

EIR

Executive Intelligence Review

March 6, 2015 Vol. 42 No. 10

www.larouche.com \$10.00

LaRouche Denounces Frame-Up of Putin for Nemtsov Murder
What Is Mankind, Such That We Would Want To Save It?
To Stop War, Join the BRICS Movement for Development

**Hear These Russian Warnings:
They Might Save Your Life**



Founder and Contributing Editor:

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Editorial Board: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.,
Antony Papert, Gerald Rose, Dennis Small,
Nancy Spannaus, Jeffrey Steinberg, William
Wertz

Editor: Nancy Spannaus

Managing Editors: Bonnie James, Susan Welsh

Technology Editor: Marsha Freeman

Book Editor: Katherine Notley

Graphics Editor: Alan Yue

Photo Editor: Stuart Lewis

Circulation Manager: Stanley Ezrol

INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORS

Counterintelligence: Jeffrey Steinberg, Michele
Steinberg

Economics: John Hoefle, Marcia Merry Baker,
Paul Gallagher

History: Anton Chaitkin

Ibero-America: Dennis Small

Russia and Eastern Europe: Rachel Douglas

United States: Debra Freeman

INTERNATIONAL BUREAUS

Bogotá: Javier Almarino

Berlin: Rainer Apel

Copenhagen: Tom Gillesberg

Houston: Harley Schlanger

Lima: Sara Madueño

Melbourne: Robert Barwick

Mexico City: Gerardo Castilleja Chávez

New Delhi: Ramtanu Maitra

Paris: Christine Bierre

Stockholm: Ulf Sandmark

United Nations, N.Y.C.: Leni Rubinstein

Washington, D.C.: William Jones

Wiesbaden: Göran Haglund

ON THE WEB

e-mail: eirns@larouchepub.com

www.larouchepub.com

www.executiveintelligencereview.com

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Webmaster: John Sigerson

Assistant Webmaster: George Hollis

Editor, Arabic-language edition: Hussein Askary

EIR (ISSN 0273-6314) is published weekly

(50 issues), by EIR News Service, Inc.,

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

(703) 777-9451

European Headquarters: E.I.R. GmbH, Postfach

Bahnstrasse 9a, D-65205, Wiesbaden, Germany

Tel: 49-611-73650

Homepage: <http://www.eirna.com>

e-mail: eirna@eirna.com

Director: Georg Neudecker

Montreal, Canada: 514-461-1557

Denmark: EIR - Danmark, Sankt Knuds Vej 11,

basement left, DK-1903 Frederiksberg, Denmark.

Tel.: +45 35 43 60 40, Fax: +45 35 43 87 57. e-mail:

eirdk@hotmail.com.

Mexico City: EIR, Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz 242-2

Col. Agricultura C.P. 11360

Delegación M. Hidalgo, México D.F.

Tel. 55 53182301

Copyright: ©2015 EIR News Service. All rights

reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without
permission strictly prohibited.

Canada Post Publication Sales Agreement

#40683579

Postmaster: Send all address changes to EIR, P.O.

Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390.

EIR

From the Editors

Helga Zepp-LaRouche provides the crucial strategic overview in this issue of *EIR*, posing with up-to-date predicates the crucial conjuncture mankind faces: nuclear war on the one side, versus the future being offered by the BRICS nations' steps toward a new just world economic order, on the other. Citizens of the United States, and the world, have to act to determine which future they want, she stresses, with the passion to ensure that a beautiful mankind survives (*Feature*).

The rest of the issue contains substantial back-up for her thesis, much of it from material blacked out of the mainstream Western media.

Take the recent warnings from top Russian military and political figures, which we report in our *International* lead. If these don't scare you, you are not in reality. Then look at what the Ukrainians and the State Department's Victoria Nuland are up to, with plans to arm Ukraine. Face the fact that the Western media spin that Russian President Putin is behind the assassination of liberal oppositionist Boris Nemtsov is not only a fraud, but possibly a deliberate sacrifice, to get a martyr for those who wish to overthrow the Russian President. In reality, Putin himself is a target of this vile murder.

And this insanity is not confined to Russia, as you can see in our coverage of recent anti-Chinese rantings by top U.S. military planners.

On the BRICS option, we also have a number of significant developments the Establishment wishes to bury. First, the moves forward by the BRICS nations in setting up their financial infrastructure. Second, the moves forward by Greece toward auditing the illegitimate debt imposed on it by the murderous Troika. Third, a report from the European Parliament, where two parliamentarians, one Greek and one Italian, have teamed up to push for adoption of a real Glass-Steagall (all three in *Economics*). Our Iran story, featuring an interview with one of the nuclear negotiators for that country, also touches on that nation's potential to join the BRICS dynamic (*International*).

In the (*National*) section, we feature the opposition, led by Rep. Walter Jones, to Obama's unconstitutional war policy.

This week's *Science* section offers an exciting discussion on the Kepler principle, and how this is being applied by the Chinese to their space program, particularly toward exploration of the Moon. LaRouche's Scientific Research Team, as usual, goes to the fundamentals: What is mankind, that we should wish to preserve it as a species?

Cover This Week

Russian Topol missiles, on display in Red Square, during the Victory Day Parade, May 9, 2014.



Hungária Televízió

17 **Hear These Russian Warnings: They Might Save Your Life**

Russia's Gen.-Maj. Andrei Burbin, chief of the Central Command Post of the Strategic Missile Forces, said in an interview, that Russia is prepared to use its strategic nuclear weapons under conditions of attack on the country, including the much-ballyhooed U.S. Prompt Global Strike scheme for a non-nuclear attempt to destroy the Russian retaliatory capability. His message was that "utopian" military schemes for "limited nuclear war" or a "counterforce" destruction of Russia's nuclear weapons are illusory: The result will be retaliation against the United States with Russia's intercontinental ballistic missiles. Other prominent Russian officials are making a similar point.

21 **Nuclear War Madness Fueled by Visit of Neo-Nazi Parubiy to Washington**

For Immediate Release

LaRouche Denounces Frame-Up of Putin for Nemtsov Murder; Calls Out Obama

Feature

4 **To Stop War, Join the BRICS Mass Movement for Development**

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's video address to a conference of the Schiller Institute in Houston, Texas. "I have to tell you," she said, "that the idea of joining the BRICS countries, and the other countries which are actually very speedily constructing a new world economic order, is not an optional thing, but it is the question of the very survival of the United States, and also the world at large."

14 **LaRouche: Murder of Opposition Figure Nemtsov 'Smells Like Nuland'**

Lyndon LaRouche said that the question must be asked whether U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland was "part of the team that organized the assassination" of Boris Nemtsov. "It sounds like Nuland. To me, it smells like Nuland. . . . She's on the list of the suspected criminals, for this case, as for other cases."

International

23 China, Russia Seek To Revive Founding Spirit of United Nations

At a special session of the UN Security Council, battles raged over the core issues of national sovereignty and unilateral actions.

25 The Atlantic Charter

26 Iran Pursues Comprehensive Solutions to the Global Crisis

Majid Takht-Ravanchi, Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister for European and North American Affairs, and a member of the Iranian P5+1 nuclear negotiating team, addressed a press conference in Copenhagen, and spoke to *EIR*, about the negotiations over his country's nuclear program.

Economics

29 BRICS Ready To Provide Funds for Development

The ratification by national governments of the BRICS' new financial institutions, such as the New Development Bank and the Contingent Reserve Arrangement, provides fresh hope for a better future for the developing nations and the world as a whole.

33 The Battle for Glass-Steagall Brought to the European Parliament

34 Draghi's Lies Exposed

36 Greek Government To Investigate Bailout

National

37 Will Congress Sign On to Obama's Losing War on ISIS?

Obama has finally decided to ask Congress for an Authorization for Use of Military Force, but it not only fails to repeal the 2001 AUMF, voted up in the wake of the 9/11 attacks—it would have Congress sign on to a new one with the same vagueness and lack of limitation as the old one.

39 U.S. Hawks Mobilize for War on China

Science

41 From Kepler to China: What Is Mankind, Such That We Would Want To Save It?

The Feb. 18 LaRouchePAC New Paradigm for Mankind program featured a presentation by Liona Fan-Chiang, Jason Ross, and Megan Beets. "The thing that Mr. LaRouche has pushed the most, has been excited about the most," said Fan-Chiang, "is the Chinese space program. And I'd like to get at this from something he brings up, which is the Chinese space program, in the context of the discovery made by Kepler.

Editorial

50 The Zeus Option Is No Option at All

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

LaRouche Denounces Frame-Up Of Putin for Nemtsov Murder; Calls Out Obama

March 3—U.S. economist Lyndon LaRouche decried today the fraudulent effort to frame up Russian President Vladimir Putin for the murder of liberal Russian politician Boris Nemtsov on the night of Feb. 27-28. In fact, LaRouche insisted that the Nemtsov murder was nothing but a provocation directed against Putin, as he had said from the first moment it became known. The evidence is conclusive, and the stakes are life or death: peace or war. Given these circumstances, Obama's endorsement of this frame-up in a Reuters interview yesterday, merits his immediate removal from office as a last-ditch defense of the United States.

First, on the Nemtsov murder, there is no sane way to claim that Nemtsov represented any threat whatsoever to Putin, given the latter's 87% popularity rating. Who can deny that Nemtsov was thoroughly discredited by his role in the Yeltsin Administration, when Western speculators destroyed Russia, or that his support was minuscule when he was killed?

The prominent French economist and Russia expert Jacques Sapir posted an analysis today titled, "Who Framed Vladimir Putin?" It shows, on the one hand, that Nemtsov's killing was a professional murder, like a contract murder, but, on the other hand, that it was staged in the open air, virtually under the windows of the Kremlin, in such a way as to greatly increase the risk to the killers and to the whole operation—in order to frame Vladimir Putin.

Among other considerations, Sapir notes that the shooting from behind implies that one has perfectly identified the target, and the modus operandi implies an expertise only compatible with a contract murder; the risk of missing or inflicting non-lethal wounds is high. Note the large number of shots, eight or more, the lack of a coup-de-grâce shot, and the fact that Nemtsov's companion was unharmed.

Sapir continues: "From this point of view, one wonders why not wait till Nemtsov returned home? The classic type of contract killing occurs in a spot where one is sure to find the victim: the stairwell of the apartment building, or as the victim exits a restaurant. The very choice of crime-scene could indicate a demonstrative intention, such as to implicate Putin in the murder. In any case, it is evident that the assassins took risks that seem to indicate a political intention. All this makes one think of a set-up, a staging.

"Why would these people kill Nemtsov more or less directly under the windows of the Kremlin?"

Matlock: It Looks Like a Frame-Up

This point made by Sapir is confirmed by the dispatch from Moscow of an unnamed, but credible correspondent of former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union Jack Matlock, who wrote similarly, "The Kremlin Walls and the Bekhlimishevskaya Tower frame the scene with St. Basil's to the

right. It is simply difficult to imagine a location that could include more symbols of the Russian state. It looks like a frame-up.”

Sapir then asks, “How would these people have gathered knowledge about Nemtsov’s behaviour after he left the restaurant with a girl on his arm? Again, a killing at Nemtsov’s home would have made much more sense. And, if the girl is linked to the killing (even not directly and not in the intent), that would have necessitated deep connections in Ukraine.”

(Do these have any connection to Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland’s connections to Ukrainian Nazis?, one might ask.)

Sapir totally discredits the notion that this could have been a murder directed by Putin, writing: “The media, in France and in countries of the West, have put forth the idea of a murder commanded by the Kremlin, or by movements close to the Kremlin. We will say right now that the first hypothesis is not coherent with the crime scene. Further, it is hard to see what interest the Russian government would have to have one of the opposition killed, certainly a well-known opponent, but one who had fallen into the political background. When Dmitry Peskov, spokesman for President Putin, said that Nemtsov did not represent any danger nor any threat for power, it was perfectly true. And supposing the murder of Nemtsov was an attempt to frighten the others in opposition, it would have been a lot simpler to hit him at home. The idea of an involvement, direct or indirect, of the Russian government thus appears highly improbable.”

After equally discrediting the notion that Nemtsov was killed by right-wing Russian nationalists, Sapir says, “Vladimir Putin and the Russian government have immediately advanced the hypothesis of a provocation. It is easy to see the appeal for them of this hypothesis. But one must have the honesty to say that’s what it is. Putin is actually the target of a deep and widespread hate campaign in the Western media. The killing of someone supposed to be an opponent is just something journalists could not resist. They moved on

accusing him of all sins on the earth. The fact that Nemtsov was strongly linked to policies which failed in the ’90s, and led Russia to the brink of collapse, has been forgotten. The fact that Nemtsov has chosen to advise Orange Revolution Ukrainian governments since 2004 has been forgotten. A lot of people, and not just in Russia, could want to see Nemtsov dead. But all this has been forgotten and the rallying word is now ‘Putin is a killer,’ or ‘Putin has inspired Nemtsov’s killer.’ It is just a shame, a dirty shame. But this is consistent with the war Western media are waging against Russia and Putin.”

Obama Has To Go

Now, Obama has put himself in the middle of this frameup with a March 2 statement to Reuters which characterized Nemtsov’s murder as “an indication of a climate at least inside of Russia in which civil society, independent journalists, people trying to communicate on the Internet, have felt increasingly threatened, constrained. And increasingly the only information that the Russian public is able to get is through state-controlled media outlets.”

“This means Obama has to go,” LaRouche said. “Because our defense is getting Obama dumped. And that would save the United States. Because the President of the United States did not deny it; he did not withhold such an allegation, he allowed it to go through. Here we are, the world is now facing a threat of thermonuclear war, global thermonuclear war, which has never happened before in the history of mankind; and you sit back there as the President of the United States and you condone the spread of a false report of this nature, and you have tacitly committed yourself to being thrown out of office. And that’s what we should do. So the dumb son-of-a-bitch knew one thing: what he was doing. And for that, for his allowing that, condoning that, and not going out there and disowning it, he is guilty.

“Want to save the United States? Want to save civilization? That’s what you do.”

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

To Stop War, Join the BRICS Mass Movement For Development

Helga Zepp-LaRouche is the founder of the Schiller Institute. She gave this speech by video conference to an Institute meeting in Houston, Tex., on Feb. 28.

Good afternoon. We do need in the United States, and also in Europe, a mass movement for development, and a mass movement to join the very optimistic new world economic order that is developing among the BRICS countries—that's Russia, China, India, Brazil, and South Africa, but these countries have been joined by most of the Latin American countries, many of the Asian, and even some of the African countries, in a completely new economic system.

But before I can come to this optimistic perspective, I have to tell you that the idea of joining the BRICS countries, and the other countries which are actually very speedily constructing a new world economic order, is not an optional thing, but it is the question of the very survival of the United States, and also the world at large. Because right now we are closer to the potential of an outbreak of World War III than most people have any inkling of, and that is actually one of the most dangerous points: that people are sort of sleepwalking, that the dark clouds which could be very quickly turning into thermonuclear clouds, or one big thermonuclear cloud—they're not awake to it. And that is what we have to discuss first.

So, what I want to tell you probably will be scary, or new, for many of you, but that is the reality.

A Buildup Toward War

You probably have heard that yesterday, one of the critics of President Putin, Boris Nemtsov, former deputy prime minister during the Presidency of Boris Yeltsin, was assassinated, with seven shots, in Moscow. And naturally, without any evidence, immediately the international media ganged



Schiller Institute

Helga Zepp-LaRouche addresses the Houston conference: “Right now we are closer to the potential of an outbreak of World War III than most people have any inkling of.”

up, and said, “Naturally, it had to be Putin, to silence one of his critics.”

Now, first of all, I don’t think Putin is that stupid, that he would do such an obvious thing. Secondly, the activities of Mr. Nemtsov have not in the slightest reduced the 85% popularity of Putin. As a matter of fact, there are reports that there is only 2% of the population in Russia against Putin; 85% are openly for him, and the remaining 13% or so criticize him that he is not harsh enough against the West—they criticize not from the standpoint of the Western criteria, but the other way around.

Now, why would such an event occur? It could very well be a false flag operation, something which is pinned on Putin, in order to mobilize the non-existent resistance, because tomorrow was supposed to be a big demonstration in Moscow, whereas everybody knew it would fizzle out—it would be very small. But obviously, such an assassination could be aimed to fuel the protests, and to bring a so-called Maidan demonstration into Moscow.

Why is that a sign of the closeness of a potential World War III?

You have to see it as a pattern of similar

events which occurred in the last period. You had, for example, the extremely influential British establishment figure Malcolm Rifkind, and the former minister Jack Straw, also British, who were watergated practically overnight (Rifkind was ousted from a very influential position in the British Parliament), because they had opposed the confrontation against Russia. They were set up with a sting operation, there was a trial by media, and out they went.

You have similar destabilizations against President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner in Argentina, which fortunately seems to be failing; against President Dilma Rousseff in Brazil, and many similar operations. And all of that is like a streamlining, eliminating the opposition against a confrontation against Russia.

Now, why do I say that we have a situation which could very quickly turn into a hot war?

First of all, James Clapper, the head of the U.S. National Intelligence, came out two days ago and demanded that the United States start arming the Ukrainian military, while everybody knows that Russia has said that they will not allow that—that the idea of the U.S. arming the Ukrainian military is a red line, after which, if it is crossed, they will have some kind of a response. They didn’t say what.

Also, Ukrainian President Poroshenko was in Abu Dhabi, where he bought weapons from a big weapons fair. Abu Dhabi is not known to be a big producer of weapons, but they are a sales agency for American weapons.



Creative Commons/Chatham House



Creative Commons/Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Prominent British political figures Jack Straw (left) and Malcolm Rifkind were ousted from their positions last week, for speaking out against the confrontation against Russia.



Regime change in Ukraine: The Maidan protests turned violent when the Nazi groups took over. Here, on Jan. 22, 2014, a policeman is set on fire by a Molotov cocktail thrown from the crowd.

Now, William Polk, who was one of the three advisors of President Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis, just came out and said, what is happening in Ukraine is like a reverse Cuban Missile Crisis. The only difference is, when this crisis occurred in 1962, between Kennedy and Khrushchov, and when Russian nuclear bombs were put on the island of Cuba, at that time everybody knew that if thermonuclear weapons would be used, it would lead to the annihilation of mankind.

And today, nobody is even thinking about it.

People may remember, that during the Cuban Missile Crisis, John F. Kennedy said, if nuclear weapons are ever used, those people who die in the first hours will be happy, as compared to those who die a few weeks later in a nuclear Winter, dying of starvation, because all plant and animals life will be eliminated.

So, there is a clear change, because nowadays, you have people—and this is the doctrine of the United States right now—who have the illusion that you can win a first strike against the nuclear capabilities of Russia and China.

In the recent period, a lot of people have spoken about it. They're not yet mainstream, but there are some voices. The first, obviously, was Lyndon LaRouche, who, after the military attack against Libya in 2011, and the absolutely brutal murder of Qaddafi, said this only makes sense if this is a drive to World War III. And Mr. LaRouche is famous, that not only had he the right economic analysis many, many times, but also that he has a

unique capability to give a new historical development a name, to give it a sort of a notion—and later people say, “Ah ha, that is what it was.”

