

as the basis for an industrial boom in that region, shared among the peoples who live from Jordan and the Dead Sea, all the way down to the Gulf. The production of so valuable a commodity as water, by means employing, as its energy basis, or power basis, high-temperature gas-cooled nuclear reactors, is the obvious central proposition for that region, which could be the beginning of a greening of the Middle East on a larger scale. By entering into cooperative agreements on economic development, with a group of local powers in the region, we create an economic common interest on which political agreements may be premised.

The other aspect to be considered in an Oasis Plan for the Middle East, is that unless we provide rational solutions, particularly those based on the wonders of science and technological progress, then the result must be mass insanity. If the rational world is not provided to the desperate, then they will seek solace and power in the ultimate irrationality. That's the lesson of history; that's the lesson of what is happening in the Arab world, from the Atlantic outposts of the Islamic world, toward the East. Unless we change the course of events, we go down.

As part of the same package, therefore, such projects as, say, a high-speed rail project between Dakar, Senegal, and Djibouti, along an old project—over 120 years old in design—could be implemented, changing the prospects for the Sahel region, the sub-Saharan nations, and so forth, and make possible the otherwise impossible: The reversal of the expansion of the Sahara desert and the beginning of development. The opening of large-scale water projects in Africa, including the rational use of the excess of rainfall upon Zaire, for the nations to its north—these kinds of things must be done. Even though these are somewhat beyond the range of the Middle East per se, they are nonetheless part of the project which immediately affects it.

### **The economic road to peace**

These kinds of things should be done, things which I've proposed over the years, from 1974 all the way to the present, as Middle East solutions. I say again, that I've been told, repeatedly, that an economic-based solution is not possible, that you must have a political solution first and then bring in an economic-based solution. My experience of the past 16 years in particular, and my study of the experience of the years before this, says: Those who have insisted upon a political solution first, before considering an economic alternative, have failed. That experiment has failed. We must have the economic basis established, and establish the political agreements on the basis of those political agreements being imperative to establishing the necessary economic cooperation and to achieving the benefits of that economic cooperation.

Therefore, I would say in summation, that we must have these solutions as the alternative to the kind of Malthusian, neo-Malthusian Dark Age solution imposed as the so-called peace plan by the superpowers—the Anglo-Americans and

the Soviets—upon the Middle East. Otherwise, we get hell for all concerned, and because of the follies of the parties in the Middle East which reject this alternative, which accept the Anglo-American-Soviet peace plan, they will find themselves with the same fate as the brave leaders of the forces which sank in the swamps of the Thirty Years' War. We must have it.

The opposition to an economic solution comes mainly from two sources: from the environmentalist fanatics—the Nazis of the 1990s are the environmentalist fanatics, including their animal rights fanatics, who are determined to destroy Judaism and Christianity for the sake of the pagan Mother Earth goddess whom they worship. That is the Nazism of the 1990s. The other opponent is Adam Smith and his kind: the assumption that we must maintain, perpetuate the present monetary and financial structures which ought to be swept from the face of the Earth in mass bankruptcy.

The very fact that mass bankruptcy is erupting, in the existing monetary institutions, creates the opportunity for establishing alternatives, in the form of Hamiltonian, shall we say, national banking. So, therefore, if we are sufficiently determined, and as determined as fear of inaction motivates us to be, then we shall move seriously on an Oasis Plan for the Middle East, and use the Oasis Plan as the basis for a political solution, a political solution as an alternative to a new Thirty Years' War, a new Dark Age, in that region.

## **Grand strategy for developing Eurasia**

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*Here are excerpts from "The New Role for Russia in U.S. Policy Today," by Lyndon LaRouche, EIR, Aug. 25, 1995.*

The present writer's televised Berlin address of Oct. 12, 1988, signalled this proposed application to the new Russia of the tradition of American System political-economy. In that address, which was broadcast to a national U.S. television audience that same month, the imminent collapse of the Soviet system and reunification of Germany was announced and a policy of reconstructive cooperation toward eastern Europe was identified. That policy of reconstruction was later elaborated in significant detail, beginning November-December 1989, in policy statements and prospectuses issued under the rubric of "the European Productive Triangle."

