

Editorial

Dramatic Moment For Shanghai Summit

The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) meeting in Shanghai sits at a dramatic turning point in the worldwide economic and strategic crisis; the meeting contains the seeds of escape from the current threatening global disaster, or of the tragic unleashing of it. The Presidents of the United States, Russia, and China are meeting on Oct. 20-21 at a summit where, because of the intensity of the crisis, no policy should be considered a matter of routine; all should be on the table for reconsideration. It is these three nations, above all, which could launch an economic recovery from the depression, based on agreement on the Eurasian Land-Bridge “projects of the Century,” and on a peace-by-development strategy for the Mideast. This is Lyndon LaRouche’s policy, and it is well known and considered within both Russia and China.

There are two axiomatically-opposed paths diverging from this rare summit; one pointing to slow, hard-won human progress, the other descending quickly toward chaos.

President Putin will present Russia’s “Eurasian mission” at the APEC summit. This means expanded trade and economic cooperation with China and India, first of all; but with the bigger purpose of creating transportation “bridges” and corridors for rail transport, energy, and communications across Eurasia, from Europe to all parts of the Pacific and Indian Ocean coasts. It includes unifying the Koreas and bridging from Siberia to Japan with such development corridors. China shares this perspective, and adds to it the largest water-management and hydroelectric projects in the world; the only large economy in the world still growing. The pre-summit coverage in the Russian and Chinese press, of their own leaders’ statements, makes it clear that at Shanghai, both countries intend to stress these great projects, in coordination with each other, as the potential “economic locomotives” for a global economic recovery.

If President Bush is seeking a way out of the accelerating collapse of the American economy—one which, at the same time, opens up a new and peaceful path to

dealing with all the nations of Eurasia, including the Mideast—he will seize this “Land-Bridge” development policy like a drowning man a plank. Then the three Presidents could agree on something vital—as opposed to “communiqués on fighting terrorism” to which each of the many nations ceremoniously signing, attributes its own, radically different meaning.

This is the happy option which LaRouche’s influence makes possible in such a crisis, as unlikely as it may seem to an observer guided by “the media.”

The opposed, disastrous path which the APEC forum may be temporarily compelled to take, is the forced-march defense of the indefensible U.S. dollar by all of the Asian nations attending. Strong pressure is being brought to bear by some parts of the U.S. administration, to insist on this impossible course. It would force the Asian nations to reduce the question of the global depression to the absurd choice of being “for the U.S. dollar or the Sept. 11 terrorists.” They would be demanded to buy whatever huge quantities of dollars Alan Greenspan’s Fed continues to print, and to further “open up” their national economies to “free trade” and investment looting: all under the threat that otherwise they will lose whatever remains of their exports to the collapsing U.S. economy.

Should this short-term panic course be forced through at the Shanghai summit, the result will be a catastrophe worse than terrorism. The inevitable dollar crash will then take down with it parts of the Eurasian Land-Bridge recovery potential—the very “economic locomotive” which is also the only hope for a U.S. recovery from its economic collapse.

President Bush’s choice is most stark. He is the tragic actor at the last turning-point of choice in the drama. Having launched *external* war, against what are really *internal* threats and the skeletons of the United States’ own policies, he is watching the red warning flags of wars triggered by his actions, going up in the Mideast and the Asian Subcontinent; he is stumbling toward the “clash of civilizations” he professes to abhor and avoid.