So, when he identified the murder of Qaddafi as a trend quickly going toward regime change—before that, there was Iraq, Afghanistan, then the attempt in Syria, the attempt in Ukraine, which happened a little bit later—that was very clearly a recognition that we had entered a phase of confrontation with the danger of leading to World War III.

Right now, if you look at the entire nuclear arsenal of the world, there are in existence 16,400 nuclear warheads.

Ninety-four percent of those warheads are either in the possession of the United States or of Russia, and both of these arsenals are in a condition of highest alert, because of the crisis in Ukraine. Also, the United States recently announced that it will modernize its entire nuclear arsenal, although President Obama in 2008, during the election campaign, one of his big promises was that he would *reduce* the nuclear weapons around the world. Now they will modernize these nuclear warheads, and delivery systems via ship, submarines, missiles, planes—at a cost of \$1 trillion in the next period.

This is a point of utmost danger, and the situation in Ukraine is getting out of control; and there was the effort by the Presidents of France, Germany, Ukraine, and Russia to try to conclude the so-called Minsk II agreement, which is sort of halfway being implemented. But completely independent of that, the United States keeps moving with the push to arm the Ukrainian military with weapons, to push more NATO posts into the Baltic States, to move more troops along the Russian border, and all of this is really going with breathtaking speed.

Who Is To Blame?

How could we come to this point? Is it Putin who is the warmonger? Well, I must tell you, absolutely not. Because you have to go back to the point of the collapse of the Soviet Union, which I want to review very quickly, because people tend to forget—and after all,

this is only a quarter-century ago.

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, relatively peacefully—because it could have also led to more aggression and military occurrences—you had at that point the chance for a peace order for the 21st Century. After all, communism had disappeared—at least the Soviet version of it. You could have integrated Russia into new alliances, and the Schiller Institute and the La-Rouche movement presented such a plan, in the form of a proposal to build a Eurasian Land-Bridge, to connect Europe and Asia through infrastructure corridors, and we called that the New Silk Road.

Now, unfortunately that idea, which was totally acceptable to many forces in the world, was rejected by the United States—the Bush Administration (Bush Sr.) and his neo-cons, in alliance with Margaret Thatcher. And these people instead said, okay, now we have no second superpower; we are the only superpower left. And therefore, we declare the Project for a New American Century doctrine. And what that really means is, we can try to establish a world empire based on the special relationship between Great Britain and the United States, and then we will run the world together, and kick out every government around the globe which resists that.

That effort was usually called globalization: the idea that you could have, from now on, an unrestricted free-market economy; that you would deregulate all remaining regulations in the banking sector, and change the whole financial system in such a way that high-risk speculation would make the rich more rich, while impoverishing the majority of the population of the globe. But who cares? There was no longer anybody who could resist that.

Naturally, there was the idea to get rid of the governments that would be obstacles, through regime change. The first such effort was made against Saddam Hussein, in the first Gulf War. This was then stopped when Clinton came in for eight years, but it continued with Bush, Jr., for two administrations, and then the six and a half years of Obama.

The idea was to have regime change, to have color revolutions, to finance NGOs to recruit people who would make propaganda for these goals. And Victoria Nuland, who is the Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, admitted, that in the case of Ukraine, the State Department spent \$5 billion to recruit 2,200 NGOs in Ukraine, and basically make propaganda against the alliance with Russia. And this led

in 2004 to the so-called Orange Revolution, which brought in Yulia Tymoshenko, who subsequently had to leave office because of utter incompetence.

A similar thing was done in Georgia, with Saakashvili, the Rose Revolution; and it was later attempted in the Arab Spring. It was attempted in the so-called White Revolution against Russia [around Putin's reelection as President, 2012—ed.], where this Boris Nemtsov played a leading role. It was attempted in Thailand; it is being attempted in Mexico; it is now being attempted in Brazil, in Argentina. And it is generally a method where you have asymmetric warfare, color revolution, which in the meantime, has been recognized by the Chinese and the Russian governments as being a real form of war, even if it is not fought with real weapons. Because it's aimed at regime change by using large amounts of money.

At the same time, you had the expansion of the NATO borders, all the time farther toward the East, to the borders of Russia. It had been explicitly promised to Gorbachov at the time [of the reunification of Germany], and later to Yeltsin—also to German Chancellor Kohl and to Foreign Minister Genscher, that this would never happen.

Now, the official narrative is that such a promise was never given. But fortunately, the ambassador to Moscow at the time, Jack Matlock, a couple of weeks ago, gave a press briefing in the National Press Club in Washington, where he reiterated that, even if it was not in a written treaty, it was promised to the Russians that NATO would not take advantage of the collapse of the Soviet Union.¹

That promise was utterly broken, and every pretext was taken to include more East European countries in the NATO alliance, and that way, move the borders closer and closer to Russia, and encircle not only Russia, but try to do the same in China, in the Pacific, as well.

Escalation in Ukraine

The recent crisis was triggered one and a half years ago at Vilnius, at the EU summit, where the EU tried to incorporate Ukraine into an EU Association Agreement, which would have meant that European products would have immediately flooded, unrestrictedly, the Russian domestic market, and therefore it would have represented a form of economic warfare of the type

1. See Matlock's speech in *EIR*, Feb. 20, 2015.

which we now have in the sanctions, trying to destabilize Putin in such a way that he could be kicked out and replaced by some more pro-Western government. [Then-Ukraine President] Yanukovich didn't go for that at the last moment, including because he recognized, as was also mentioned for example by the American thinktank Stratfor, that in that moment when Ukraine would have joined the EU Association Agreement, NATO would have had [enhanced] access through the Crimea to the Black Sea, and that would have made Russia indefensible.²

After Yanukovich rejected that agreement, in the next hours, you had demonstrators on the Maidan, which at first may have been innocent, normal citizens, but they were immediately taken over by these NGOs, but even worse, by Nazis. And there is *no* question that the Right Sector, the Svoboda organization, and several others are not only neo-Nazis, but they are full-fledged Nazis, in the tradition of Stepan Bandera, who was the leader in Ukraine in the 1940s who helped the Nazi occupation at that time.

The Bandera networks, the Ukrainian Nazis were never prosecuted, they were never put in front of a Nuremberg Tribunal, and the reason was, that immediately after the end of the war, the CIA, MI6, the [German] BND, started to take over these networks for the coming Cold War against the Soviet Union, and they were kept in a kind of controlled network, also in the West. They were part of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations organization, which was run out of London, and, in part, out of Munich; they were organized by Yaroslav Stetsko, and later his wife Slava Stetsko; these were people sitting in Munich and they started to recruit new people into this Bandera network, which later became Svoboda/Right Sector.

2. Ukraine's Association Agreement has been called a "Trojan Horse for NATO," because it commits Kiev to a Common Security and Defense Policy with the EU, most of whose members are also members of NATO. With Crimea under Ukrainian jurisdiction, the agreement implied a challenge to Russia's continued basing of its Black Sea Fleet at Sevastopol, as well as the potential for significant eastward extension of the forward basing of NATO weapons systems, including the EuroBMD program identified by Russia as a threat to its strategic nuclear deterrent—ed.



The fascist Azov Battalion, with its adapted swastika symbol (the wolfsangel), is now under the command of the Ukrainian Army, as the Ukrainian Ambassador to Germany admitted.

ZDF-TV

These were the people who basically then made the demonstration on the Maidan violent, and they were the ones who did the coup on Feb. 21, 2014, which then brought in the government of "Yats" [Arseniy Yatsenyuk], who was the darling of Victoria Nuland, and of Poroshenko. These Nazis are sitting in the government; they're in the army; they're partly controlled, partly not controlled. The Azov Battalion, are people who are complete Nazis!

And the big scandal is that, as the present Ukrainian Ambassador to Germany [Andriy Melnyk just said on a German talk show, it's much better for Ukraine to work with these Nazis, because without them, the Russians would have advanced much more. So they openly admit, 70 years after the end of World War II, that they have no problem to work with such Nazis.

A First-Strike Military Doctrine

Why is the West turning a blind eye to such operations? Because obviously, they have ulterior motives. At the same time that all this eastward expansion of NATO went on, the color revolutions, the regime-change policy, there was also a change of the military doctrine of NATO. Remember that during the Cuban Missile Crisis, the only reason this could be stopped at the last moment was because there was an acceptance that the NATO military doctrine would be Mutually Assured Destruction, which was the idea that nobody in their right mind would ever use nuclear weapons, because nobody would survive it; it would lead to the extinction of mankind. *And*, you had, despite the Cuban

Missile Crisis, direct communication between Khrushchov and Kennedy.

That no longer exists, on both accounts. Instead of Mutually Assured Destruction, you have right now a first strike doctrine—this is admitted; there is enough literature out there for you to verify what I'm saying. You have Prompt Global Strike; that's the idea of a first strike, that it would be possible, through the modernization of cyberwar, to knock out the air defense of an opponent, that you could take out the second-strike capability of Russia and China. You also have a global missile defense system which has the same purpose; you have the Air-Sea Battle doctrine against China, which explicitly has the same idea. And a little while ago, the president of the Academy for Geopolitical Problems in Moscow, Dr. Konstantin Sivkov, said that also the modernization of the tactical nuclear weapons in Europe must be read as a possible preparation for a nuclear attack against Russia.

Why would you modernize tactical nuclear weapons sitting in Germany, Holland, Belgium, Italy, Turkey? It does not make sense if you're trying to maintain peace. But what is happening with this modernization, is that they're transforming the fighter-bomber F16, the Tornado VBC, the F35 fighter, in such a way that they can carry nuclear bombs of the B61-12 class, which then will turn these five countries I just named into nuclear countries, which they had not been so far. There are several people who say that this is already a violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Now, what is being created with that, is a completely new nuclear capacity with much more precise targeting. It's kind of a use-for-all nuclear bomb and it has the idea—and this is what Mr. LaRouche has been discussing since the beginning of this week—that you can limit nuclear war, with these new weapons, in which cyberwar is playing a very big role, and with the ability of the NSA to not only surveil the whole world population, but to also take over even the computer hardware of your opponents and destroy all the systems which are run by this hardware, and even occupy private laptops, and do these operations from there under the cover of this so-called human shield.

This is all incredible, but that is the idea. And the idea is that this way, you can limit a nuclear war to Europe, to Russia, and to China, and spare the United States from a counterattack.

Now, this is absolute insanity! This is criminal, and I think somebody who is preparing a first strike falls under the Nuremberg criteria, which said that whoever

is preparing a war of aggression is committing war crimes, and to prepare or even play with the idea of a first strike, in my view, at least needs to be investigated, if they are not such war criminals.

This is completely ludicrous, and if you look at recent articles that have been published by the American nuclear expert Theodore Postol, who wrote in both *The Nation* and in the *Boston Globe* recently, articles saying that the people who think this way, that you can win a first strike, make a fundamental error in confusing the fundamental difference between a conventional war and a nuclear war: that in the conventional war you will try to disarm your opponent, to destroy as much as possible of his military capability, and then the war is won, and then you stop and it's over.

In a nuclear war, however, it is impossible to eliminate *all* nuclear weapons. Right now, the intention of the first strike is well-known, and the Russians have consequently moved a lot of their strategic weapons onto trains; they have ICBMs running throughout the large territory of Russia; they have put them on strategic submarines, as the Chinese have also done; there are silos, there are many, many ways of making sure that such weapons are not hit, and that in any case, the remaining nuclear capability will be enough to cause global nuclear war. But even if you would have only part of these nuclear weapons being used, the nuclear Winter which would follow would shortly eliminate all life on the planet, and therefore lead to the extermination of civilization.

Nobody knows, is this a bluff? Is this a thermonuclear chicken game? Are these people Dr. Strangeloves, loving the bomb? It is very difficult to say. But if you look at the situation in Ukraine, and the many warnings from people like Gorbachov, who used to be a critic of Putin's, who has now come out recently, defending Putin and warning that the Third World War is about to happen—there is no question that we are on the verge of this, and we absolutely, absolutely, first of all must have a discussion about that throughout the whole world, because the fact that we are that close to the extinction of civilization, and *there is no public debate*. That has to be changed, and I'm appealing to you that you should help, to first of all read all the articles about that—we have published a list of such articles on our website; but also help us to mobilize to change that.

Globalization and War

Now, how do you change that? You do not change it by creating a peace movement, because a peace movement as such may have good intentions, but they're not

effective. How do you stop this machine? You have to understand where it comes from: It comes from the fact that we identified in the beginning as “globalization,” the idea to take over the world, eliminate all resisting governments, and establish a banking dictatorship geared entirely to profit-maximization of those people who are the multimillionaires and the hangers-on to power, so to speak, those who profit from speculation.

Well, that system, that system of unrestricted globalization is about to blow in a bigger crash than happened in 2008, with the collapse of Lehman Brothers and AIG. As a matter of fact, the too-big-to-fail banks, today, are 40-80% larger than in 2008; Bank of America today has 85% more derivatives than in 2008, and all the Wall Street and European banks are completely bankrupt and have a derivatives exposure of \$2 quadrillion, and are so indebted that this debt can never be paid.

Why do you think there is such hysteria against Greece right now? In Greece you recently had a democratic election, where the Syriza party and the Independent Greeks won a majority, they formed a government, and they won on an election platform that they would reject the brutal austerity policy of the Troika—the European Central Bank, the EU Commission, and the IMF—a policy which has ruined Greece in the last years, reduced the real economy of Greece by one-third; has increased the death rate, has thrown the population into desperation; has increased youth unemployment up to 65%. So the population rejected that and the new government attempted to say, OK, we have a democratic mandate and we want to cancel the Memorandum of the previous government. And then they were met by the EU, by Mario Draghi, the head of the European Central Bank, by Wolfgang Schäuble, the Finance Minister of Germany, with absolute anger and a hard line, totally, totally rejecting any effort by the Greek government to have a debt conference, to reduce the debt, a measure which was done in 1953 for Germany in a conference in London, where they cancelled 60% of the debt of Germany, and that was the precondition for Germany to be able to have the “economic miracle,” for which Germany became famous.

So why are they such hardliners? Why do they want to continue the suffering of the Greek people? Well, because they know that the moment you cancel part of this debt, you trigger the collapse of the entire derivatives bubble of the European banks, which are connected through a swap agreement with the Federal Reserve to

the U.S. banks, and it would bring *instantly* a collapse of the whole system.

The war danger comes from that dynamic, because the more Wall Street and the City of London realize that they’re about to blow—and they’re looking at Asia, China, India, Brazil, other countries, and they see that they are prospering, that they are rising—they say, “We have geopolitical interests, and rather than allowing that part of the world to progress while we are collapsing, we will go for this thermonuclear confrontation, even if it risks the extinction of the civilization.”

Now, they probably think that this will not happen, that they can destroy everybody and remain in control afterwards, but that is an illusion: That’s the illusion of the god of Olympus, Zeus, who chained Prometheus to a rock, because Prometheus had dared to bring fire and therefore technology, to humankind. If Zeus is successful to do that, Zeus will die too, and the whole human population.

That is why, when we say we need a mass movement for development in the United States and in Europe, it is not an option, but an absolute necessity.

The BRICS New Paradigm

Now, let me go back a step: We have now a parallel economic system. This was begun one and a half years ago, a little bit more than that, by Chinese President Xi Jinping, when he, in a conference in Kazakhstan in September 2013, announced that China will revive the ancient Silk Road of 2,000 years ago, in the form of a New Silk Road, connecting China, Central Asia, all the way to Europe, and he called that the New Silk Road, “One Road, One Belt” economic policy. And he said, like the ancient Silk Road during the Han dynasty 2,000 years ago—where you had an exchange of goods, of technologies, of silk-making, of porcelain-making, of book printing, and many other very useful things which improved the living standards of all the people at that time—we are now extending our Chinese economic miracle through the New Silk Road to all the countries who want to participate.

I don’t know how many of you have been in China recently. I had the advantage of having been in China 44 years ago, during the Cultural Revolution, on a cargo ship. And I could travel around quite a bit. And I can tell you, China was a horror-show; people were afraid, the Red Guards would terrorize people; they had no development, they were hungry, there were periods of mass starvation. And I went back in 1996 with our proposal

for a Eurasian Land-Bridge, as I mentioned, as a peace order proposal, after the collapse of the Soviet Union. I was invited by the Chinese government in '96 as a speaker to a big conference on the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

And when I came back to China after 25 years, I can tell you, this was *absolutely* unbelievable! China has progressed, you had a gigantic economic miracle in the east, on the coastal areas in the south. And I went there subsequently several times; and more recently, after President Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road last year, I went back two times to China, and there was *even more* development: *800 million people, or more* have been lifted from poverty into a very, very good living standard. People are optimistic, they are proud, they are proud to be Chinese, and they say, we could transform China in 30 years in a way which took the industrialized countries in Europe and the United States *200 years*, we did that in 30 years, and now we are extending that model as a Silk Road to all countries who want to participate.

There was a development in Fortaleza in Brazil, last July, where the BRICS countries, and also the heads of state of the Latin American countries agreed that they

would build an enormous number of projects—a second Panama Canal in Nicaragua, a continental railway from Brazil to Peru, and many, many, many other projects, cooperation for nuclear energy, for space travel, for water projects, for a war against the deserts in many parts of the world. It's a completely different idea, of bringing recovery and economic development to all of the participating countries.

They have also created a new financial system. China created an Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), which has now been joined by more than 21 countries; the BRICS created a New Development Bank, which has just been ratified by the parliament in Russia, in India, and in China, so it can start working; and many other financial institutions which are entirely devoted *not* to speculation, but only to development and investment.

When the APEC [Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation] conference took place last November in Beijing, there was a press conference where President Xi Jinping told President Obama, why do you, the United States, and other major nations not join with us in this effort of the New Silk Road, the BRICS development projects, and let's work together in "win-win" coopera-

The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge

The BRICS countries have a strategy to prevent war and economic catastrophe. It's time for the rest of the world to join!

This 374-page report is a road-map to the New World Economic Order that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have championed for over 20 years.


Includes:

Introduction by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, "The New Silk Road Leads to the Future of Mankind!"

The metrics of progress, with emphasis on the scientific principles required for survival of mankind: nuclear power and desalination; the fusion power economy; solving the water crisis.

The three keystone nations: China, the core nation of the New Silk Road; Russia's mission in North Central Eurasia and the Arctic; India prepares to take on its legacy of leadership.

Other regions: The potential contributions of Southwest, Central, and Southeast Asia, Australia, Europe, and Africa.



