as the basis for an industrial boom in that region, shared 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 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 power-lines. 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.

---
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