

attempt to reduce even all existing nation-states, of European advanced nation-states, to essentially colonial dependencies of an international rentier-financier power. So, essentially, the conflict has been, and is now, a conflict between the modern form of nation-state, sovereign nation-state, and an imperial power of a rentier-financier form, a new kind of Roman Empire.

So, therefore, the conflict is essentially between the force behind this, and the forces which represent the interests of the modern sovereign nation-state.

The implication of this is seen clearly, when you think about, what do we do, as nation-states, in the case of a collapse of the financial system? Under natural law, as it's been defined in Europe since the Fifteenth-century Renaissance, as established by Nicolaus of Cusa's *Concordantia catholica*, the only legitimate basis for the existence of a nation, a national government, is the efficient commitment of that government to promote the General Welfare, the common good, of all of the people, and among nations.

Now, despite the problems of the religious war period of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth century, we have man-

aged to maintain that legacy of the common welfare, the common good, as a general fundamental principle of law of civilized society. Which means, in a time of crisis, the state, the sovereign state, must intervene, in collaboration with other sovereign states, to reorganize the financial system to ensure the protection of the General Welfare. Thus, the modern nation-state, in this form, is the greatest enemy of the attempt to create a new empire.

We have, therefore, the significance of what is happening in Asia, which has two chief dimensions: On the one hand, we have, with the developments around President Putin of Russia, as with Prime Minister Primakov before him, a tendency to bring the nations of Asia, and Europe, into contiguity. The second problem, which is posed by that, is: We have two basic cultures on this planet. We have, not Western civilization, but European civilization. By European civilization, I mean something which began in Egypt, which developed in Greece around figures like Solon and Plato, and which became a new European culture through the apostolic mission of John and Paul.

Behind the 'Clash of Civilizations' Hoax

Since the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on Sept. 11, 2001, a fierce debate has erupted over whether or not a "Clash of Civilizations" between various combinations of Western nations and the Islamic world and/or China ("Confucian civilization") is inevitable, and, indeed, on our doorsteps. The reality is, that, while the world is closer now to a new, global Thirty Years' War than at any time in memory, the reason for this danger is not some inevitable clash between the underlying cultural and theological principles of Islam and Christianity.

Instead, the reason is, that factions of the international financial oligarchy, principally headquartered in the English-speaking world, are desperate to start a new war in Eurasia, to block the potential for a revival of the Nineteenth-century American System idea of fostering the development of sovereign nation-states across the largest landmass on the planet, the area stretching from the Atlantic shores of England, France, and Scandinavia, to the Pacific coast of Japan, the Korean peninsula and China—in other words, the Eurasian Land-Bridge program of development corridors conceived by Lyndon LaRouche. They are driven to this level of desperation by the looming final collapse of the present global financial and monetary system, a system on which their power depends. Their strategy is the same old British and other

imperial geopolitical claptrap that helped foment World Wars I and II. The geopoliticians of those wars had names like Halford Mackinder and Karl Haushofer.

In furtherance of this war drive, a modern-day collection of quack academics and geopoliticians have been trotted out to peddle various theories about the inevitability of a war between "the West and the Rest" in the aftermath of the Cold War. While the Trilateral Commission's Samuel Huntington has been most frequently cited as the "author" of the "Clash of Civilizations," through an infamous 1993 article by that same name in the Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs* magazine, it was, in fact, the 85-year-old British Orientalist and wartime British intelligence official, Bernard Lewis, who first coined the phrase in a 1990 article in *Atlantic Monthly*. For more than 60 years, Lewis has been a leading proponent of a new civilizational clash between Islam and the West, as a means of destroying any prospects of economic and political advancement in the Arab and Muslim world.