The report is available in PDF **\$200**
and in hard copy **\$250** plus shipping and handling.
Order from <http://store.larouchepub.com>



Xinhua/Li Xueren

Chinese President Xi Jinping with President Obama in Beijing, Nov. 12, 2014. Xi offered to have the United States join the development initiatives of the BRICS. So far, the U.S. has not responded.

tion? In other words, what China is offering right now is not geopolitics against geopolitics, where one country or one bloc of countries has to make war against the other bloc, simply because their supposed geopolitical interests are threatened. But China says, no, we have to have “win-win” cooperation; we should cooperate for the common aims of mankind, for the benefit of each participating country.

Obviously, this is opposite of what the Project for a New American Century people say, people like Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Dick Cheney—they said that the United States will be the unilateral, only superpower, and will never allow any other country or bloc of countries to bypass that role of the United States.

That is the reason we are on the verge of World War III right now, as long as the United States says “we are the unilateral master of the universe and all these other countries have to be our followers.” And that is what Obama said in the State of the Union address, that Russia is just a regional power—which is sort of absurd: If a country has thousands of ICBMs with nuclear warheads, they’re not a “regional power”; and when he said that China must not be allowed to determine trade relations in Asia, but the United States has the only right to do so, well, that is strongly debated by all of these countries, who say, we do not want to have a unipolar world, we want to have a multipolar world, and if the United States joins with us, we have no problem with that, but we do not want to be the slaves and the underlings of

one superpower. We want to be sovereign, in sovereign relations with the United States.

A Challenge to the United States

That’s where we are. The big question is, can we find, in time, before we are all dead, enough forces in the United States who say, “Well, that is a reasonable proposal by Xi Jinping”? There are *so* many problems which fall under the category of “common aims of mankind,” like eliminating poverty; making sure there is fresh drinking water for the 2 billion people who don’t have such water; reversing the deserts—this is not a problem just of the Sahara and the Arabian Peninsula, and China, this is a problem of the United States! We have an expanding desert in Texas, in California, and we don’t have right now the means to stop that!

Maybe it would be a good idea if the United States joins this new development idea, the New Silk Road. The New Silk Road is a metaphor for a just, new world economic order, and if the United States would join it, maybe we would stop having money printing for bankrupt banks in Wall Street and instead go back to a credit system like Alexander Hamilton created in the First National Bank of the United States after the War of Independence, and we would issue credit for development. Then we could build new cities, not in China, but in the United States.

Don’t you think that the United States could very well have some beautiful, new cities that would be a little bit more beautiful than Houston? We could build new cities in the West, in this area east of the Rocky Mountains, which is very thinly populated, where we would build maglev system throughout the United States, replacing the not-so-well-functioning railways, and replacing much of the short-route air traffic through a functioning system of maglev trains which could make it much safer, much quicker, and which would connect the East and the West coasts, the North and the South. That way we would have the infrastructure to build new, beautiful cities, let’s say, east of the Rocky Mountains and in other thinly populated states in the United States.

Don’t you think that that would cause some more excitement among young people? Don’t you think that that would encourage them more, to not take drugs, to start to learn, to study, to study for the future? If we would join with Russia, with China, with India, and even Bolivia, in the space program—because Bolivia has now joined the space effort—we would say, we have the questions and challenges of the future! We



LPAC

A LaRouchePAC rally in New York City, Feb. 21, 2015. “We have to absolutely get the United States back to being a republic,” said Zepp-LaRouche.

have to defend the planet against asteroids; we have to find out, how is the Solar System organized? We don’t know! I mean, we know very little: Just recently, we discovered that there are many planets that have the same conditions as the planet Earth—maybe we should find out how to get there in time. These are all very exciting questions which we have to answer, if we want to exist as a human species on this planet and beyond.

I think the idea that history has come to an end, that we have to revert to a third world war to maintain the banking structure which is bankrupt—that is completely crazy. And what we need instead, is a mass movement of development, like the new prime minister of India, Narendra Modi, called for in India. He said, we need to have a mass movement of young people and older people who fight for development. He is now engaged in “Operation Clean Water” for India, “Clean Streets,” just have India become a clean nation, which is super-important hygienic question. But also to fight for development and to have young people study and not just do some make-work jobs, but to have the highest scientific education. And then, take the fact that India, for example, has, I think 60% of its population is under 30 years of age, and if these people are all well-educated, Modi said, that can become the biggest export, because these young, educated people are needed very much in countries that have demographic problems, like Italy, Germany, and many other so-called advanced countries, where the population is dying out.

So, we have to change the thinking, we have to get the United States back to being a republic. I think the

American model, as it was conceived of by the Founding Fathers, by Benjamin Franklin, by George Washington, by Alexander Hamilton, by John Quincy Adams a little bit later, by Lincoln, by Roosevelt, by Kennedy, this America was a beacon of hope for the whole world. People wanted to go there, to have a new world, to have all the chances for their own lives, for the pursuit of happiness as it is written in the Declaration of Independence.

But America has turned away from that beautiful path, and now has turned into a country which is really not liked, and that is a British understatement of the year! As a matter of fact, the anti-Americanism around the world, as a result of the drone warfare, the torture, the regime change against all these countries—anti-Americanism right now is at a high point: I think if most people in the United States knew how big it is, they would have a sleepless night or two.

This can be remedied very quickly, if we can get a majority, or at least a significant portion of people in the United States—mayors, city councils, state representatives, even Congressmen and Senators, other institutional people, trade unionists, and businessmen to say, “We want to join with the BRICS countries to have a new paradigm for mankind, a paradigm in which we stop being warriors against other countries, but where we focus on the common aims of mankind, where we focus on the true identity, that the human being is the only species that can be creative, and again and again change the mode of living and in that way improve the living standard of all human beings.”

Why don’t we join hands with the BRICS countries and create a mass movement for development and turn America, as part of it, again into the beautiful country it was meant to be? I call upon you to *passionately, passionately* join this fight, because what is at stake is the danger of World War III, but also to have a future. And let’s make sure that we don’t only have a future, but that we have the kind of beautiful future worthy of the beauty of mankind.

LaRouche: Murder of Opposition Figure Nemtsov ‘Smells Like Nuland’

by Dennis Small

March 2—Former Russian “young reformer,” and recent opposition figure Boris Nemtsov was shot dead Feb. 27 as he walked across the Bolshoy Zamoskvoretsky Bridge, adjacent to Red Square in Moscow. Vladimir Markin, spokesman for Russia’s Investigative Committee, said that Nemtsov was hit numerous times by shots fired by a gunman or gunmen who escaped by car; he died at the scene before emergency medical services arrived. Markin also stated that “the investigation is looking at several versions” as to who was responsible.

Western press headlines immediately declared Russian President Vladimir Putin’s responsibility for the assassination. Presidential spokesman Dmitri Peskov said: “Vladimir Putin noted that this cruel murder has all the signs of being a contract killing, and is absolutely provocational in nature.”

In fact, Putin had warned explicitly against precisely this kind of scenario, as far back as February 2012, when he noted that there were forces which “really want some kind of clashes; they are pushing for that, and are even prepared to sacrifice somebody and blame the authorities. . . . They are even looking for a so-called sacrificial lamb, somebody famous. They would off him—excuse me for the expression—and then blame the authorities.”

Lyndon LaRouche put a name on the operation, in remarks on Feb. 27: “The idea that he [Nemtsov] was assassinated by Putin, in Putin’s interest, is crazy. . . . Who would have the motive to have shot this guy, in Russia? Victoria Nuland.” LaRouche added that the question must be asked whether or not Nuland “was part of the team that organized the assassination of this guy. It sounds like Nuland. To me, it smells like Nuland. . . . She’s on the

list of the suspected criminals, for this case, as for other cases.”

Nuland, who is Obama’s Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, is widely recognized as the architect of the 2014 coup d’état in Ukraine, as well as the sponsor of the neo-Nazi organizations which led that coup. Just this past week, Nuland met in Washington with Andriy Parubiy, the leader of the fascist militias during the Euromaidan coup, and who is now the deputy speaker of the Ukraine Supreme Rada (Parliament). Nuland and Parubiy are pushing the U.S. to send lethal weapons to the Kiev government, which would throw oil on the fire in the region and likely unleash a broader conflict with Russia (see *International*).

As LaRouche and his associates have thoroughly documented, Nuland, Obama, and their British sponsors are hell-bent on bringing a “Maidan revolution” to Russia as well, orchestrating regime change to topple



Cui bono? is the question to ask in the murder of Russian opposition figure Boris Nemtsov. Certainly not President Putin or the Kremlin—despite the rabid accusations against the Russian head of state by Western media.

the Putin government; they have even activated a policy of threatened tactical nuclear warfare against Russia and China to force them to submit to the crumbling trans-Atlantic financial empire. That submission will not happen, however, as the Russian leadership has repeatedly made clear.

Murder and Mayhem Against the BRICS

More broadly, Obama and the British are frantic to stop the emerging alternative to their bankrupt trans-Atlantic financial system, which is taking shape around the newly established “new paradigm” of global development established by the BRICS nations, under the leadership of China and Russia. That BRICS process now includes Argentina, Egypt, and increasingly, Greece. Obama and his City of London/Wall Street sponsors have repeatedly deployed murders and terrorist acts to target these nations, along with military and financial warfare aimed at regime change.

For example, take Argentina, where President Cristina Fernández de Kirchner, a collaborator of the BRICS, is being threatened with regime change, orchestrated by the New York and London vulture funds. There, federal prosecutor Alberto Nisman was “suicided” on Jan. 18, the day before he was to announce the release of a dossier supposedly proving Fernández’s guilt in covering up for Iran in the 1994 bombing of a Jewish community center in Buenos Aires. The President was immediately identified as the architect of Nisman’s death, in much of the international media. But on Feb. 26, the judge overseeing the bombing case, after reviewing Nisman’s so-called “evidence,” threw the case out and declared that “there is not a single element of evidence, not even circumstantial, which implicates the current head of State.”

In BRICS member Brazil, President Dilma Rousseff is also the target of destabilization and financial warfare, revolving around charges of corruption of the state oil company Petrobras. A national mobilization in defense of Brazil and in opposition to that operation has been launched, with leaders such as former Science and Technology Minister Roberto Amaral charging that “the coup is already underway.” Here, too, there are threats of violence and mayhem. Brazil’s Justice Minister José Eduardo Cardozo, on Feb. 25, reportedly warned Prosecutor Rodrigo Janot Monteiro de Barros, who is running a high-profile corruption investigation against the state oil company Petrobras and

President Rousseff—an investigation praised and promoted by Wall Street et al.—that his ministry had information which led them to warn Janot to take security measures.

In South Africa, one of the five BRICS nations, agitation from the British-linked left opposition around corruption accusations, is putting forward the demand for President Jacob Zuma to be removed.

Another recent case of unfounded charges being leveled against Putin and the Russian government, was that of Malaysian Airlines Flight 17, which was shot down over Ukraine on July 17, 2014. Obama and London immediately blamed Putin, with *no evidence whatsoever*. In fact, the U.S. has refused to release satellite or AWAC surveillance videos of the incident, or other relevant evidence. This charge was used to browbeat a reluctant Europe into joining in sanctions and related financial warfare against Russia, and to escalate the military confrontation.

A British ‘Sacrificial Lamb’

Now, the timely murder of Nemtsov indicates that Obama and the British are moving to escalate the confrontation with Russia, even up to the threshold of thermonuclear war. One of the more outrageously provocative lines being circulated in an effort to trigger a “color revolution” in Russia, is that the murder of Nemtsov is like the notorious 1934 assassination of Sergei Kirov.

The London *Economist* led the way with a Feb. 28 article headlined, “Boris Nemtsov, Liberal martyr,” with the opening line, “Russia’s rising political hatred claims a victim: a scrupulously honest reformist leader.” The article argues: “As Mikhail Iampolski, a Russian cultural historian, wrote on his Facebook page, ‘one cannot exclude the possibility that the execution of Nemtsov could become for Russia something like the murder of Kirov.’ The reference is to Sergei Kirov, a charismatic Bolshevik leader who was assassinated in 1934 inside Leningrad’s City Hall. Stalin used Kirov’s murder as an excuse to unleash a period of terror and purges.”

But there is also widespread recognition, both inside Russia and abroad, of the provocative nature of the Nemtsov murder. China’s *Global Times* published an editorial March 2 warning of the dire consequences for Russia and the world if Russia is destabilized and divided. The editors dismiss the argument that Putin was



Government Press Service

In a campaign speech Feb. 29, 2012 (shown here), Putin was asked about the presence of provocateurs at his rallies; he responded, in a statement prescient of today's events: "The people you mentioned really want some kind of clashes; they are pushing for that, and are even prepared to sacrifice somebody and blame the authorities...."

behind the murder, emphasizing that assassinating an opposition figure "is especially senseless because the outrage triggered by such an act can only enhance cohesion of the opposition, rather than weakening it." They conclude that Russia is at a difficult juncture, and that the "US-led West wants to add burdens to it, making the Putin government and Russian society face severe tests."

Paul Craig Roberts, the former Reagan Administration Treasury official, who is currently in Russia, is warning that Obama's provocations against Moscow are driving the world towards nuclear war. Roberts wrote Feb. 28 in his blog, "As if on cue, the murder yesterday of Boris Nemtsov, a Washington-funded Russian 'opposition politician' with a tiny following, has become a major news item for the American prostitute media. The prostitutes have responded as if orchestrated by a conductor with insinuations of Putin's responsibility and the death of democracy in Russia." He quotes analyst Stephen Lendman saying, "Expect no evidence whatever surfacing suggesting Putin's involvement. Nemtsov's martyrdom is much more valuable to Washington than using him alive as an impotent opposition figure."

Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachov stated, "The assassination of Boris Nemtsov is an attempt to complicate the situation in the country, even to destabilize it by ratcheting up tensions between the govern-

ment and the opposition. Just who did this is hard to say; let's not jump to any conclusions right now and give the investigators time to sort this all out."

And Kremlin spokesman Dmitri Peskov noted: "With all due respect to the memory of Boris Nemtsov, he was no political threat to the current leadership of Russia or Vladimir Putin. Compared with the popularity of Putin, or the government as a whole, Boris Nemtsov's was hardly greater than that of the average citizen."

Putin Speaks

But perhaps the clearest warning came from Putin himself, over three years ago, in a speech at a political rally. *EIR* reported at the time:

"Russian Prime Minister and Presidential candidate Vladimir Putin has continued a busy schedule of activity through-

out this week's run-up to Sunday's vote, including stern statements about the strategic situation, in an interview with foreign editors, and a warning on Feb. 29 against possible drastic provocations around the election.

"During a Feb. 29 campaign meeting with leaders of the Russian National Front, Putin responded to a question by a professor from the North Caucasus about the presence of provocateurs among those attending mass rallies. He said, 'Concerning provocations at rallies, and so forth, I have talked about this. I hope nobody will go that far, and things will remain within what is allowed under the Constitution, so that provocations against law enforcement won't achieve their goal. The people you mentioned really want some kind of clashes; they are pushing for that, and are even prepared to sacrifice somebody and blame the authorities. I know this method and these tactics. For a decade there have been attempts to use them, especially abroad. This is true, and I know about it. They are even looking for a so-called sacrificial lamb, somebody famous. They would off him—excuse me for the expression—and then blame the authorities. People over there are capable of anything. I'm not exaggerating. I hope that those who sincerely want to see improvements in the situation in the country and are exercising their right to criticize and demonstrate, will not fall for this, but everybody should be aware of it.'"

Hear These Russian Warnings: They Might Save Your Life

by Rachel Douglas and Nancy Spannaus

March 3—On March 1, Gen. Maj. Andrei Burbin, chief of the Central Command Post of Russia’s Strategic Missile Forces (SMF), gave an unusual on-air briefing on Russia’s readiness to use its strategic nuclear weapons under conditions of attack on the country, including the much-ballyhooed U.S. Prompt Global Strike scheme for a non-nuclear attempt to destroy the Russian retaliatory capability. The message from this Russian officer is that “utopian” military schemes for “limited nuclear war” or a “counterforce” destruction of Russia’s nuclear weapons are illusory: They will fail, and the result will be retaliation against the United States using the intercontinental ballistic missiles of Russia’s SMF.

Burbin’s RSN Radio interview by military analyst Igor Korotchenko, editor of the journal *Natsionalnaya Oborona (National Defense)*, was a high-profile message, which was intended not to be missed. It was cited by major Russian wire services and newspapers, in-



Gen. Maj. Andrei Burbin

cluding the government daily *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. Highlights were showcased in English by Sputnik News, RT, and other outlets, indicating a high-level decision to get out this statement of Russia’s military posture worldwide.

Within the days before and after Burbin’s radio statement, his message was amplified in additional speeches and comments by Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov, Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu, and Russian Ambassador to NATO Alexander Grushko. The Russians are reiterating a policy which leading Western powers have been determined to ignore.

The absorption of this message is essential to saving your life, that of your posterity, and of all mankind.

LaRouche’s Warning

Burbin’s statement came a few days after Lyndon LaRouche issued his own sharp warning on the threat of nuclear war. What we’re looking at, LaRouche said, is a “Zeusian” threat—the intent of a faction of the British elite which believes they can “cull the herd” of humanity, by launching some sort of limited nuclear war against the nations of Eurasia. The underlying assumption among these utopians, who think they can carry off a limited nuclear war confined to Eurasia, is that a government, such as that of Russian President Putin, would be willing to respond in a limited fashion to a “limited” nuclear strike.

This is a fallacy and a fantasy, LaRouche said. These

Zeusian forces must be told: “There is no way that *you* can survive the effects of your own genocide.”

Burbin’s Message

The first half of General Burbin’s interview concerned the scientific and psychological training of SMF officers, who man the “most combat-ready and capable component of the strategic nuclear triad,” namely land-based ICBMs. These forces “are capable of performing their mission within minutes.” Also explored was the command-and-control function, including multi-channel communications between President Putin, as the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, and the SMF.

Korotchenko then asked about the just-ended, month-long SMF training cycle. Burbin said that their main practice mission had been “to move our mobile missile units away from an attack,” so that the ability to launch a retaliatory strike would be preserved: “We worked on changing and extending the positioning areas, maneuvering the units, and thus increasing the survivability of these units and making the task of our probable adversary more difficult.”

Korotchenko: “So, the retaliatory strike potential will be ensured under all circumstances? It is no secret that the Prompt Global Strike concept now exists, meaning large-scale use of high-precision non-nuclear weapons, in order to make a disarming first strike in a critical situation, and thus knock out capabilities such as our strategic nuclear forces.”

Burbin: “This issue has been addressed. Within the developing or changing situation, we have already worked through this challenge and can meet it. The point is that, under any circumstances, the SMF can carry out their mission. *In particular, in peacetime, our strategic mission is deterrence. But if it is necessary to perform the mission of launching a nuclear missile strike, this will be done in the prescribed time frame, with absolute certainty.* Our units are geographically deployed in such a way, that no global strike is capable of disabling the entire SMF.”

To a follow-up question, Burbin replied that this “absolutely” applies to a nuclear attack on Russia, as well. The discussion also touched on the ability of the SMF to function “under real war conditions, with attempted interference and the deployment of sabotage teams.” The SMF officer said that this also involved countering new technologies, an allusion to stepped-

up electronic or cyber warfare. Reviewing the Topol-M and Yars land-based strategic missile-building programs, Burbin noted that by 2020, 98% of the SMF will consist of new missiles.

