Administration is against that. India and Pakistan were able to resist American pressure to refrain from building the natural gas pipeline connecting them with Iran. But the GCC states are not in the same position as India and Pakistan in relationship with the U.S.A. One other hurdle is that the GCC states are inclined to give the private sector a leading role in building these projects. The private sector in these countries is not likely to take the risk of investing in these projects under the present uncertain conditions, especially given that that sector is dominated by a rentier approach to business.

The uncertainties surrounding the ambitions of the GCC states to connect with the trans-regional railways project call for an innovative approach to deal with these problems. In this respect, the idea of Helga LaRouche to hold an international conference in the Gulf region on the economics of the Eurasian Land-Bridge seems to be a good idea. I believe that the Gulf states will welcome that idea. A collective effort to defeat the projected aggression against Iran would also encourage the GCC states to break away, at least partially, from American hegemony, in the direction of coordination with Iran on the question of the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The Danger of a U.S. Strike Against Iran

After Dr. Selim responded to a question concerning the possibility of a military attack by the United States against Iran, Mr. LaRouche added the following comment:

One thing that I've been trying to teach people a long time, about their own minds and other people's minds, is that most people live in a fishbowl kind of situation, where they have a mixture of certain false and relatively true axiomatic assumptions about what is possible. And therefore, they don't mentally live in the real world. They live in a synthetic world, which is composed of working assumptions, some of which are true and some of which are false.

I often cite the case of Frederick the Great at Leuthen, in the battle there: Every assumption would have said, in this case, that the Austrians would have had an overwhelming victory, or Frederick would have had to be routed. But he acted in a way in which the Austrians did not think possible.

Now, there are two ways in which this occurs. One, in which the decision is a sane one, that's made on the basis of, you strategically out-think your opponent, by doing what is



EIRNS

Lyndon LaRouche: “The danger here is that some idiot will be deployed to do something absolutely mad: because they don’t care.”

rational, when your opponent is blind to a possibility. And that’s good strategy. It’s also good tactics.

The other case, is another case which came up, as promoted heavily by the RAND Corp., which was promoted in the case, for example, of the idea of what I was concerned about in 1975 in Lebanon. When I was in Iraq, and I knew that we were about to have a civil war explode under Kissinger’s premises in Lebanon. So, I told my friends and hosts then in Iraq, that we could expect a breakout of a civil war in Lebanon, started by Kissinger. And this would be the beginning of a general war in the Middle East. And it happened at that time.

And the point was, a so-called “chicken game,” which is a standard thinking among some people, especially neo-conservative types in the United States’ configuration. If you say something doesn’t make any sense, they may do it. If it’s insane, they may do it. It’s the great bluff. It’s the use of, “I am a madman, playing ‘chicken’ on the highway,” in the highways of California, the narrow highways.

And therefore, the danger here is—and it’s a danger also from Israel—that some idiot will be deployed to do something absolutely mad: *because they don’t care*. They don’t care. The so-called “countervailing factors of risk” will not prevent them from doing something mad. They will do it on the presumption, the same way that somebody did something in New York City on 9/11 in 2001. They didn’t have Hermann Göring handy to set fire to something, so they used another device, to create a “Reichstag Fire” effect in order to change the politics of the United States and the world.

Terrorist acts are often of that character. And the mentality of the Israeli right wing and its backers, in the Middle East: They are a terrorist mentality. They will do something for effect, hoping that the sheer horror of what they do, will deter people from an appropriate action, or cause them to launch a flight forward into an even more inappropriate reaction.

Brawls in Britain Over Iraq/Terror Link

by Mary Burdman

Since Prime Minister Tony Blair launched his evangelical crusade to join the George W. Bush Administration in invading Iraq, the war and the campaign of deception used to justify it have divided Britain, including Britain’s intelligence and military services. The controversy over the Blair government’s notorious “sexed up” dossier on Iraq of September 2002, which was used to ride roughshod over the broad national opposition to the war, has led to one revelation after the other of the policy fights in Britain.

Barely 10 days after the July 7 deadly terrorist bombings in London that killed 56 people, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (known as Chatham House), the British establishment’s leading policy think-tank, released a report July 18 which states that there is “no doubt” that the Iraq War, and Britain following the policy of the George W. Bush Administration in Iraq, is crippling British intelligence and raising the terror risk to Britain itself.

On the strategic level, the London bombings and the entire brutal terrorist campaign, have been unleashed by networks of Synarchist financiers, who have used terrorism to twist world events for decades. These are the networks which brought fascism to power in Germany and Japan in the last century; the British “liberal imperialist” crowd has played the leading role since the Empire was launched in the 18th Century. Yet, even at the height of the British Empire, certain factions opposed, and at times brought under control, the extreme policies of the “Forward School.” Their opposition serves as a precedent for the many in Britain—in and outside the power structure—who are trying to do the same to Tony Blair.

“A key problem with regard to implementing [core counter-terrorism policies] is that the U.K. government has been conducting counter-terrorism policy ‘shoulder to shoulder’ with the U.S., not in the sense of being an equal decision-maker, but rather as pillion passenger compelled to leave the steering to the ally in the driving seat,” the report states.

“There is no doubt that the situation over Iraq has imposed particular difficulties for the U.K., and for the wider coalition against terrorism. It gave a boost to the al-Qaeda network’s propaganda, recruitment, and fundraising, caused a major split in the coalition, provided an ideal targeting and training area for al-Qaeda-linked terrorists, and deflected resources