This Productive-Triangle policy anticipated all the principal features, and more, of the later "Delors Plan." It proposed that the emergent world-center of economic progress, since Charlemagne, the approximate spherical triangle whose apices are Paris, Vienna, and Berlin, be mobilized as the pivotal

technology-driver for all Eurasia, and that this triangle be the hub of a network of railway-spined developmental corridors, extending eastward and southward, across Eurasia, through such routes as Berlin-Warsaw-Moscow, Kiev, and so on, to the Pacific and to the Indian Ocean. Although the principles embodied in the Productive-Triangle proposal are either unknown or unfashionable in the classrooms and professional journals of the past quarter-century's west European and North American academia, there is nothing in that proposal which is not implicit in established American System traditional doctrine and practice. . . .

### Infrastructure policy

Let us summarize the implications of the "Productive Triangle" program for the vast reaches of eastern Eurasia, and thereafter conclude this introduction by focussing upon the mathematical problems posed by the notion of science-driver principles in modern economy.

The most conspicuous obstacle to the successful economic development of Russia's vast potentials, greets one as one flies east of Warsaw: great, undeveloped spaces, whose want of elementary infrastructural development, is the crucial obstacle to successful, modern technological investment in the productive powers of labor. This is the characteristic feature of that vast land-bridge area which development must traverse to reach the densely-populated regions of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean littoral. This was the key problem addressed by the LaRouche "Productive Triangle" proposal for post-Soviet reconstruction of Eurasia.

The principle can be traced in western Europe's cumulatively successful development since Charlemagne. First, it was inland waterways, roads, and market-fairs; later, it was more inland waterways, and then railways. . . .

The upshot of that successful economic history of western Europe and North America, is that one does not attempt to develop broad expanses economically. Rather, one traverses those expanses by development corridors, whose width is normally approximately a hundred kilometers, approximately fifty kilometers either side of a spinal artery of transport, such as a navigable inland waterway, a trunk railway, or, superseding rails, magnetic levitation transport.

The principle involved is conveniently illustrated by reference to data for five nations, from the 1967-70 interval. These are, the three model industrialized nations of that period: Japan, West Germany, and the U.S.A., and the two archetypical developing nations, China and India. Since the levels of technology among the first three, were comparable at that time, the similarities show more brightly the significance of the crucial differences in population-density: Japan's habitable territory: extremely high density, relatively speaking; West Germany: high density; the U.S.A.: low density. *High density of population is a marked economic advantage:* Transport between points of production and consumption, traverses shorter average distances, and the employment of

basic economic infrastructure is greatly more efficient. In contrast, the lack of such infrastructural maintenance and development in high-density China and India of that period, demonstrates, with the force of a hammer, the roots of poverty in the lack of essential infrastructural development. . . .

In summary, the developmental strategy we have termed "the developmental corridor," is a way of creating the advantages of a relatively Japan-like density of population and productive activities, within a relatively small portion of a large territory. All other geographical considerations being equal, the development corridor would reach, as we have noted, typically, about fifty kilometers either side of a central transport-spine of waterways, rails, pipelines, and trunk powerlines. The development of the larger territory is accomplished somewhat as railway development opened up the western United States: by criss-crossing vast expanses with developmental corridors.

Without placing the emphasis upon infrastructural development so defined, a successful reconstruction of Russia would not be possible. Without the use of such modern forms of development corridors reaching from Berlin to the Pacific and the Indian Ocean, the required rate and degree of economic development needed to satisfy the requirements of the populations of China and the Indian subcontinent would not be possible. . . .

For previews and  
information on  
LaRouche publications:

## Visit EIR's Internet Website!

- Highlights of current issues of EIR
- Pieces by Lyndon LaRouche
- Every week: transcript of the latest **EIR Talks** radio interview with LaRouche.

<http://www.larouchepub.com>

e-mail: [larouche@larouchepub.com](mailto:larouche@larouchepub.com)



The construction of the Gezhou Dam in China.

Out-of-work Americans apply for unemployment benefits in Front Royal, Va.

## China plans 10,000 major infrastructure projects in the next decade.



**Will the United States adopt this approach to make its way out of the new Great Depression?**

READ

# The Eurasian Land-Bridge

The “New Silk Road” — locomotive for worldwide economic development

**A new  
special report from  
Executive  
Intelligence  
Review**

**including studies of:**

- High-technology infrastructure development corridors
- China and Europe as Eurasia’s development poles
- Crucial infrastructure projects in China
- The Eurasian Land-Bridge and development around the great ocean basins
- Financing an economic miracle: Hamiltonian credit generation
- The Eurasian Land-Bridge and the economic reconstruction of the United States

260 pages **\$200**

Available from:

**EIR News Service** P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390