Summing up, Burbin said, “The missile forces, which are in permanent combat-readiness, perform the task of strategic deterrence in peacetime. Thanks to the SMF, we are living without war today.” Korotchenko rejoined, “The conclusion for all of us, for our country and for the world, is that Russia’s nuclear shield is reliable, and that military orders will be carried out in any situation that develops.”

In the call-in portion of the program, after the general had left the studio, Korotchenko continued this discussion with listeners, noting the turnaround of the Russian military during the past two years since General Shoigu became minister of defense, and the emergence of a new, highly competent generation of Russian officers. He commented, “This is very important, when Obama is threatening us with sanctions and divine retribution, and hands are itching to press the button. So the Americans know that if you press, then the button will be pressed in response. And this makes for strategic equilibrium, and puts us on an equal footing with the Americans. Maybe we’re weak in some areas, or the liberals say things are bad here, and that sanctions will suffocate us, but a great country that has a nuclear shield cannot be suffocated by any sanctions.”

Long-Standing Policy

General Burbin’s policy statement is a reiteration of a Russian policy repeatedly stated by President Vladimir Putin, Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev, and the top military brass. *EIR* highlighted this policy in its special report on “[The British Empire’s Global Showdown](#),” in Spring 2012, and subsequently reported the detailed Russian warnings about the threat which the NATO/U.S. European Ballistic Missile Defense deployment and the increasingly eastward deployment of NATO represent for upsetting the strategic balance. (Helga Zepp-LaRouche reviews these insane utopian schemes in this week’s *Feature*.) Numerous of those warnings explicitly referenced that this “Western” deployment could potentially trigger nuclear war.

In a public address Feb. 29, 2012, President Putin emphasized his determination that Russia be prepared to deal with attacks. Referring to the lack of prepared-



about Russia's readiness to beat off aggression."

A Two-Pronged Policy

The Russians' military warnings have been more than outpaced by the government's offers of cooperation with the European Union and the United States on common objectives such as fighting terrorism, combatting drugs, building infrastructure like the Bering Strait tunnel, and even collaborating on space research which could defend the planet against asteroids (the Strategic Defense of Earth proposal of October 2011). But these offers have been ignored, in favor of increasingly blatant efforts toward de-

President Putin has underscored his determination that Russia be prepared: "We cannot afford a replay of the tragedy of 1941, when unreadiness of the state and army for war was paid for by enormous losses," he said.

ness of the Soviet Union at the time of Hitler's attack in July 1941, Putin said, "We cannot afford a replay of the tragedy of 1941, when unreadiness of the state and army for war was paid for by enormous losses."

An article by two Russian military experts in *Military Thought*, the English-language edition of the Russian Defense Ministry journal *Voennaya mysl* (No. 4, 2012), elaborated the thinking of the Russian military establishment about Western military strategy against Russia, including assumptions that the West could use new generation weapons that would "achieve the war goals without much loss of life or property for their user."

How would Russia deal with this? We quote: "In these conditions, Russia is going to resolve its problems in inter-state relations by using every kind of deterrence—by force or peacefully, or by nonmilitary and indirect (asymmetrical) actions.

"Any forms and methods will do to deter the aggressor by force, such as, in the face of direct threat of attack, demonstrative deployment of a powerful defensive task force in the area where the aggressor is expected to strike; an ultimatum with a caution that Russia would (in the event of war) use nuclear weapons immediately and exercise no restraint in employing high-precision weapons to destroy strategically vital objectives on the aggressor's territory; and planning and conduct of an information campaign to mislead the adversary

grading Russia's sovereignty, if not dismembering it as a potential rival altogether. (See *EIR*, Dec. 19, 2014, "Who Is Behind the Drive To Dismember Russia?")

Foreign Minister Lavrov's address to the Diplomatic Academy of the Foreign Ministry Feb. 27 provides a guide to how the Russian leadership is thinking, and thus the context for the military warnings.

Lavrov lamented the "systematic violations" of principles of the UN Charter by the U.S.A. and others. He especially emphasized the lack of security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region, attributed it to the West's "line towards seizing geopolitical space and moving eastward: both through NATO expansion and the implementation of the EU Eastern Partnership initiative." Said Lavrov, "Russian interests were not taken into account, and our numerous initiatives, including the elaboration of the European Security Treaty, were either dragged out or shelved. This policy reached its peak when the Washington- and Brussels-supported unconstitutional coup and armed seizure of power took place in Ukraine in February of last year."

Lavrov denounced U.S. President Obama's latest National Security Strategy document, for expressing "a striving for global domination and a readiness to unilaterally use armed force. . . . This 30-page document mentions over a hundred times the issue of the exclusive

right of the U.S. to implement the notorious ‘American leadership.’ . . . The White House seems to have forgotten about the consequences of the attempts to gain hegemony at the expense of the interests of other members of the world community.”

“Concerted efforts” by nations, Lavrov countered, are the only way to address difficult international problems. He dwelt on “Eurasian integration, our absolute priority,” starting with the Eurasian Economic Union in its own right, and as “a bridge between the integration structures of Europe and the Asia-Pacific Region.” Russia’s current presidency of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the BRICS, Lavrov added, is guided by “the philosophy of collective efforts,” exemplified by the BRICS “projects for a New Development Bank and a reserve currency pool, and coordinating the strategy of economic partnership and the road map of investment cooperation,” opening up “new vistas of cooperation.”

Lavrov pointed to President Putin’s commitment to meshing these efforts with cooperation with Europe, saying that Russia’s turn to the East is envisioned as paralleling better relations with the West. But he warned that this will be impossible, “without reaffirming the principles of non-interference in internal affairs of sovereign states, and without abandoning the sanctions pressure and the attempts to stage so-called color revolutions, or encouraging radical extremist forces.” He said, “We have no plans for slipping into self-isolation or confrontation. At the same time, outside pressure will not lead us to revise our principled policy. . . . Washington has failed to put together a global anti-Russian coalition.”

More Warnings

Over the course of one day, March 2, three high-level Russian officials delivered the same message as that delivered most dramatically by General Burbin the day before: Russia is prepared to respond with full, strategic force to any existential threat.

It is likely all were aware of the most recent aspect of that threat. On the same day, the Commander of the U.S. 173rd Airborne Brigade, Col. Michael Foster, announced at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, that “before this week is up,” the United States will deploy six U.S. companies to Ukraine, for a six-month training program for Ukraine’s notoriously-Nazi riddled National Guard. Last week, British Prime Minister David Cameron had announced

that the U.K. was sending its special forces in to train Ukrainian forces.

This, even as Russia’s NATO Ambassador Grushko stated in an interview with Rossiya 24 TV channel, that “Moscow will take all ‘necessary measures,’ including military, technical, and political, to neutralize a possible threat from NATO presence in Eastern Europe,” according to RT. He specified that NATO’s actions “significantly impair regional and European security, and pose risks to our security,” citing intensified NATO military drills in Eastern Europe, with about 200 exercises in its eastern member states, mostly in the Baltic and Black Seas, Poland, and the Baltic States. “Sending instructors and offering military technical assistance are playing in the hand of Kiev’s party of war and give grounds for certain figures in Kiev to believe the crisis can be settled by military means,” he said.

At the same time, Defense Minister Shoigu and Navy Chief Adm. Viktor Chirkov discussed the modernization of the Russian military, including its strategic forces, in public comments March 2.

Shoigu reported that the Russian Navy will receive two Borei-class ballistic missile submarines, this year—the *Vladimir Monomakh*, which began sea trials in June 2014, and the *Alexander Nevsky*, awaiting its load of Bulava ballistic missiles before transfer to the Pacific Fleet—along with two general-purpose submarines and five surface warships. He also said that the Air Force will receive 13 modernized strategic bombers this year, and that by 2020, the strategic bomber fleet will be 70% modernized. He added that bomber patrols will be expanded to new areas. “It is important to note that such flights are regular, and we will not abandon this practice,” he stressed.

The Navy will receive 50 vessels of various sizes and classes this year, Chirkov said, according to Interfax news agency. Those ships are part of a rearmament program begun under President Putin, which aims to provide Russia with a navy capable of operating far away from home—a capability lost after the collapse of the Soviet Union—by 2050. “The period of stagnation in the development of our potential has long since passed,” Chirkov was quoted as saying. He also announced that research companies are already planning for the new aircraft carrier which will be built.

Interfax added: “The expansion of naval power comes as Russia confronts the West over Ukraine.”

Nuclear War Madness Fueled by Visit Of Neo-Nazi Parubiy to Washington

by Jeffrey Steinberg

March 2—Andriy Parubiy, the Banderite fascist who was the commander of the Maidan fighters who overthrew Ukraine’s Yanukovich government in February 2014, and is now the deputy speaker of the Ukrainian Supreme Rada (parliament), was in Washington, D.C., last week, to press the Obama Administration to arm the Ukrainian Armed Forces for confrontation with Russia. According to his interview with the Ukraine division of Voice of America, he met with Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs Victoria Nuland; Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-Ohio); and Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), who chairs the Senate Armed Services Committee and has been agitating for confrontation with Russia.

Parubiy, who founded the neo-Nazi Social-National Party of Ukraine (the future “Svoboda”) in 1991, and the Ukrainian Patriot paramilitary organization, a future component of the Right Sector in 1999, is now a leader of the People’s Front, the political party of Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk. It was “Yats,” whom Nuland was caught pushing for the prime ministership, in an early 2014 phone call with U.S. Ambassador Geoffrey Pyatt.

The Parubiy visit was an even more disgusting embrace of literal neo-Nazis, than the silence of German officials, recently, when Yatsenyuk told a Berlin audience that Russia had “invaded” Ukraine and Germany in World War II. The insult of this Western kowtowing to Hitler apologists is compounded by the fact that this year is the 70th anniversary of the defeat of the Nazis, in which Russia played an indispensable role.

While the fragile ceasefire negotiated by the four Normandy Group heads of state (Russia’s Putin, Ukraine’s Poroshenko, Germany’s Merkel, and France’s Hollande) in Minsk in early February is largely holding, particularly on the side of the Lugansk and



Ukrainian Embassy in Washington

Ukraine’s deputy speaker of the parliament, Andriy Parubiy, a founder of the neo-Nazi Social-National Party of Ukraine, meets with Assistant Secretary of State Victoria Nuland, on Feb. 26, 2015, in Washington. Lyndon LaRouche commented that Nuland must be removed from office, if war between NATO and Russia is to be avoided.

Donetsk forces, the battalions of Nazi “volunteers” continue to reject the ceasefire altogether, and are setting up their own separate, parallel command structures to continue the fighting.

Limited Nuclear War?

Ukraine is one of several hair-trigger situations that could spark a much larger war. Lyndon LaRouche warned, in the context of the Parubiy visit to Washington, that the Nuland apparatus must be removed if war is to be averted.

Among some Western strategists, he said, including in the Obama Administration and in London, there is a

perverse belief that it is possible to provoke war in the heart of Eurasia, against Russia and China, without such a war spilling over into global conflict. LaRouche warned that some hardcore utopians believe that a limited nuclear strike could be launched against Russia or China, without triggering all-out thermonuclear retaliation.

“Nobody considers a thermonuclear war of extermination to be a desirable outcome or a viable strategy,” LaRouche said on Feb. 24. “But there are some who delude themselves into believing that a limited nuclear strike, targeted at Russia around the Ukraine crisis, for example, could be possible.” At the top of the British Establishment there is a powerful commitment to reduce the world population by as much as 80%. Among those circles, typified by Prince Philip, there is a conviction that a “limited” war against Russia and/or China could be confined to Eurasia, and avert a full-scale thermonuclear exchange between the United States and Russia, which would be an “extinction event.”

Indeed, ever since the 2002 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, the doctrine of successive U.S. administrations has been Prompt Global Strike, a war-fighting doctrine which blurs the lines between nuclear and conventional war.

At the same time, the U.S. is modernizing its tactical nuclear weapons in Western Europe and Turkey to effectively convert them into intermediate range nuclear weapons. The new generation of B61-12 nuclear bombs will be more accurate than their predecessors, and have lower yields, as well as being forward-based closer to Russia. The underlying assumption is that such weapons could be used in limited warfare without triggering a strategic thermonuclear confrontation.

That dangerous folly was addressed March 1 by Gen.-Maj. Andrei Burbin, chief of the Central Command Post of the Strategic Nuclear Force, who denounced the doctrine of Prompt Global Strike, while warning that Russia has the capability to survive such attacks and carry out devastating retaliation (see accompanying article).

A similar U.S. war-fighting doctrine has been developed against China as well, under the name Air-Sea Battle (ASB) program, by which the United States will launch deep conventional strikes against China’s strategic forces. The Obama Administration is also pressuring South Korea to accept the deployment of U.S. THAAD missile defense systems, under the guise of protecting Seoul from the threat of North Korean nuclear attacks. Those THAAD systems would be of no

use against the North, but are part of a missile defense system aimed at China.

The Push for Arming Ukraine

Parubiy hit Washington following a trip to Canada, where he lobbied the government for improved surveillance aid, and to pressure Washington to provide lethal assistance.

In D.C., his private meetings were supplemented by a presentation at a conference on “Ukraine-U.S. Collaboration” sponsored by the U.S. government-funded National Democratic Institute and the Brookings Institution. In his talk, he swaggered that Ukraine, provided the right weaponry, could defeat Putin and “the Russian occupiers.”

Accompanying him in Washington was Mikheil Saakashvili, a wholly owned property of wartime Nazi collaborator George Soros and erstwhile President of Georgia, now posted to the Ukrainian government as head of its Advisory International Council on Reforms. Saakashvili’s message, published in an op-ed in the *Washington Post*, was that Ukraine was the “new Berlin,” where the West had to confront “Russian revanchism.”

Despite the fact that the Obama Administration has eschewed an official decision to arm Ukraine so far, there continues to be a flow of reports that such arming is already going on, or will go on through third parties. The Obama Administration has a history of using the Gulf Emirates, for example, to supply weapons to guerrilla groups engaged in the regime change campaigns being conducted by Washington. Among the nations involved—as documented by at least two United Nations investigations—was the United Arab Emirates, where Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko announced last week that he was purchasing armaments; the UAE was one of the countries shown to have violated the UN arms embargo in order to supply the guerrillas in Libya in 2011—with the apparent connivance of both NATO and the Obama Administration (see *EIR*, March 21, 2014).

LaRouche stressed that by arming Ukraine, “Obama is actually supporting a thermonuclear war organized around terrorists, international terrorists. This is where the threat of wars is coming from. The United States is capable of supplying weapons, serious weapons, major weapons. But the United States does not want to be responsible for that process; they want to be the backup people.”

The Russians, however, are unlikely to be fooled.

China, Russia Seek To Revive Founding Spirit of United Nations

March 1—The United Nations Security Council met in special session Feb. 23, at the instigation of its Chinese chairman, to discuss “Maintaining International Peace and Security: Reaffirm the Strong Commitment to the Purposes of the Charter of the United Nations.” The UN is celebrating its 70th anniversary this year. Representatives of 80 nations participated, each speaking for five minutes on the subject at hand.

Those purposes, shaped in large part by the vision of U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and first enunciated in the Atlantic Charter of 1942 (see *Documentation*), are defined as follows in the UN Charter:

“The purposes of the United Nations are: To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

“To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

“To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

“To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends,”

That these objectives have not been adhered to is obvious. But, are they even shared by the leading na-



Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi

tions of the Security Council? The debate brought to the fore the conflict between those advocating war on sovereign states as a means of “resolving disputes,” and those insisting upon cooperation among all nations, however small, as equals. The outcome may well be decisive for the fate of all mankind.

China Against Unilateralism

After a brief opening statement by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, who stated that

“sovereignty remains a bedrock of international order,” but should not be “viewed as a wall or a shield,” Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi took the floor.

Wang invoked the anniversary of the victory over fascism, which also occurred 70 years ago, and the importance of the UN Charter in the attempt to forge world peace in its wake. He particularly took aim at the tendency of certain nations to act unilaterally—as the United States has on an increasing number of occasions over recent decades.

“In China’s view,” he said, “any unilateral move that bypasses the Security Council is illegal and illegitimate. The Security Council needs to take more precautionary measures to forestall conflict and act in a timely manner to stop warfare so as to restore peace and promote reconstruction as early as possible.”

Xinhua reported, “Wang said China calls upon all countries, major countries in particular, to step up awareness of cooperation and abandon the mind-set of confrontation, working hard to resolve major problems hampering the world’s peace and regional development through consultations.” Wang continued, “The old mindset of confrontation should be discarded, and consultation and cooperation among the parties should be encouraged if we are to address the major issues affecting world and regional peace and development.”

Wang pointed out that no country is entitled to impose its own will on others or to topple the legitimate governments of other countries. “We should make sure that justice, not hegemony, will prevail in the world,” he said. *BRICSPost* noted today, with understatement, that Wang’s point was “an apparent jibe at the US.”

Wang said, “We should work with each other with a win-win, not zero-sum approach. We call upon all countries to come together to share rights and obligations and uphold justice while pursuing interests.”

Russia Hits the Same Theme

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov spoke next, emphasizing that the UN Charter was a “vital source of international law,” and had established a system which, despite the Cold War, “formulated the key elements of a polycentric world order.”

This has now been repeatedly violated, he continued, citing the “bombing of Serbia, the occupation of Iraq, under a patently false pretext,” “as well as gross manipulation of the UN Security Council mandate that resulted in destruction and chaos in Libya.”

All of these are the consequences of “attempts to claim domination in global affairs and control everyone everywhere, and the unilateral use of military force in the pursuit of selfish interests,” he added.

“In pursuit of the illusion of global domination, an array of rotten methods are used, such as intense pressure on sovereign states, and attempts to force upon them outside political, economic, and ideological decisions and standards. For those who don’t go along, there are techniques for instigating internal disorders and regime-change operations. One such case is the open encouragement of the anti-constitutional coup d’état in Ukraine a year ago.”

He attacked the imposition of unilateral sanctions, outside of the Security Council, another intentional destruction of the intended purpose of the UN itself.

Lavrov said, “The topic suggested for discussion is urgent: On the eve of the UN’s 70th anniversary, it allows us to critically assess the state of international relations and discuss ways to overcome accumulated systemic problems and correct them before it is too late... We believe it is necessary to immediately take decisive measures to reject double standards in world politics, to return the Security Council to the role of a leading body on coordination of collective approaches relying upon respect for the cultural and civilizational

diversity of the modern world, democratization of international relations.”

The Anti-Sovereignty, War Party

Numerous nations, including several former Soviet republics and British Commonwealth nations, countered the Russians, denouncing them by name, and, in some cases, insisting upon military intervention to protect “human rights.”