In 1998, it was Lewis who first promoted Osama bin Laden, as the prophet of the "new militant Islam," translating one of Bin Laden's "fatwas" against Israel and the United States in *Foreign Affairs*, and praising the Saudi expatriate as a brilliant Islamic scholar and poet (!). Ironically, at the same time, Lewis was adding

The Basis for a Dialogue of Cultures

Now this culture, European culture, is based on a conception of man in the image of God, which is the basis of the notion of General Welfare in law. This includes the Reform form of Judaism, as typified by Moses Mendelssohn. It is also an influence on Islam; it is the origin of Islam. But when we go to South Asia, and East Asia, we find a different culture. The idea of the conception of man as in the likeness of God, does not prevail as a cultural standard in these cultures. You have an approximation of this in the influence of Islam. . . . Certain aspects of Hinduism are not entirely hostile to this. Nor is the Confucian tradition in China hostile to it. But, when you deal with Asia, you do not have an acceptance of the most fundamental, and most precious principles of European culture.

So, on the one level, it is not difficult for us to approach China, Japan, India, and so forth, and say, "We want respect for the perfect sovereignty of nation-states." But when you say, What does that mean?, you come to

his name to a list of prominent neo-conservatives who were demanding that President Clinton bomb Iraq and Saddam Hussein back to the Stone Age.

Today, Lewis, Huntington, and their colleague Zbigniew Brzezinski are among the most vocal warhawks, attempting to *provoke* a hideous new religious war that would engulf all of Eurasia, and bury the prospects of peace and prosperity for decades, if not centuries. Whereas Samuel Huntington and Bernard Lewis might not be exactly household words, most Americans are familiar with the former Carter Administration National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski. Under Lewis' tutelage, Brzezinski implemented the "Arc of Crisis" strategy, which sought to create a zone of radical Islamic insurgency targetted along the southern tier of the former Soviet Union. Brzezinski's promotion of the Afghans mujahideen to drive the Red Army out of Afghanistan between 1979-1990, created two generations of well-trained and almost hopelessly brainwashed irregular warfare operatives, now associated with Osama Bin Laden and the terrorist "blowback" of September 11. Yet, mad geopolitician Brzezinski defends his execution of the "Bernard Lewis Plan" to this day, as one of the greatest geopolitical "chess moves" ever executed.

—Jeffrey Steinberg

the conception of culture, the conception of man. In that case, if you try to approach it one way, you end up with an impossible, and a self-defeating policy. If you say, we're going to respect the *opinion* of other cultures, you create an order which is like the Roman pagan Pantheon, and we see in the plan for a Clash of Civilizations, precisely how that works.

We have in the history of civilization, in ancient Babylon, for example, to the present, all empires were based on the principle of the Pantheon. And the way that the emperor ruled the empire, was to play the different religions of the Pantheon against each other. What Zbigniew Brzezinski is proposing, is exactly that: a war among cultures, to define the planet as a Pantheon, and to make war among the different religions and cultures of the Pantheon. That is the Islamic "Clash of Civilizations" thesis of Brzezinski.

So that, from the standpoint of our Christian tradition, you can't approach this from a standpoint of *doctrine*. You must approach it from a missionary standpoint, from an apostolic standpoint, not a *doctrinal* standpoint. Rather than saying, What are the differences between us?, you have to say, What is the agreement among us? It means, there has to be, as President Khatami of Iran has proposed, there has to be a discussion of the agreement on an idea, a certain idea of man. And there must be a discussion, with agreement to the *idea* of man, but a continuing discussion of what that means.

You can never unify people, except around a common principle. You can never unify people around a Pantheon. We see this in Babylon, we see this in the delphic cult of the satanic Apollo, we see it in pagan Rome, and so forth. You see it in the doom of Byzantium, which doomed itself in the same way the Roman Empire doomed itself, by trying to organize civilization around a Pantheon. *There must be a conception of man*. We must do that. So, this is our problem.

The Coup Plot

Now, the enemy is well aware of this. So now the crisis is coming on, the financial crisis. Nothing can stop the collapse of the system, in the system's present form. Any attempt to perpetuate the system will only make things worse. Forget the financial markets, they're doomed anyway. What the financial market does this month, or next month, or the month after that, is totally unimportant.

The world economy, including the U.S., is going through a hyperinflationary, monetary-financial expansion, and a deflationary economic collapse. And the people who had planned this coup d'état against the United States, have accepted that.

Now, we don't know who the coup plotters are. What