Most rabid in this direction was President Obama’s UN Ambassador, Samantha Power, who called for making changes at the UN to end the last remnants of the guarantees of sovereign rights in the UN Charter, even while lying that Russia must be denounced and countered for a supposed breach of sovereignty in Ukraine. The UN must back the United States, she said, in waging war on Syria, which she accused of torture, murder, forced starvation and other heinous crimes—without a mention of the U.S.-backed insurgency in Syria which has in fact spawned, and armed, the ISIS and al-Nusra terrorist operations. The UN’s “failure to act” in Syria has “let down the people,” she fulminated.

While she denounced Sudan and North Korea, she focused on Russia for “flaunting the UN Charter” in Ukraine, demanding that the UN “find a better way” to counter Moscow. Power said that some people argue that human rights are not connected to the issues of peace and security, and thus do not warrant military intervention against a sovereign state. To Power, and the Blairites whose philosophy she shares, economic progress is divorced from “human rights,” and war will bring peace. Shades of Orwell’s *1984*.

Power even denounced the fact that “50 countries have restrained the rights of NGOs over the past two years”—implying that this qualified these wrong-doers for military intervention.

British Ambassador Mark Lyall Grant backed up Power’s imperial rant, adding that human rights offenses are an “early warning of coming conflicts,” and that the UN must thus adopt a new view of security, to consider human rights violations as justification for military intervention.

Spain’s Ambassador, Román Oyarzun, added a new twist, indicating that his country had introduced a motion to change the Charter, preventing the use of a veto by the Permanent Five—U.S., U.K., France, Russia, and China—“in cases where atrocities have been proven.” Proven by whom?

Documentation

The Atlantic Charter

The official text of the Atlantic Charter, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill on Aug. 14, 1941, aboard ship in Placentia Bay, Newfoundland.

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing H.M. Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.



U.S. Navy

President Franklin D. Roosevelt (left foreground), seated alongside Prime Minister Winston Churchill, aboard the HMS Prince of Wales during the Atlantic Charter Conference. The Charter set the guidelines for what would later become the United Nations.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.
3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
4. They will endeavour with due respect for their existing obligations, to further enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.
5. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all improved labour standards, economic advancement, and social security.
6. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.
7. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.
8. They believe all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armament.

Iran Pursues Comprehensive Solutions to the Global Crisis

by Hussein Askary and Michelle Rasmussen

Feb. 28—The Iranian government is seeking comprehensive solutions to many burning international issues, while at the same time, negotiating the specific matter of Iran's nuclear program and the harsh sanctions imposed on that nation, as the result of its defense of its right to nuclear technology. This was evident from statements made by Majid Takht-Ravanchi, Deputy Foreign Minister for European and North American Affairs, and a member of the Iranian P5+1 nuclear negotiating team, during a press conference attended by *EIR* in the Danish capital Copenhagen on Feb. 26.

However, the key issue in Iran's negotiations with the United States, as its main opponent among the P5+1 nations (5 Permanent Members of the UN Security Council plus Germany), is the lack of orientation and good will in policies pursued by the trans-Atlantic powers, headed by the United States and Britain. It is not the technical issues related to the Iranian nuclear program, on which both Iran and some members of the P5+1 nations have made concessions, to facilitate a general agreement, but the political games that are being played by the trans-Atlantic powers and their allies in Southwest Asia, such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the oil-rich countries neighboring Iran, which are creating obstacles.

Following the victory of President Dr. Hasan Rouhani in the elections of June 2013, there was a consensus among the leadership of the country, to make specific concessions in Iran's previous position, to order to reopen the deadlocked P5+1 process. Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei gave President Rouhani a mandate to pursue these negotiations,

but warned that Iran would not accept any agreement that would not include the complete lifting of economic sanctions imposed on Iran by both the international community and the U.S. That remains the key issue.

When the Iranian negotiating team, which included Foreign Minister Mohammad Jawad Zarif and Takht-Ravanchi, reached the Interim Agreement in Geneva on Nov. 24, 2013, Iran cleared up many of the disputed technical issues. The agreement provided that:

- All uranium enriched beyond 5% will either be diluted or converted to uranium oxide. No new uranium at the 3.5% enrichment level will be added to Iran's current stock.
- No new centrifuges will be installed or prepared for installation.
- 50% of the centrifuges at the Natanz enrichment facility and 75% at the Fordow enrichment facility will be left inoperable. Iran will not use its advanced IR-2 centrifuges for enrichment.

• Iran will not develop any new uranium enrichment or nuclear reprocessing facilities.

• No fuel will be produced, tested, or transferred to the Arak nuclear power plant. In addition, Iran will share design details of the reactor.

• The IAEA will be granted daily access to Natanz and Fordow, with certain sites monitored by 24-hour cameras. The IAEA will also have access to Iran's uranium mines and centrifuge production facilities.

In return, Iran was relieved from certain financial sanctions, and the ability to get spare parts for Iranian civilian airplanes was granted.



Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister for European and American Affairs told a press conference in Copenhagen Feb. 26 that the country is committed to reaching a negotiated settlement with the P5+1 on its nuclear program, but the U.S. and its allies are blocking such an agreement.



Iranian Students News Agency

Iran cleared up many of the disputed technical issues concerning its nuclear program in the Geneva Agreement reached in November 2013. Shown, the reactor building of the Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant.

Intense Negotiations

The Geneva agreement stipulated that the parties would reach a comprehensive agreement within six months. But when that deadline was missed, a new one was established. The next deadline, before which, especially the U.S. and Iran should reach an agreement, is March 31. Iranian and American negotiators have been meeting regularly and intensively in the past few months.

However, it is in Washington and the U.S. Congress, not in Geneva or Tehran, that major obstacles exist. The Obama Administration's policy of regime change in Southwest Asia, aimed at almost every nation, especially Iran's allies, and the continued support by the U.S. and its allies to train, arm, and finance terrorist groups targeting many nations of the region, are seriously compromising the negotiations. While President Obama, for his own reasons, is eager to make a deal with Iran, Congressional opponents of the deal are creating further complications.

The Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu is hell-bent on destroying the Iranian nuclear program, and threatening to spark a nuclear war in the region and the world by attacking Iran. U.S. House Speaker John Boehner's invitation for Netanyahu to address a joint session of Congress March 3 will likely further energize

the large faction of the U.S. Congress that wants to impose more sanctions and block any agreement with Tehran. Netanyahu, who is facing a tough election on March 17, is making his last push to lobby the U.S. Congress to block a final agreement later this month—and hoping that his bravado, opposed by a vocal section of the Israeli security establishment, will help his re-election chances.

Prior to the press conference, Takht-Ravanchi had met with Danish Foreign Minister Martin Lidegaard; their discussion centered on combatting terrorism in the aftermath

of the terror attack in Copenhagen on Feb. 14-15, which left three people dead—one person during an attack at a “freedom of expression” meeting; a Jewish security guard killed in front of the main synagogue; and later, the terrorist himself, who was killed by the police.

At the press conference, questions focused on the nuclear negotiations, about which the Iranian official would not go into details, but he stressed that the sanctions against Iran ought to be lifted. Issues of terrorism, and the advance of terrorist groups such as ISIS in Syria and Iraq were also discussed. (The full press conference is available at <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=5157>)

Dialogue with Takht-Ravanchi

EIR's Michelle Rasmussen broadened the discussion by presenting China's New Silk Road plan and the BRICS dynamic for peace through economic development. Here are excerpts from the discussion:

EIR: In 2013, Chinese President Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road Economic Belt, a policy of infrastructure and for an economic development corridor, all the way from China to Europe, which the Chinese call a “win-win” policy. This policy was proposed by *EIR*, and advanced by the BRICS, including the

Russian-Afghan infrastructure peace plan. As for Iran, the Iran-Turkmenistan-Kazakhstan rail link was completed in 2014, and the Chinese are financing the Tehran-Mashhad line, as well as others. How do you see the role of Iran in the New Silk Road development strategy?

Takht-Ravanchi: It is an important undertaking by Iran and other countries along the Silk Road. We think that if we can establish such a road, and if we can strengthen cooperation with countries along this road, naturally, a huge number of people can benefit from such an exercise.

First, let me say that Iran is located in a very strategic area. In the south, we have the Persian Gulf, which is a natural way to the high seas. In the north, we have not only the Caspian Sea, but a number of Central Asian republics which are eager to get access to the high seas, which, at the same time, want to diversify their contacts, not only to the east, but to the west as well. So Iran can be a transit road for these countries to send their exports to Europe, and get their imports from Europe and the east, through the territory of Iran.

So we have established a good link connecting the

northern border, the northeast of Iran, to Bandar Abbas in the Persian Gulf area. That gives us the opportunity to help these countries in the north to have access to the high seas, whether they want to go eastward to Japan and China, or if they want to go westward towards Europe. So this is one project.

I was saying that making a good link between Iran and these Central Asian Republics to China, will definitely benefit millions of people along that road. It is in our interest, and we have spent a good amount of time and energy to reach that point: We are in close contact with our Chinese friends, with Central Asian friends, so we can materialize such a project.

Financing Terrorism

EIR also asked a question about financing terrorism, stating that there is a group of U.S. Congressmen who are trying to get the classified 28 pages of the report of the Joint Congressional Inquiry on 9/11 released, which point to the role of Saudi Arabia in financing that attack. The question was: What do you think needs to be done to prevent the financing of the terrorism?

Takht-Ravanchi: It's a real great challenge that all of us face. As you know, there are attempts by different individuals and countries to continue supporting, financially, the terrorists who are active in Syria and Iraq. There are resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council demanding that countries and individuals not provide financial support for terrorists, but, unfortunately, this channel of sending money to individuals is still going on. I think that the Security Council has the responsibility to honor its resolutions, the provisions of a number of resolutions which have called for the cessation of funding of the terrorists should be observed, and the Security Council should devise mechanisms to prevent the occurrence of this money being transferred to the terrorists.

As long as the funding is going on, I am afraid that the terrorism will continue to inflict casualties on innocent people inside Iraq, inside Syria, in Europe, and in other places. If they are not denied such access, we cannot claim that we are sincere in our efforts to fight the terrorists by all means available to us. And, as I said, there is a legal responsibility on the part of the members of the Security Council, in particular, the Permanent Members, to honor their undertakings, which are stipulated in the Security Council resolutions, to prevent the transfer of money being made to the terrorists in Syria and Iraq.



THE EURASIAN LAND-BRIDGE
'The New Silk Road'—Locomotive For Worldwide Economic Development
An *EIR* Special Report

(1997) 260 pages \$100
(EIR 96-007)

Available from
EIR News Service
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390
Phone: 1-800-278-3135 or www.larouche.com

BRICS Ready To Provide Funds for Development

by Ramtanu Maitra

March 2—On Feb. 25, at a Cabinet meeting chaired by Prime Minister Narendra Modi, India cleared the way for the creation of the proposed five-nation BRICS bank, the New Development Bank (NDB), which will mobilize resources for infrastructure projects, and provide short-term liquidity to emerging economies in case of payment crises. Modi's Cabinet responded promptly to a Ministry of Finance request of Feb. 10 to ratify the NDB and allocate funds. India thus became the second of the five BRICS nations—Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa—to ratify the NDB.

On Feb. 20, the Russian State Duma had ratified the \$100 billion BRICS bank, which will serve as a pool of money for infrastructure projects in the five nations, and challenge the dominance of the Western-led World Bank and IMF. While China's city of Shanghai will headquarter the bank, India will hold the presidency for the first six years once the Bank becomes operational. The Modi government has not yet named the president.

Following the ratification, India's Cabinet issued a statement that said: "The New Development Bank will mobilize resources for infrastructure and sustainable development projects in BRICS and other emerging economies and developing countries, to supplement existing efforts of multilateral and regional financial institutions for global growth and development." In clearing the BRICS' other instrument, the Contingent Reserve Arrangement (CRA), set up at the 6th Annual Summit at Fortaleza, Brazil last Summer, the statement said: "The establishment of the bank will help India and

other signatory countries to raise and avail resources for their infrastructure and sustainable development projects. It would also reflect the close relations among BRICS countries, while providing a powerful instrument for increasing their economic cooperation."

According to Russian state media, it is likely that Russian Finance Minister Anton Siluanov will head up the board of governors at the New Development Bank. The first board meeting is supposed to take place this April. The NDB, dubbed the BRICS Bank by the media, will be up and running by year's end.

Challenging the Global Financial Threat

Under the terms of the agreement signed by the BRICS leaders at Fortaleza, the NDB's mandate is to "mobilize resources for infrastructure and sustainable development projects in BRICS and other emerging economies and developing countries." To accomplish this goal, the Bank will "support public or private projects through loans, guarantees, equity participation and other financial instruments." The initial subscribed capital of \$50 billion will come from initial payments of \$10 billion from each of the five BRICS members. Total authorized capital of the Bank will be \$100 billion. Membership in the bank will be open to all members of the United Nations, and each member's voting power will be equal to its subscribed shares in the Bank's capital stock. The Bank's governance will consist of a Board of Governors, a Board of Directors, and a President.



PIB of India

Indian Prime Minister Modi (right, center) and South African President Zuma (across from Modi) meet on the sidelines of the 6th BRICS Summit in Brazil, July 2014. The New Development Bank, Zuma said, “is going to do things differently. . . . No country will go to the BRICS bank and say ‘I need to be rescued’ and find itself not being rescued.”

The CRA, meanwhile, “is a framework for the provision of support through liquidity and precautionary instruments in response to actual or potential short-term balance of payments pressures.” Its initial \$100 billion in committed resources will come in tranches: 41% from China, 18% each from Russia, India, and Brazil, and 5% from South Africa. BRICS nations will hold 55% of the voting power, and outside their domain, no country will be allowed more than 7% of votes. But importantly, developing nations may also become partners and receive loans. Governance of the CRA will consist of a Governing Council, including one Governor and one Alternate Governor appointed by each of the five parties, and a Standing Committee consisting of one Director and one Alternate Director appointed by each party. The CRA’s two main instruments will be a liquidity instrument for providing funds in response to balance of payment problems and a precautionary instrument for permitting access to funds ahead of anticipated balance of payment problems.

In essence, the CRA will help signatory countries to withstand short-term liquidity pressures, provide mutual support, ensuring their financial stability. It would act as an additional line of defense against the IMF-created financial destabilization of countries which has brought about decades of economic devas-

tation throughout the developing nations in Africa, Ibero-America, and Asia. It is fair to say that while the founding fathers of the National Development Bank had planned to set up the NDB to kick-start infrastructural development throughout the developing nations, ravaged by the colonial looting by Western nations, the CRA is intended to counter the IMF’s decades-long campaign on behalf of the London-Wall Street financial imperialists to cannibalize and drown, with dollar-denominated debt, developing nations, which were trying to improve their citizens’ living conditions,

To set up the Bank and CRA, all five BRICS nations must ratify the proposal. On Feb. 19, South Africa’s Cabinet approved sending the ratification instruments over to its parliament. Brazil’s Senate has yet to take up ratification, but the head of the powerful National Federation of Industry (CNI) issued a call on Feb. 10 for it to do so quickly. Brazil’s Ambassador to Russia, Antonio Guerreiro, in an interview with the Russian news agency RIA Novosti on Jan 28, said the BRICS member-nations will quickly ratify a July 2014 agreement to create the New Development Bank. “I hope [the Fortaleza agreement] would be ratified by all parliaments because it is important to make all financial implications operational,” Guerreiro told RIA.

Looking to the Future

At the 7th Annual BRICS Heads of State Summit meeting to be held at Ufa, in the Russian Federation, July 9-10, additional details of the role of the NDB and CRA are expected to be laid out. It is evident that the summit will focus on the economy. At the G20 Summit in Brisbane, Australia, last year, Russian President Vladimir Putin made clear that Russia was prioritizing strategic economic partnerships. Expanding investment cooperation and exploring a strategy for multilateral economic cooperation is the centerpiece of Russia's 2015 agenda in the framework of the BRICS.

The emergence of the BRICS nations, with an agenda to develop physical infrastructure and strengthen economic cooperation among the five nations, takes place at a time when the trans-Atlantic nations, under the control of global financial institutions, have become bankrupt, and increasingly belligerent, especially toward the nations of Eurasia. The emergence of the BRICS' institutions, such as the NDB and CRA, provide fresh hope for a better future for the developing nations and the world as a whole.

China is planning to spend hundreds of billions to integrate East Asia with Central Asia, South Asia, and Europe, through its New Silk Road and Maritime Silk Road projects, which aim to vastly expand industrial and commercial development along their corridors. India, under the Modi government, has begun to concretize its plans to develop infrastructure-aided economic linkages with its neighbors. Presenting the 2015-16 annual budget, Finance Minister Arun Jaitley, on Feb. 28, proposed that India set up manufacturing hubs in four Southeast Asian countries, as part of its "Act East" policy. "The 'Act East' policy of the government endeavors to cultivate extensive economic and strategic relations in South-East Asia. In order to catalyze investments from the Indian private sector in this region, a project development company will set up the manufacturing hubs in Cambodia, Myanmar, Laos, and Vietnam through separate special purpose vehicles," Jaitley said, in his budget speech to Parliament.

While China's building of transport and energy infrastructure to link it with the other Asian nations and beyond, and India's proposed linking up with neighboring nations and setting up some manufacturing hubs, will provide some relief to the smaller and economically weaker nations, those nations will still require plentiful credit, without strings attached, in order to develop their respective essential physical infrastructure.

This is what the role of the NDB will be.

The Bank will provide loans for infrastructure development. Visiting Washington last August, South African President Jacob Zuma made clear to *Business Reporter* why the developing nations should look forward to the NDB. He said the IMF had few success stories to show, despite the often austere regimens it imposes on troubled economies in return for emergency loans. "There has been concern from the African leaders that the existing banks that have been there before have not succeeded to produce an example country that was helped successfully and is now thriving," Zuma told a news conference. The new Bank, he said, "is going to do things differently.... No country will go to the BRICS bank and say 'I need to be rescued' and find itself not being rescued."

Ending the Use of U.S. Dollars To Bankrupt Nations

There is yet another role of the NDB that the BRICS member-nations are working on. One of the major problems that has caused untold misery to many developing nations over the years is manipulation of dollar-denominated currency market. Sharp currency value fluctuation, devaluation, mass withdrawal of foreign exchange, etc., had been the hallmarks of destabilizing developing nations. Most developing nations require more importation of goods in dollar-value than they can export. As a result, they suffer perpetually from negative trade imbalances, causing routine shortfalls in foreign exchange reserves, aka, U.S. dollars.

Because of their dollar shortfall, the London-Wall Street-dominated World Bank withholds all developmental loans, and at that point, the IMF comes in, and provides the victim-country with a fraction of the loan amount required, while attaching a string of conditions. This, in essence, is done to straitjacket that country's mobility, and force it into financial submission. To further weaken the nation, IMF economists "restructure" the beleaguered nation's economy and finance, calling for devaluation of its currency, curtailing all vital developmental and life-protecting plans, and imposing austerity.

Such policies have killed millions, removed many able leaders, destroyed political processes, and have created a political environment where only those who are beholden to the West, and willing to carry out the IMF-World Bank-dictated policies, could be permitted to survive. That policy, which goes well beyond providing "financial relief," has brought many devel-

oping nations to the brink of economic and physical disaster.

In due course, it is expected that the NDB will enable developing nations to get rid of the dollar as their singular reserve currency, and the NDB will become an open institution. It is likely that at the April board meeting of the NDB, another subject of discussion will be the usage of each other's currencies in lieu of the dollar. At the Fortaleza summit, the BRICS leaders had announced that the New Development Bank would help its member-countries to avoid the adverse effect of dominance of the dollar, and the dollar-backed IMF and World Bank, in world trade.

The process might have begun already. *Russia and India Report (RIR)*, in a Feb. 28 article, titled "Goodbye dollar? BRICS set to enhance trade in national currencies," said Russia is well ahead in planning a transition to making trade settlements in rubles and yuan. "In the long-term, of course, settlements in the ruble and yuan are very promising," Putin said at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit, in November in Beijing. After his statement, Russia's largest bank, Sberbank, began financing letters of credit in yuan and performed the first transactions in yuan with one of

Russia's largest companies. The two countries aim for a broader use of the yuan and the ruble in mutual settlements in various industries, including defense, telecoms, energy, and mining.

In March 2014, Brazil signed a deal with China to trade in its own currency, to protect itself from dollar fluctuations. Likewise South Africa, has been trying to enter into bilateral agreements with other member-countries of the group as a step towards replacing the dollar as the main unit of mutual trade and investments.

RIR also reported that India and Russia have set up a Joint Working Group (JWG) to work out an "appropriate mechanism" for rupee-ruble trade. The JWG, with representatives from the central banks, export-import banks, commercial banks, and governments of both countries, have conducted a number of sessions since last October on this mechanism. "Both India and Russia are of the view that transactions in national currencies would be mutually beneficial for our national economic cooperation. Our two Central Banks are working on modalities and are expected to make concrete recommendations to our governments shortly," India's Ambassador to Moscow P.S. Raghavan told RIA Novosti on Feb. 18.

The latest in
the series of
**NEW
PARADIGM**
conferences
by the Schiller
Institute



SEE
newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com
for videos and texts

The Battle for Glass-Steagall Brought to the European Parliament

by Claudio Celani

Mar. 1—On March 23-24, the European Union's scheme to preserve the bankrupt system of universal banking and financial speculation will go through a crucial test, as the draft bill on bank regulation prepared by the European Commission will be discussed in the Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee of the European Parliament (EP).

The draft bill is a poorly concealed attempt to sell to public opinion a phony banking separation measure which does not separate anything. Two Italian members of the EP, Marco Zanni and Marco Valli, members of the M5S party, have filed a list of 101 amendments to the fake EU bill, in order to judo the move, and turn the EU regulation into a Glass-Steagall-like real banking reform.

After the 2007-08 bailouts, which have virtually bankrupted government finances of most industrial nations, there was a public outcry for a regulation that would protect taxpayers from having to cough up billions of dollars to bail out speculators. The EU appointed a commission of so-called experts, led by former Finnish central banker Erkki Liikanen, with a mandate to come up with a proposal for a feasible bank separation.

The Liikanen Commission produced a paper calling not for complete separation of commercial from investment banking, but for "ring fencing" of traditional banking. Under dictate from the financial industry, it was clear that the intent was to leave a door open so that financial trading could continue in other forms.

As the Commission produced its draft bill based on the Liikanen report, the financial lobby prepared to tear down even the watered-down prescriptions of the bill. Now, their troops in the EU Parliament are ready for the assault. However, Valli and Zanni have moved preemptively to blow the whistle on the fraud; they have announced that they will fight to make the bill, if anything, stronger.

The FDR Model

In a press statement released on Feb. 23, the two MEPs explained their initiative: "Soon after the great

1929 crisis, U.S. President F.D. Roosevelt rushed to stop speculation as a cause for the crisis. In 1933, through the Glass-Steagall Act, traditional banking and investment banking were unconditionally separated. Sixty-six years later, policymaking capitulated in the face of Wall Street sharks. The Republican-led U.S. Congress tears FDR's reform apart. [Bill] Clinton, a Democratic President, enacts the Counter-Reformation.

"History repeats itself with the major economic crisis that started in 2008. Banks used the power of their universal model to carry out speculative activities and concern themselves exclusively with their easy gains, without any longer helping small and medium enterprises [SMEs] and the real economy. The 'public hand' intervenes with citizens' and taxpayers' money when something goes wrong.

"...In order to avoid this being repeated in the future, we need a real reform of the system, that prevents banks from speculating with depositors' and customers' funds.

"[Concerning] the fake reform by the Commission: In the face of the 2008 crisis, European politicians behaved either ignorantly or as accomplices. The former did not understand anything, and the latter functioned as useful idiots in order to erect smokescreens and distract public opinion. . . . The accomplices bent the law to the will of the strongest. . . .

"How can you reduce systemic risk if one single bank has a mountain of speculative assets equal to a hundred times the deposits of families and companies? The European Parliament is discussing a draft bill on structural measures aiming at boosting resilience of EU credit institutions. The stated target is to separate commercial and investment banks. Beautiful! Unfortunately, it is a fraud. M5S MEPs Marco Valli and Marco Zanni have examined the Commission draft, and have discovered that this Europe is just pretending to do something. . . .

"In order to avoid new crises, the M5S amendments propose to implement a modern Glass-Steagall Act, through:

“Clear and mandatory separation between traditional and speculative-investment banking activities;

“Prohibiting banks from holding equities in non-financial enterprises, thus avoiding harmful conflicts of interest;

“Perpetual interdiction of managers who violate regulations;

“Exemption for small banks which do not reach a threshold value for speculative activities and leverage on balance sheet.

“We must go back to the model of Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall Act: On one side traditional banks, performing only activities in support of the real economy (collecting deposits and loans to SMEs), enjoying government protection; on the other side, investment banks which can carry out their speculative activities without government protection, thus free to fail without being bailed out with taxpayers’ money.

“Banking separation is first of all a reform of fiscal policy. Austerity was introduced because governments

must collect billions of euros used to bail out banks. . . .”

Zanni and Valli also made a short [video](#) to explain their proposal.

The Fraud of the ‘Bank Separation’ Bill

The way the fake separation pushed by the EU works, is that a narrow definition of “financial trading” is rejected, in favor of a “case-by-case” approach. In each case, the EU supervisor (de facto the European Central Bank/ECB) will judge whether the risk quality of financial trading performed by a bank is high, in which case it will mandate a separation. The relevant section reads:

“In view of the challenges derived from the difficult distinction between proprietary trading and other similar trading activities, market-making in particular, a narrow definition of activities subject to the prohibition underpins the proportionality of this measure. Excluding smaller banks from the scope of the prohibition is justified because of the disproportionate effects such a

Draghi’s Lies Exposed

At the European Parliament debate Feb. 26, ECB head Mario Draghi was drawn into a shouting match with Greek MEP Notis Marias, who accused the Bank of a giant conflict of interest, being both the lender *and* the regulator at the same time, and of being “a state within the state.” Also, the ECB, as part of the Troika, has plunged countries into poverty, and has blackmailed peoples and governments in the name of saving the euro. Marias said the ECB decision on Feb. 4 to lift the waiver on Greek bonds, and no longer accept them as collateral, was illegal. You have to respect European peoples, Marias said. He demanded that the ECB give back to Greece the €1.9 billion in earnings it made from Greek bonds.

Draghi answered, claiming that the profits the ECB makes from the Securities Market Program “have been distributed to the central banks.” At that point, Marias shouted from his bench that this was incorrect, and a shouting match ensued, until the chairman intervened. Draghi then claimed that the reason the ECB had lifted the waiver on Greek bonds, thus shutting out the refinancing operation for Greek

banks, was that they had plunged “below the threshold.”

In a short interview with *EIR*, Marias refuted Draghi’s statements as lies. First, he said, the ECB is withholding restitution of profits to the Central Bank with the claim that Greece must first comply with the Troika austerity program. Secondly, the ECB decision on the waiver was illegal, because it was taken before the program expired. Greece was in the program until Feb. 28, but the ECB took its decision on Feb. 4, to be executed on Feb. 16. Furthermore, the ECB purchased Greek bonds at 40% and now wants them to be paid in full.

Only the French government restituted profits from Greek bonds last year, Marias said.

Draghi might have had one additional reason to be angry with the Greek MEP: he had wanted to cancel or postpone his appearance before the EP, and filed a request to the Rapporteur, who happened to be Notis Marias, who turned him down. Thus, Draghi was forced to go to the EP against his will. He arrogantly decided to stay only for the first round of discussion, provoking protests from several MEPs. However, a motion of order to force him to stay was tabled by the chairman, and Draghi and his praetorians departed, disrespectfully leaving the floor to discuss with itself.

prohibition could entail for those banks if forced to divest parts of their portfolios.

“The proposed Regulation also requires the competent authority to undertake a systematic review of certain other activities—namely, market-making, investment in/sponsoring of securitization and trading of certain derivatives. These have been identified as the activities where there is the greatest risk that proprietary trading could be performed in contravention of the prohibition, and which could give rise to risks for the stability of the core credit institution and the Union financial system. The competent authority is granted the power to require the separation. This power to require separation is not imposed as a blanket measure: instead, the competent authority is allowed to exercise judgment, *using a set of harmonised metrics* [emphasis added]. Only under certain circumstances, when risks exceed levels to be defined using harmonised metrics, is the competent authority required to enforce separation. This approach is considered to be proportionate because separation is imposed only under certain conditions, and following an in-depth review of the impact of those activities on the risk profile and behaviour of the core credit institution.”

So, the European Banking Authority (EBA), which is located at the ECB, will use “harmonized metrics,” i.e., statistic models, to judge case-by-case whether the volume of risk activities is such, that the bank should be preemptively separated.

The problem is, that we have seen those statistical models being applied in all stress tests so far implemented by the ECB, and they all have proven to be a fraud. Worse, in the last “Asset Quality Review,” performed in 2014, the EBA/ECB confessed that they used the banks’ own models, largely differing from one another in pricing the same asset.

Counting Junk as Assets

This practice was blasted by Nick Anderson and James Chappell, analysts at Bank Berenberg, the oldest German private bank, who have pointed to the ridiculous fact that banks with a high amount of Level 3 junk have passed the stress test. Level 3 assets are assets for which the market is not able to establish a price, i.e., they are worthless. They represent a loss, and writing any value for them on the books is simply financial fraud. And yet, banks have priced their Level 3 assets, and the ECB has accepted those prices!

In a 2013 report, Anderson and Chappell published a chart with Level 3 figures for major European banks.

The [chart](#) shows banks with high Level 3 ratio on capital, which eventually passed the stress test!

For instance, DNB (Norway) has a 114% Level 3 ratio; Deutsche Bank 96%; Barclays 49%; BNP Paribas 42%. The highest ratio belongs to Credit Suisse, which, however, was not included in the stress tests: 133%; other non-Eurozone banks are Goldman Sachs (76%), JPMorgan (62%), Morgan Stanley (55%). In the lowest range are banks such as Intesa (8%), Erste Bank (3%), and Raiffeisen (1%).

Applying their own model in case of a “pain” scenario (i.e., a systemic crisis), the Berenberg experts came to the conclusion that the following six banks landed on the bottom of the equity/assets ratio: Commerzbank, Santander, Société Générale, Deutsche Bank, Credit Suisse, and Credit Agricole, with four banks having a ratio below 2%: Santander, Deutsche, Credit Agricole, and Credit Suisse.

Questioned by Zanni at an EP hearing Nov. 3, 2014, Danièle Nouy, chair of the Supervisory Board of the ECB, claimed that her agency accepted risk assessment values supplied by the banks’ own models for the stress tests because of . . . lack of time! Nouy said, “It was not possible to address the issue this time because of the short period of time in which we had to do the comprehensive assessment.”

What the EU/ECB aim at, is to hide the tremendous losses of the banking system, hoping to keep it afloat with a combination of money-printing (quantitative easing), “bail-in,” and “bailout,” i.e., stealing depositors’ and taxpayers’ money to try to save the system. This cannot work, as governments capacity for indebtedness has been exhausted, and all the depositors’ money in the world won’t be enough to bail-in the system. QE is a guaranteed recipe for hyperinflation.

On Feb. 26, ECB President Mario Draghi was confronted with this reality by Marco Zanni in a debate in the European Parliament. Zanni accused the ECB of seeking “war” against Greece, as reflected in Draghi’s letter to Eurogroup President Jeroen Dijsselbloem (see box), and of caring more about “yields for the banks” than welfare of the people. He mentioned former French President Valéry Giscard d’Estaing’s comment, that the “Grexit” (Greek exit from the euro) is the only solution for Greece, and argued that Glass-Steagall is the only solution for the system. QE won’t work, because we have a systemic problem, Zanni said, “and the only solution is a real banking separation, as opposed to the fake one pushed by the EU Commission.”

Greek Government To Investigate Bailout

by Dean Andromidas

Feb. 27—Greek Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis deployed what he called “creative vagueness” in drafting the reforms Greece will commit itself to in return for a four-mouth “bridge agreement” with the European Union. This was enough to get past the Eurogroup of finance ministers and the German Bundestag and even to generate gossip about Greece being ready to negotiate a third bailout agreement. Nonetheless it did not please International Monetary Fund (IMF) Managing Director Christine Lagarde or European Central Bank (ECB) President Mario Draghi, who both expressed fears that it departed from previous “commitments.”

On the other hand, there was criticism among leading members of the Syriza Party, which heads Greece’s ruling coalition, as well as from Greek composer, resistance fighter, and political activist Mikis Theodorakis. The latter expressed his concern that the agreement does not clearly state that the country has reasserted its full national sovereignty over the country’s public assets and in conducting its economic and foreign policies. This was the key promise of Syriza and its coalition partner, the Independent Greeks, during the recent election campaign.

Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras helped to clear up this “vagueness” during a televised meeting of his full Cabinet on Feb. 27, where he declared: “Some have bet on a third bailout in June. I’m very sorry but once again we will disappoint them. Let them forget a third bailout. The Greek people put an end to bailouts with their vote. . . . What we want at the end of four months is a mutually acceptable agreement with the partners for the final release of the country from suffocating and humiliating guardianship.” He called for an agreement that will make Greece’s financial commitments socially sustainable and enable the country to have growth and social cohesion.

What the Committee Will Do

Tsipras announced that next week his government will send to Parliament a proposal to establish a com-

mittee to investigate how the Memorandum of the so-called Troika (IMF, ECB, European Commission) was imposed on Greece four years ago. The Memorandum has caused soaring poverty and rising death rates. The committee, he said, should “investigate the circumstances and the political responsibilities of all factors at play in the country’s bankruptcy that led us to the forced loan. With responsibility and honesty, we will take this policy initiative, because the Greek people have a right to know the truth, because we are morally and politically obliged to do justice.”

Earlier on the same day, Deputy Social Insurance Minister Dimitris Stratoulis stated simply that the debt will “not be paid in full,” and “cannot be repaid because the country and our people will be brought to full enslavement.”

Parliament Speaker Zoe Konstantopoulou (Syriza) had called for such an investigative committee on Feb. 24.

Konstantopoulou, following a meeting with her Cypriot counterpart Yiannakis Omirou, who is a member of the opposition Cypriot Movement for Social Democracy, said that one committee would be set up to audit Greece’s public debt and another would check the circumstances under which Greece had to sign its first bailout agreement in May 2010.

She said the investigation into how Greece’s debt, currently totaling around 175% of GDP, was accumulated would be a “tool aimed at rectifying an acute injustice against the Greek people.” Konstantopoulou then asked Omirou for the Cypriot House of Representatives to help in this search for truth and said that the Greek Parliament would assist to seek the truth about how a similar Memorandum was imposed on Cyprus.

Defense Minister Panos Kammenos, leader of the Independent Greeks, made a similar proposal the same day before his party’s parliamentary group and it was unanimously accepted.

Such an investigation will reveal facts already detailed by *EIR*’s exposé, “The Greek Government Is Right: The Debt Is a Swindle” ([EIR](#), Feb. 27, 2015).

Such an investigation would provide crucial information to be presented before a European Debt Conference, as proposed by the Greek government, to demonstrate the illegitimacy of the debt. (See “Convene a European Debt Conference for 2015,” [EIR](#), Feb. 13, 2015.)

Will Congress Sign On to Obama's Losing War on ISIS?

March 2—Six months into Obama's undeclared war against the Islamic State terror group, which is a spawn of his allies in Saudi Arabia, the President finally decided to ask Congress for an Authorization for Use of Military Force (AUMF). His legislation, offered on Feb. 11, asks for a three-year war against ISIS/ISIL and "any associated person or force," without territorial limitation, but without engagement in "enduring offensive ground combat operations."

Does this sound like the AUMF of 2001, which is still used by the administration to carry out a global "war on terror" of assassinations and drone strikes without limit? You're right. Obama's AUMF in fact *fails to repeal* the 2001 AUMF, and would have Congress sign on to a new one, with the same vagueness and lack of limitation. And, at the same time, the President is asserting that *he doesn't need the authorization* to carry out this war: He just thinks it would be nice to have.

A small group of Congressmen have stepped forward to challenge the President on this fraud, and to demand a full debate in which its ramifications can be discussed. The group is led by Representatives Walter Jones (R-N.C.) and Jim McGovern (D-Mass.), who issued an open letter on Feb. 6 demanding a full Congressional debate on the matter. Acting in parallel is Rep. Adam Schiff (D-Calif.), who filed his own proposed AUMF Feb. 12, which sunsets the 2001 authority in three years, and puts stricter limitations on U.S. action.

Call for a Full Debate

The Jones-McGovern letter, subsequently signed by 18 other Congressmen, was sent to House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio), urging him to "schedule adequate time for proper debate on the House floor," once the President submitted his AUMF. The crux of the argument is contained in the following paragraph:

"The last authorization for use of military force was brought to the House floor for debate on October 8, 2002. The House gave its full attention to this joint resolution and debated the contents for more than 26 hours over three full days. Ultimately, this bill became law on October 16, 2002. The dynamic and complex world we find ourselves in now demands that we give the same attention to a new request for military force. As James Madison said, 'The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.'"

In conclusion, Jones and McGovern ask that the "same amount of time for debate that as given in 2002" be provided for deliberation on Obama's AUMF on ISIS, but that more amendments be allowed (there were only two in that case).

Jones and McGovern, in collaboration with Rep. Barbara Lee (D-Calif.), have been fighting for this debate for more than six months. In fact, Congress passed Jones's H. Con Res. 105 last July, which specifically prohibited the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in a sustained combat role in Iraq without Congressional authorization.

Yet, Congress has permitted Obama's deployment into Iraq and Syria to proceed, with now an acknowledged deployment of approximately 3,000 servicemen in various capacities.

Jones Rallies the Nation

On Feb. 24, Jones took the fight for Congress to take responsibility for the war policy already being carried out by the President, to the airwaves. He was interviewed on C-Span's "Washington Journal" for 45 minutes, during which he engaged in animated discussion with callers, who repeatedly praised his courage for speaking out, independent of party and in a principled way.

Jones began by reporting on his demand, with McGovern, for an open debate. After the host recalled that Jones had declared his vote in favor of the 2002 AUMF, which authorized the war against Saddam Hussein on the basis of the lying Blair-Cheney intelligence fraud, "one of the worst mistakes" he'd made in Congress, he asked Jones what he thought of the current AUMF.

Jones replied: "Obviously, that was a different administration and a different time. I sincerely believe that the previous administration had manipulated the intelligence to justify an unnecessary war. So I'm very cautious, and again, I'll use the word dubious. I know what the President sent to us was very vague..." He then cited one of his advisors, a former commandant of the Marine Corps, who told Jones that he saw "no end to this resolution," that it was "open-ended."

"At the end of the day, we are going to spend a good deal of money on something that is unclear in both mission, measures of effectiveness, in state and exit strategy. Haven't we been down this road before?"

During the discussion, Jones added that it is nations in the area, such as Jordan and Egypt, that have to take the lead against ISIS; that he agreed with Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) that the new authorization "does not put limits on the war and expands the definition of ISIL to associated forces"; and that even the most powerful military force can't win against a guerrilla force, because the crucial element is being able to "keep the peace," and that such a war simply leads to more and more war.

Jones spoke of the chaos and terrorism resulting from the war-making, interventionist, regime-change approach. "Until the day I die, I believe sincerely that, if Saddam Hussein was still in power, I don't think we would have all of these jihadists running around the

world... Was he an evil dictator? Absolutely. I believe, had we not bombed Libya and taken out Qaddafi, I believe we would not have the terrorists living in Libya... Diplomacy is the best way to try to maintain some type of order."

We are "not only killing the enemy," he said, "but also killing innocent people. When you are killing innocent people, their families will tell people for centuries that Americans killed their uncle or aunt."

Release the 28 Pages

The response to Jones from callers suggests that he's become something of a folk hero, especially for his fight against illegal wars by Presidents from both parties. But he has also come to prominence nationally for his leadership in the fight to get President Obama to release 28 classified pages of the Congressional Inquiry report on 9/11—the pages dealing with financing of the 9/11 attack, which were classified by the G.W. Bush Administration. President Obama, shortly after his election, promised 9/11 families to declassify the pages, but has since refused to do so. Jones is currently sponsoring H. Con. Res. 14, a resolution calling on the President to declassify the pages. It now has 13 co-sponsors, from both parties.

Praised by a caller for his role on the 28 pages, Jones reiterated the importance of their release. "I don't know how we can make foreign policy decisions unless these pages are declassified," he said.

While Jones and other Congressmen who have read the pages are not at liberty to disclose their contents, former Sen. Bob Graham, who was a co-chair of the Inquiry, has repeatedly indicated that they—and other evidence that subsequently came to light—point to the role of Saudi Arabia in funding the terrorists. Jones and Graham joined Rep. Stephen Lynch (D-Mass.) and 9/11 Families representatives in a widely publicized press conference on Jan. 7, titled "Declassify the 28 Pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry 9/11 Report" (see the transcript in *EIR*, Jan. 16, 2015).

That very same Saudi Arabia is at the heart of the network that created ISIS—as investigative journalists, and knowledgeable figures in Iraq and elsewhere, have repeatedly pointed out—and still sustains it.

Congress had better get the 28 pages declassified before proceeding with *any* AUMF. As Rep. Jones has reiterated on numerous occasions, Congress—and American citizens—have a Constitutional responsibility to act.

U.S. Hawks Mobilize For War on China

by Michael Billington

Feb. 25—Almost four months ago, at the conclusion of the APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) summit, Chinese President Xi Jinping publicly invited the United States and others to join China in the Asian International Infrastructure Bank, and its drive for global development. Yet leading elements of the U.S. security establishment not only refuse to admit that China is eschewing geopolitics in favor of cooperation, but are also gunning for a military confrontation.

The latest example comes from Andrew Krepinevich, one of the leading members of the Andy Marshall kindergarten at the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment (ONA, which dreamed up Donald Rumsfeld's misbegotten "Revolution in Military Affairs"). He authored a piece in the March/April issue of the Council on Foreign Relations' *Foreign Affairs* magazine, titled "How to Deter China—The Case for Archipelagic Defense." The article is a call for a massive build-up of U.S. and allied land, air, and sea military forces along the "first island chain" around China (the Kuril Islands, Japan, the Ryukyu Islands, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Borneo, running from the Kamchatka Peninsula to the Malay Peninsula). Krepinevich, who now heads an ONA spinoff, the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (CSBA)—the current Deputy Secretary of Defense Bob Work was previously a senior fellow there—declares China to be preparing to drive the United States out of the western Pacific altogether.

"China's PLA is bolstering its so-called anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities," Krepinevich writes, "with the express goal of making the western Pacific a no-go zone for the U.S. military," including the destruction of the Pentagon's satellite-based command-and-control systems. To meet this imagined challenge, he calls for enhancing the Air-Sea Battle doctrine (Andy Marshall's first-strike plan for war on China, which Obama has officially endorsed) by sending significant numbers of ground forces throughout

the region to run "mobile launchers and anti-ship missiles," and plant naval mines across the access-points to the Pacific through the island chain, "to make large stretches of sea off-limits to the Chinese navy."

Proof that ground troops could do the job? Krepinevich points to the great success of U.S. advisors, with air power, in Vietnam! This would indicate that Marshall's kindergarten is also smoking too much of George Shultz's marijuana.

Since China has become skilled at anti-satellite warfare, he adds, the United States should "establish a communications network of fiber-optic cables buried beneath the ground and the seabed along the chain."

Krepinevich worries about the fact that there is an inadequate "willingness of states along the first island chain to cooperate." This is explained, he says, by China's effort to "slowly but inexorably shift the regional military balance in its favor, leaving the rest of the region with little choice but to submit to Chinese coercion."

Are They Insane?

This captures the insanity of this neoconservative network within the institutional leadership of the United States. The fact that China, together with its allies in the BRICS (Russia, India, Brazil, and South Africa, but essentially including nearly all of the nations of Asia, Africa, and South America), has sparked the greatest explosion of infrastructure development and trade agreements in the last 50 years, in contrast to the refusal of the U.S. and Europe to invest in any real physical development anywhere in the world, is of no import to these utopian theorists.

In their eyes, everything is geopolitics, and the actual conditions of life of the human beings who populate the nations of the world mean nothing to them. In fact, their view of humanity as no more than animals in a Hobbsian world of "war of each against all," is extended to the interests of nations as well, in a zero-sum game, with each nation's advantage coming at the expense of the others.

Xi Jinping's call on the U.S. to join in his New Silk Road vision, in "win-win" cooperation in developing the entire world, is viewed by this Pentagon grouping as simply a cynical ploy aimed at Chinese world domination. Since the U.S. must necessarily confront China, argues Krepinevich, the (mostly unwilling) nations surrounding China must accept U.S. material military support, so that they can "form a col-

lective front that deters China from acts of aggression or coercion,” and counter “China’s revisionist ambitions.”

Air-Sea Battle and the ‘Third Offset Strategy’

Krepinevich was one of the authors of the “Air-Sea Battle” doctrine in 2010, which has subsequently been adopted by the Obama Administration. It is not actually a military strategy, but simply a first-strike battle plan, based on the assumption that if China, in the eyes of the neo-con war planners, has the intention of securing its territorial waters (through what these imperial schemers dubbed “anti-access/area-denial”), then Washington must launch full-scale bombing assaults on all Chinese mainland military installations, along with an array of military and space-based operations against China’s industrial and military capacities.

In October, one of Krepinevich’s collaborators at the CSBA, Robert Martinage, issued a report titled “Toward a New Offset Strategy: Exploiting U.S. Long-Term Advantages to Restore U.S. Global Power Projection Capability,” which is essentially an up-

dated version of Air-Sea Battle. It argues that twice before, the United States found itself confronted by an adversary that threatened to obtain military parity with it—in the 1950s, when President Eisenhower responded by launching a “New Look,” massively building up nuclear weapon capacities as a deterrent to Soviet nuclear capacity, and in the 1970s, under Secretary of Defense Harold Brown’s “Offset Strategy,” using information technology to create a new generation of “smart weapons” to maintain superiority over the Soviet Union.

Now, China and Russia are modernizing their military capacities, such that U.S. superiority is “beginning to slip away,” writes Martinage. The United States must launch a “Third Offset” strategy to meet the threat, he argues, laying out a series of proposals which are spelled out in Krepinevich’s “Deter China” war plan in *Foreign Affairs*.

Lyndon LaRouche, briefed on this insanity, said that it demonstrates that Obama and his neo-con controllers are a lost cause; that they have no idea how to run a war, or even an interim operation. All they know how to do is kill masses of people.

EIR Special Report

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, And How To Overcome It


In the face of a potential thermonuclear World War III, a confrontation being engineered from London by a desperate British-centered financial oligarchy operating through the vast—yet often underestimated—powers of the British monarchy, EIR has produced a 104-page Special Report, documenting both the drive for war, and the war-avoidance efforts of patriotic military/intelligence circles in the U.S., and the Russian and Chinese leaderships. The British hand behind the warmongers, and the concrete economic and strategic programs which can defuse the threat, are elaborated in depth. These include the Russian proposal for collaboration on the Strategic Defense of Earth (SDE), based on Lyndon LaRouche’s original Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Global Showdown report is available in hard copy for \$250, and in pdf form for \$150, from the [EIR store](#).

Call **1-800-278-3135** for more information.

EIR
Special Report

The British Empire’s Global Showdown, and How To Overcome It



June 2012

FROM KEPLER TO CHINA

What Is Mankind, Such That We Would Want To Save It?

The Feb. 18 LaRouchePAC New Paradigm for Mankind [program](#) featured a presentation by Liona Fan-Chiang, and two of her colleagues from the LaRouchePAC Scientific Team, Jason Ross and Megan Beets.

Liona Fan-Chiang: ...I think, in this time where the existence of mankind is being challenged, is being questioned, we do need to ask some of the biggest questions. One, what is mankind, such that we would want to save it? And the other question that that question answers, is what is mankind such that we can continue to persist?

What the BRICS development has illustrated is beginning to answer this question; because you saw, the Greeks can say basically, “screw you,” because of the changing momentum which the BRICS nations have outlined. People who have been following Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, have been developing a completely new structure for the world, and now, whether that will actually succeed, is going to depend on us, is going to depend on if we actually exist for that structure to succeed.

As part of this, they’ve been doing a lot—nuclear



LPAC-TV

Liona Fan-Chiang led the discussion on the Feb. 18 New Paradigm show, demonstrating how China today is acting on the principles discovered 400 years ago by Johannes Kepler.

investment, investment into creating the New Silk Road corridor, a Maritime Silk Road, building the Suez Canal, building the Nicaragua canal, all sorts of incredible things that have been on the books or have been only in conception for a long time. And yet, you see that when the political decision is made, it can be done very quickly. These are not engineering issues, although you

have engineering issues—the problem, the place where these things are held up is not in engineering. It is a political decision.

Now, the thing that Mr. LaRouche has pushed the most, has been excited about the most, is the Chinese space program. And I'd like to get at this from something he brings up, which is the Chinese space program in the context of the discovery made by Kepler. And it goes along actually with Mr. LaRouche's insistence that right now, the most important subject to take up, the largest subject to take up, is the distinction between man and beast. And Kepler was very, very explicit about this, in several places.

What Kepler Discovered

What did Kepler do? Since both of you have taken up different aspects of Kepler on this show, we'll just summarize it here. Kepler made a *huge* discovery, and this is in the early 1600s, seemingly a long time ago, but at the same time, it's not the beginning of human history. In the early 1600s he discovered the Solar System. It's a funny thing to say—"What do you mean, he's discovered the Solar System? Did the Solar System not exist before that?" But he was the first one to discover, in the human mind, that the Sun *governs the motions of the planets*. Prior to that, people had these different models. People have heard of Copernicus having planets go around the Sun. Sure, Copernicus, for example, had planets going around the Sun, but not *governed* by the Sun.

You [Ross] pointed out over the weekend, at the Schiller Institute conference (<http://www.schillerinstitute.org/>), that all of these—Ptolemy, Copernicus—their models have no regard for the distances of the planets from the Sun. The planets are where you should see them, and as long your model accounts for what you see, it doesn't matter how far away they are.

Now physically, how far you are from that hot, burning ball of fire, really matters. It's going to determine whether your planet has water, or not, or has liquid water or not, and can support life. So that's very important.

Kepler though, asked this question: What makes the planets move at all? Why do they move at all? And from that question, he was able to figure out why the Solar System is the way it is. So he proved two things: One, that the Solar System can be known as a system, as a *solar* system. But then, two, that *human beings can know it*. That a human being, namely Kepler, standing on Earth—there was no space program at this time;

there were barely just telescopes—in his own body, can come to know a *cause* of the motions of, at least as far as he knew, the entire Solar System.

And that's very big, because this is really the basis of science: You know cause. And it's not a fantasy. You know you made a scientific discovery, because you can change the universe with that discovery. You can make things happen, that couldn't have previously happened without your making it happen. And there's no doubt when you see them, you say, "Okay, a human made that." You may ask, "Well, how do you know a human made that?"

A good example is nuclear fission. Fusion happens on the Sun, but where does fission happen? Does fission happen in the 99% of the universe that's made of hydrogen and helium? No! Fission happens on Earth, and it's induced by human beings because we made a discovery about the nucleus, about nuclear processes.

Same thing with numerous other things—for example, lasers. Where do lasers happen that are the size of a table top, or in your hand? Where does coherent light like that happen? It does actually happen in large structures, as far as we know, whole galaxies, in the micro-wave scale, but where does it happen like that, except by a scientific discovery by human beings? And this is a discovery because they're not violating the laws of physics; but prior to our discovery, that law of physics was not acting in the universe. It was not manifesting in that way, in the universe.

Kepler started science from that standpoint, and really defined human beings as a creator, a creator that's capable of knowing cause and applying it. And that was very big. That's a very big statement, and we've basically lived in the wake of this discovery.

Vernadsky vs. the 'Speck' View

At the same time, that discovery is not popular. And the reason I say that is because, think about the view of human beings now. Do people think about themselves as creators, for example? Now, that's something that's relegated to religion at this point, and if you say that in science, you must be a mystic. And the reason that that is the case, is that Kepler himself, Kepler's ideas and Kepler's discoveries, were incredibly, viciously attacked for the next several centuries, by Newton, by several others, by the sect of our artificial intelligence crowd, and I'm sure they don't know it, but by the environmentalists as well—that idea of human beings.

Vernadsky, in the early part of the last century,

pointed this out very clearly, and that was 1931. And it unfortunately still applies today: Look at science now. When we make a discovery about the cosmos, you would think we would say, “Wow! We know more about the cosmos!” But when we make a discovery about the cosmos, people say, “Wow, the cosmos is so vast, that must mean that we are so small. Human beings are so small on this little planet, and just on a continent, in this little body of ours, and we’re just a speck in the middle of this vast expanse. How are we to say that we are important, that we constitute anything special? How can we say we’re allowed even to touch these other processes, or that we should change anything? Or violating the Solar System, or the rest of the universe?”

So there’s that aspect of it, which is this view of man, which I call the “speck view.” But Vernadsky was saying from the scientific standpoint, that this speck view actually leaves out large parts of the universe. So the way he laid it out was that: Look you’ve got physics, and right now physics is the physics of dead things. And he was saying, look, you’ve got all these discoveries that are specifically from life, for example, life does things that only occur at extremes in non-life, like superconductivity, or several other things. And if you don’t take those into account—his favorite one is dissymmetry, the ability to distinguish left and right, which isn’t distinguished in chemistry, but is in life—if you don’t take those things into account in your science, how can you call it universal? How can you call your law universal, if you don’t take life into account? And at that point, all these new discoveries from life explicitly were being made.

And the next step which he pointed out, is the human mind. How can you leave the scientists who made the scientific discovery out of your theory of science? That, again, your science isn’t really universal if you leave out the cause of the existence of science itself. And so, Vernadsky pointed this out, in 1931: This view that Vernadsky was attacking, this view of the “small mankind,” which is basically unnatural, still persists today and is actually very popular. It’s being taught in schools. And that has to change.

FIGURE 1
The China Lunar Exploration Program (CLEP)



That view has to be proven unscientific, as Kepler already proved. And I think that’s where Mr. La-Rouche is placing the development of space right now. So you can almost say that Kepler started the space age. But human beings first went into space in about 1961. It was a while ago—in modern time, that’s actually a while ago. And human beings stopped going past low-Earth orbit in 1974, or maybe it was ’76. That was a long time ago. The latest thing that landed on the Moon, was by the Chinese, in 2013. Before that there were 37 years of vacantness, of an empty, lonely Moon.

The Chinese have taken this step to go to the Moon, but they’ve also taken a step to go much farther. They’ve been very explicit that they are not going to do what we did—

which was sort of, go to the Moon, do some science, and then come back, and “Been there, done that,” as Obama says.

The Chinese Lunar Program

So I want to show you something, which is the Chinese Lunar Exploration Program (CLEP) insignia (**Figure 1**), and the symbol is supposed to be the symbol for the Moon. But at the same time, it’s obviously a Moon; it’s a crescent, and two footprints. And a lot of people have pointed out that the Chinese don’t really make their exploration program very secret, as far as their intentions go. It’s a manned exploration program, and I would say, even the term “exploration program,” is also not quite right, because what they’re doing right now, is explicitly not just explorations. For example, in just the rover aspect, they’ve already pulled several of what they call “firsts.”

Before I go through that, the father of the lunar exploration program, Ouyang Ziyuan has explicitly said, we should be there, we should be on the Moon, we should be developing, we should be mining helium-3 for fusion, we should be prospecting for helium-3, and so on. That’s a very good measure, that philosophy of the father of the lunar program will probably tell you where the lunar program is going, more than the explicit statements of what the next mission is, and so on;



Ouyang Ziyuan, the father of the lunar exploration program, has said we should be on the Moon, we should be mining helium-3 for fusion. This tells you where the Chinese lunar program is going, said Fan-Chiang.

it gives you a longer arc of where it's going.

But, too, even just what has been done shows you something that is much more than exploration. Prospecting for materials, that's already happening. They're testing for 14 different elements, one of which is helium-3, or helium, trying to figure out how much is there, how can it be utilized, and so on. The other aspect which isn't one of the "firsts," is observation from the Moon.


So, they do observation *of* the Moon, that is also happening; but they're doing observation *from* the Moon, which is one of those dreams of astronomers. Astronomers have always talked about being on the other side of the Moon, not exactly the dark side, but it's the other side of the Moon, for example. But even just being *on* the Moon and doing observations: The Moon has very, very low atmosphere, but also spins very slowly, and so, for example, you can look at the Earth, for a very long time—not only for a very long time, but also be able to see an entire half of the Earth. This, for example, is one of their preliminary pictures (Figure 2); most of what's come out is preliminary, tests of the cameras and things like that.

Jason Ross: This is from the Chinese lunar landing.

Fan-Chiang: This is from the last Chinese lunar lander, and this is of the Earth, of the Earth's plasmasphere. And so, now you know that this is what they're going to be observing, one of the things that they can observe with their near UV instrument, is the Earth's plasmasphere.

The other thing that they're looking at, is outward, the other way. They have a UV telescope looking for

FIGURE 2



China's Change'e Lander's LUT (Lunar-based Ultraviolet Telescope) captured this photo of Galaxy M101.

galaxies, binaries, quasars, active galactic galaxies, all astronomical phenomena, which are hard to see from inside the atmosphere of Earth, and this is the first observatory now on the Moon. So you can see how many different firsts you can define for that one, but there's an observatory on the Moon, explicitly looking at different cosmic phenomena. So actually, these were one of the two firsts, this observatory of galactic processes on the Moon, and the other one is the observatory of Earth, on the Moon (Figure 3).

FIGURE 3

Earth's Plasmasphere, Seen from the Moon by China's Moon Rover, January 2014





FIGURE 4
Primary Test Result of the Moon's Geological Structure



This is a picture of, I think it's radar (**Figure 4**), which is to see 100 meters below—the last tick on here is 100 meters down into the regolith of the Moon, or the ground of the Moon. So this is definitely one of the firsts, being able to prospect 100 meters down, underneath [the surface]. And I'm actually wondering how this is going to pair with the two...

Megan Beets: U.S. GRAIL [Gravity Recovery And Interior Laboratory] orbiters?

Fan-Chiang: Yes, because GRAIL did the gravity map of the whole Moon.

And then the other thing that they're doing is using an X-ray spectrometer that looks for materials (**Figure 5**). As I already mentioned, they're prospecting for materials, and it's obviously also to look at the different composition of the Moon, evolution and some of these other things.

So, this is also very big, for a pretty young program! I don't know if people realize this, but their official manned program started—which is pretty much the beginning of the actual space program—in '92. Their official Moon program, though, didn't start until 2004.

So this is all since 2004.

Given, the U.S. moved

very, very quickly when we were doing this. But in this span of time, when no one else is doing anything, this is actually very fast.


A Galactic View of Mankind

Now, what is this doing? We've got China, which is part of this whole consortium to change the dynamic, the geopolitical dynamic out of geopolitics entirely, of the entire globe. But at the same

time, leading with this concept, which has been transforming—I mean, people all around the world are incredibly excited that there's a commitment to take human beings into the Solar System. And not just into the Solar System to explore, so-called, but to actually conquer, to actually manage, to come to occupy, but also to be part of the creation of the Solar System. That, and also as you see with these observations, which will be paired with, I'm sure, the grand observatories—these are the space telescopes—to look out, to take that next step beyond where Kepler already had us.

Now Kepler already had human beings defined as a Solar System species, as we are just now sort of filling that out. But you have to fill that out to be able to take

FIGURE 5
Chang'e 3's Achievement



the next step. And Mr. LaRouche just said yesterday, that you've got to take that step and look *in*. Now, you've got to look *in* at the Solar System, from beyond that. And that would be your next discovery: One of the next discoveries will be this view of mankind that is galactic.

And as I said, it is not just a so-called scientific research subject; it is: What's the identity of mankind? Do we consider ourselves as having the responsibility to take advantage of a capability we've already been proven to have, which is to come to know causes, and to create based upon that, and to create something that's more ordered, more active, and more creative, and take that as an identifying aspect of the human species and that which we would want to fight for?

So, as we watch, it really is this potential that Mr. LaRouche sees in the space program, more than where it is at any one point. It is this potential that would define what we're looking at, what makes it so that mankind can persist, say, after we get out of this crazy existential period.

Kepler and Cusa

Beets: I want to go back to something you said throughout, which is the discovery of Kepler, and really, all discovery. It's not so much a discovery about the *thing which is discovered*, although that's a significant factor, because putting that into practice revolutionizes mankind's economy and capabilities; but the real, higher level discovery is *a new discovery about man*. And as you referenced, Kepler's discovery was not just that the principle of the Solar System was knowable, but that *man* could know it. That this was knowable by mankind.

And that is really the exemplification of the principle that Kepler had an intimation of in his youth, when he was looking at the work of Nicholas of Cusa. And what really stuck with Kepler about Cusa's work was Cusa's analogy, or metaphor, of the relationship of God's mind to man's mind, in the relationship of the circle to the inscribed polygon. And Kepler said, "In this, Cusa seems to me divine," in that he identified the relationship of man to God.

That is an idea that he clearly stuck with and developed throughout his entire life's work; and look at Book IV of his *Harmony of the World*, which was one of his last major works, where he's extremely explicit in his attacks on the Aristotelean ideology, which was the counterpole to the Renaissance: the idea that man can

only know through the senses, that man's mind is nothing but a receptacle which receives impressions from the outside world and collects them in this box of junk, and that composes mind.

But Kepler said, no, that's not true, and first of all, he said that Aristotle should be thrown out of the Christian religion for that reason; but also he said that the mind is inherently composed of ideas. And Kepler said the relationship of the mind to the senses is such that, if the body did not have eyes with which to see, the mind would not only *demand* eyes, with which it could see the outside world, but it would also determine their structure and their composition to fulfill its purposes. And I think that statement sort of exemplifies how Kepler went about his work.

And you look at his *Harmony of the World*, where he was able to solve the problem of the composition of the motions of the Solar System, and the identification of why these motions are in these planets, and not otherwise, and how that was all an expression of one principle of the Sun, he was able to work with the data to compose a certain paradox in the data, which couldn't be solved by the numbers in the data.

And then, what he did, is he actually put all the data to the side, and he went and reflected upon his own mind and the principles of human composition and the principles of human music. He invented things in his planetary harmonics, which would come later in actual musical harmonies, in musical practice. And the setting up of that irony, and the composing of the data to show the irony in the system that couldn't be solved by number, but could only be solved by an experience of the mind, which is a very real experience, in that, Kepler did exactly what you said: He took man's residency off of the Earth and put it out in the Solar System. Man's mind now subsumed the Solar System. And this goes back again to the work of Cusa and the breakthrough of the Renaissance.

So I think that is the point to be made here: that Kepler, seemingly observing from Earth, was able to put man in the Solar System, and now with the actions and potentials of the Chinese, we can now use that discovery of what man is, put ourselves on the Moon, and look out beyond to confront the greater paradoxes and ironies of this galactic system, and in that way, fulfill Kepler, but also transform mankind into something completely new and more powerful.


Fan-Chiang: Yes, I think it is the transformation.

One of the things about space exploration is that

people know that you have to have the Moon. One, it's incredibly convenient that we happen to have a moon; but then, you're not going to send frontiersmen out and just leave them there. In other words, in order to actually develop a space which you're managing, you have to have infrastructure, you have to have development.

But yes, I think it is this idea of transforming the human species into something which it is not now, and then fighting for that.

You know, it's a funny thing: How do you fight for something, if you can't imagine that it doesn't exist yet? Well, human beings have a great faith that we can make discoveries of things we don't know yet. That's how we make investments, that's why we have education, and so on. And that's its defining characteristic.



Did Kepler believe that he was discovering how God put the universe together? Yes. It makes you think, said Jason Ross, about Einstein's famous remark: "I want to know God's thoughts; the rest are details."

Knowing God's Thoughts

Ross: Yes, including the passion that drove Kepler—I mean, Kepler did *a lot* of work. He did a lot of work to figure out what he determined. You had brought up that Cusa seemed divine to him, for this reason. And it's amazing the extent to which the most powerful concepts were pushing Kepler forward. Did he believe that it was possible for the mind of man to know these things? Yes. Did he believe that that was something that was about human nature? Yes. Did he believe that what he was discovering was how God put things together? Yes—that's the level he was thinking about. He makes you think about that quote from Einstein about "I want to know God's thoughts; the rest are details."

Kepler was very excited about the Copernican hypothesis; the Ptolemaic hypothesis gave no distances between the planets; the Copernican one did, although it wasn't based on the Sun. And Kepler was really excited about that, because he said, this also means we can figure out why there are—he had a hypothesis that he thought also explained why there were as many planets as there were, why they had the distances they had, instead of other ones. Those seemed like questions that people today think wouldn't even be worth pursuing. Why are there as many planets as there are? "I dunno, there was just some dust and it made some the Sun and its planets, and who cares?"

Kepler said, No, no, come on, nothing happens without a reason. So, he looked for that. In order to determine whether he was right, he realized that he had to

reform *all* of astronomy. So in the *Mysterium Cosmographicum*, in 1596, he's got this hypothesis. The *New Astronomy*, which comes out in 1609, is where he developed a whole new astronomy, based on the physical cause of the Sun, to understand the actual orbits of the planets, to then be able to come back in his 1621 work, the *Harmony of the World*, to revisit the question of why the orbits had the characteristics that they did, from the standpoint of human music and—it was pretty daring!

To say that human music, which seems to be a human creation, that there's something universal about music, about composition, such that it's not just in our making songs for each other, but that you would even find that out in nature as a whole. It's a specific example of saying that you're going to find creativity or the mind, or humanity, out in the rest of the world.

Which I think goes to what you had said about Vernadsky, that Vernadsky took issue with anybody trying to claim a thorough, overall view of physics, that didn't include physicists. Or "here's our view science that doesn't include scientists. He says science occurs within *people*; science doesn't occur in a beaker. It's in people, in their minds, in their social activity. How do we understand that as a physical force?"

So sometimes it's easy for people to look back at the past and say, Oh! Those poor benighted fools, we're nothing like that anymore. People used to believe this



Megan Beets (center): “Kepler’s discovery was not just that the principle of the Solar System was knowable, but that man could know it. That this was knowable by mankind.”

superstition or that superstition, the Middle Ages, how medieval! But you may ask yourself, if you take one of these people today who’s so brilliant, if he had actually grown up in that society, what would it have taken to move that forward? What brought things out of that? And sometimes, people today like to pooh-pooh Kepler, and say, well, yes, he did some things but his view of inertia was wrong, and you know.

Okay, what made it possible to make these breakthroughs? What really launched science forward? And this total break from Aristotle, or the idea of understanding of that world out there as an external thing, versus Kepler’s view that what would seem like a human cause would also be a universal cause? Even his use of physics in astronomy was considered controversial, because [for Aristotle] physics is about Earthly things; the stars or the planets are ethereal, and perfect, and they shouldn’t have anything do with our physics. He said, No, no, the way we understand things, is—in other words, a universal science.

And so, you think about what it means today. It’s a little bit funny to try to have to make the case for space science. You’re an idiot if you’re not thinking that way! It’s just the most sensible thing for mankind to be doing right now, is to move out and explore and develop the infrastructure to learn more about and take advantage of the vast majority of the universe which is not the Earth! Most of it’s out there! . . .

It’s easy to look back and say, Aw! How silly people

were! But what are people going to think about us today? Where are the really new leaps going to come from?

Some people like to say, well, the BRICS are just doing what the West has already done. It’s really not that impressive. Oh, they’re building toilets in India, great. We’ve had those for a while—so what? *That’s a really stupid outlook!* Because, doing something that’s new to you, new to your culture, new to your country—that has a power that goes beyond the specific thing that you’re doing,

whether or not it’s new to humanity as a whole.

For example, take education, that experience of discovering something that’s new to you as a student’ if that happens, and it’s rather rare, but it should be the way education works. Say, okay, how was this discovered originally? You as a student are going to work through how this new thought was developed, and you’re going to have that experience in your mind.

Now, that’s not the same as the person who actually figured it out the first time. Going through how Mendeleev determined the periodic system of the elements is a powerful experience. Obviously, Mendeleev did it first. But as a basis of culture, and as a basis of a person doing things you personally haven’t done before, it serves as an inspiration to others as well.

The Experience of Newness

So you see these things that the BRICS are doing, that are “new to them,” but that’s patronizing. These things actually are new to the world as a whole. and so, people looking back on our times will be astonished.

You know, Liona, you’ve talked about how time sort of speeds up; you pointed out that going to space first in the ’60s, this is 50 years ago, but it’s 50 *modern* years ago! Like having done something 50 years ago in the 1500s—it’d be like 500 years ago in the 1500s.

So looking back on today from the future, and from out in space, it’ll seem like probably the nuttiest thing that—wait, there was a fight or a debate about whether

to continue developing in space? There was a *debate* about whether to make the breakthrough to fusion?! That would be as stupid as we would think of people saying, “Oh, the steam engine, it’s really too much of a bother, why bother? We shouldn’t develop that, we should keep using horses. We can just have better insulated stables for our horses, or something.”


Fan-Chiang: Yes, I think this point you made, too, that Mr. LaRouche challenged us, saying, look, every day you should be doing something that’s new to yourself. Because you want to get a sense of doing that, you want to know, you want to be comfortable with doing something new for yourself all the time. And in that process, you may do something new relative to humanity. But that process isn’t isolated. That’s very unique.

Ross: And that’s where you touch on human identity, that universality of human identity, that experience of newness, of creation, as Kepler experienced, and then left for us to experience, through his very kind work in writing out thoroughly how he had worked on things. Thank you very much, Kepler, for doing that. Now we can benefit from it.

But that’s the most characteristic human experience, and now China is moving forward on that.

Fan-Chiang: This also brings me back to a book, a very long essay, that Mr. LaRouche wrote, on *Earth’s Next Fifty Years*, where he discussed this idea: that the only way you can create actual international collaboration, is around universal ideas, universal ideas of man. And something which I mentioned on this show before, that he’s mentioned, that a new government or a new way of ordering, a new international collaboration, is not going to be a conglomeration of old things that we have. It’s going to be based on a new discovery about mankind, and hopefully it’s going to be based on an already-transformed mankind.

I think it’s one of those paradoxical situations where the solution for a war is to not fight the war; it’s actually going to be getting at the reason the war condition even exists at all. Obviously, you can do some band-aid measures, kicking out Obama and such things; but trying to get at the persistent reason that we would even still have war in the first place, that that even exists as plausible. That type of thing is really going to require us to evolve out of this—Helga Zepp-LaRouche called it an adolescent state. And I think Krafft Ehrlicke goes even further. He says that we’re still in the womb, the womb of the Earth. . . .



21st Century Science & Technology

The Continuing Gifts of Prometheus brings to life the stunning progress made in physical chemistry over the course of mankind’s history, in the context of the ongoing conflict between Prometheus, who gave fire and “all the arts” to man, and Zeus who was determined to destroy humanity.

Physical Chemistry is the application of higher forms of “fire” (such as nuclear “fire” today) to transforming the physical world. A Promethean culture today will fully develop a nuclear economy, including mining the Moon for the ideal fusion fuel, helium-3.

Get your copy today from Amazon.com \$20

The Zeus Option Is No Option at All

On Feb. 24, Lyndon LaRouche issued a new evaluation of the strategic situation.

“We’re on the verge of being pulled into the potential of a thermonuclear war,” he stated, “but the idea of the thermonuclear war is not quite what Obama or Obama-thinkers would imagine. Because the situation is such that if you want to take an optimal estimate of how this thing will work out, you would have to say that the Eurasian area is the area in which the British—even though they don’t have much to be able to do anything strategically—but they could waste much of Eurasia, for the sake of what they want to do: their fun and games.

“Thus their fun and games could be, most likely the type in which the Atlantic-to-Pacific element of Eurasia would be targeted, rather than the United States, and you could go south from there. The very idea that you’re going to start with a world war of all the territory of the planet, is not exactly what the schemers want to have. They want a certain part of the world within the trans-Atlantic region as a playground, from which they would watch the destruction of the rest of the world.”

Thus, “the full blast, the destructive force, will be in the Eurasian mainland and southern parts accordingly. That’s where the problem lies. Now, we have to actually define that problem. . . . Because there’s no purpose for running a war of this type on a full scale, in terms of the world as a whole. That does not make sense. But, what would make sense, is what was done with Zeus, a Zeusian kind of thing, where a very extensive destruction of large areas of the planet Earth would be affected, and it would be really a long time before anybody really moved things up and started to build a civilization again.”

“You can’t think about how you’re going to bargain or try to negotiate this thing. You’ve got to actually present this fact, that this is reality. Stick to the concept of that effect, that intention. Expect that intention to be realized. Now, you’ve got to stop it.

“Zeus must be convinced that he won’t be able to survive his genocide. . . .

“This is what we’re talking about; this is strategy. This is what I’m talking about. We need a new Renaissance now, a serious Renaissance. We understand how the human species behaves; we understand its evil as well as its good potential, and we must make an instrument which will do what has to be done, to prevent a mass killing of the human population. And to create a new kind of organization, a new kind of Renaissance, in the sense of Nicholas of Cusa’s Renaissance. That’s the policy, not the dubs and dabs and so forth. And that will work. That’s what we must do. We’re getting indications that such potentials exist. They may be faint on the horizon, but they exist. And if we do our job properly, we can call a halt to the genocide. . . .

“To deal with an atrocity of this nature, you have to go to the edge of everything. And you have to jam the works up, so the awful thing does not happen. . . . You have to take the principle of the Renaissance. You have to look at the idea of the Renaissance, from the standpoint of the long wait of Europe to become free of the Zeus atrocity.”

For, in fact, the Zeus option is a pathway to destruction of not just part of humanity, but humanity as a whole. It must therefore be defeated now, once and for all.

SUBSCRIBE TO

EIR Executive Intelligence Review

EIR Online



EIR Online gives subscribers one of the most valuable publications for policymakers—the weekly journal that has established Lyndon LaRouche as the most authoritative economic forecaster in the world today. Through this publication and the sharp interventions of the LaRouche Movement, we are changing politics worldwide, day by day.

EIR Online includes the entire magazine in PDF form, plus up-to-the-minute world news.

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

EIR's new Daily Alert Service provides critical news updates and analysis, based on EIR's 40-year unparalleled track record in covering global developments.



SUBSCRIBE (e-mail address must be provided.)

EIR Online

- \$ **360** for one year
- \$ **180** for six months
- \$ **120** for four months
- \$ **90** for three months
- \$ **60** for two months

EIR DAILY ALERT SERVICE

- \$ **500** one month (introductory)
- \$ **3,000** six months
- \$ **5,000** one year (includes EIR Online)

Name _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Country _____

Phone (_____) _____

E-mail _____

I enclose \$ _____ check or money order

Make checks payable to

EIR News Service Inc.

P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390

Please charge my MasterCard Visa

Discover Am Ex

Card Number _____

Signature _____

Expiration Date _____

EIR can be reached at: www.larouchepub.com/eiw

e-mail: fulfillment@larouchepub.com Call **1-800-278-3135** (toll-free)