

Two Decades of Organizing For the Four-Power Alliance

Here is a transcript of The LaRouche Show, an Internet radio program (www.larouchepub.com/radio), of Nov. 7, 2009, featuring EIR's Russia and Eastern Europe Intelligence Director Rachel Douglas and, from the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM), Oyang Teng. The program was hosted by Michele Steinberg.

Steinberg: This is Michele Steinberg, on a very historic occasion. Two days from now, Nov. 9, marks the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall. You've just heard an excerpt of Schiller's "Ode to Joy," set to music by Beethoven, in his Ninth Symphony. That music filled Berlin on Nov. 9, 1989, 20 years ago.

Also, Nov. 10 marks the 250th birthday of Friedrich Schiller, the Poet of Freedom, whose significance was brought to the United States, more than 30 years ago, by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute, and who is the subject today, along with Lyndon LaRouche, of our discussion, "Organizing for the Four Powers: Two decades of interventions by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche to bring the United States into an alliance with China, Russia, and India, for a true, just world economic order."

My special guests today are Rachel Douglas, who handles the Russia desk for *EIR*, and LaRouche Youth Movement leader Oyang Teng, from the notorious and famous Basement science project of the LYM.

Rachel has worked closely with Helga and Lyndon LaRouche in their trips to Russia and other countries of the former Soviet Union, for years, and today she works

night and day to handle the massive amount of activity, especially on the Internet, surrounding the writings, webcasts, speeches, and articles of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. Before we hear from Rachel, whom I've asked to give us a bit of an introduction to the Four Powers idea in organizing, let me say one brief thing:

We have a crisis in the United States. We need a change. The Obama Presidency is a disaster. And there is no recovery from this disaster, without a Four Powers agreement.

Today, Lyndon LaRouche said we're in the middle of an unmediated breakdown of the world system. It's in process, and the worst case is in the United States. Barack Obama is going down. Who will go down with him? Who will he bring down? He's bringing down the whole world. Unemployment in the United States is 10.2%—which we know is an underestimation, but that is the official Bureau of Labor Statistics release, this week. That's only people collecting unemployment, and actively looking for jobs right now. As *EIR* has said, the true unemployment in the United States is between 20 and 30%—it varies week by week. It's a disaster.

And the turning point that LaRouche forecast for mid-October, has occurred. And what we saw on Tuesday of this week, election day, was a resounding rejection of the failure of Barack Obama. There is a mass strike movement out there, a mass strike movement like that which we saw in East Germany, 20 years ago, that brought down the Berlin Wall, and one of the worst dictatorships standing on the planet at that time. And that's



EIRNS

For more than 20 years, Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche have been fighting to bring about what has now become known as the “Four Power” alliance of the United States, Russia, China, and India, as the core of a new, just world economic order. The photos reproduced on these pages represent a small sampling of their many activities in connection with this effort.

Pictured here (left), Zepp-LaRouche, at the Eastern Terminus of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, at Lianyungang Port, in China, October 1988; (above) LaRouche in Moscow, in a dialogue with Russian scientists Dr. L.M. Suslov (left) and Dr. Pobisk Kuznetsov (second from left); Rachel Douglas is to LaRouche’s left.

what we look forward to today.

On July 25, 2007, LaRouche warned that the world financial system was finished, and now he has put forward the LaRouche Plan, and the Four Powers agreement that can provide a world solution.

So, with that, Rachel, I’d like to ask you to tell us about Mr. LaRouche’s organizing and his approach to solving this existential crisis, and particularly, Helga LaRouche’s recent activities, including her Oct. 29 webcast.

Another Historic Anniversary

Douglas: I think the Oct. 29 webcast will serve us very well as a point of departure, and a guideline for reviewing the activity of Helga LaRouche, as leader of the Schiller Institute, and Lyndon LaRouche, as leader of the LaRouche PAC movement in the United States, and really the movement of his friends and supporters

around the world. Not just now, but over that entire historic 20 years, since Nov. 9, 1989. She, in the webcast, reviewed many of the highlights of that organizing, and I think we can visit those during our conversation.

I was thinking, Michele, as you introduced the show with citing those dates, that today, the 7th of November is also a historic anniversary. It used to be the national holiday in the Soviet Union; it was the anniversary of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, known as the October Revolution—they changed the calendar, though the October Revolution had actually taken place on Nov. 7 under the modern calendar. That, of course, is not the national holiday any more in Russia, or the other post-Soviet states, but it brings home to us that the Berlin Wall coming down was not only the end of the 28 years that that Wall stood there, dividing Germany and the city of Berlin, but it was the end of the way the entire world had been divided, between East and West, since

the death of Franklin Roosevelt, at the end of World War II, dashed the possibility of implementing Roosevelt's vision of a non-colonial, anti-imperial post-World War II order.

Actually, it is the way the world had been divided since the disaster known as World War I, which was orchestrated as the outcome of a desperate British imperial geopolitical project, organized and pushed over a 40-year period since the defeat of the British interests in the American Civil War, 1861-65, had opened the way, opened the potential, for an alliance of sovereign nations, including the United States, Germany, Russia, Japan, China, to develop all of Eurasia and other parts of the world. And that, of course, would have meant the end of the British Empire, already at the end of the 19th Century. World War I was the outcome of British efforts to prevent that, to destroy that potential. And, of course, the division of Europe, East and West, the formation of the Soviet Union, followed out of World War I.

But, especially, if we think about the period since World War II, since the death of Roosevelt, the Wall coming down 20 years ago was followed two years later by the Soviet Union itself breaking up. And in that time period, I remember very clearly, and I'm sure you do too, Michele, how often Lyndon LaRouche said—and he was saying this from prison, as a political prisoner of the Bush Sr. regime at the time—that the collapse of the Soviet system is the first shoe dropping, and the second shoe will drop. And what's the second shoe? The second shoe dropping would be, said LaRouche, the demise of that British system of monetarism, the system of renewed colonialism through financial looting—we call it globalization today.

And LaRouche said, at that time, and he said this to guests from Russia, who began to come to visit him in prison—I'll mention one of those in a moment—he said that the British system, the Anglo-American, or City of London-Wall Street system—because it's not really American—will crash, just as certainly as the Soviet bloc had fallen apart—as he also correctly had forecast, and warned Soviet leaders in the early 1980s.

This, too, was part of the story, that it was the failure of Soviet leaders, under Yuri Andropov and Mikhail Gorbachov, to accept from President Reagan, LaRouche's policy for cooperation on the Strategic Defense Initiative, on a crash program of military-scientific development, but then, with spinoffs for the civilian sector, to change the doctrine to end the tyranny, the reign of terror, known as Mutually Assured Destruction,

that had us all growing up with the threat of the bomb over our heads.

And what became the Strategic Defense Initiative—it had been LaRouche's initiative—was offered to the Soviets by President Reagan, and they turned it down, because of the nature of those particular Soviet leaders, Lyndon warned his Soviet interlocutors at the time—because he was functioning in what's known as a back-channel diplomatic role—that if they attempted to outstrip the United States militarily, that they would strain their military economy, they would strain their whole economy, to the breaking point, and that would be the end of their empire. And he said within five years—it happened within six.

So, because of that track record, that LaRouche was right, he enjoys an extraordinary authority in Russia to this day, among people who were around 20 years ago—and it's been passed on to subsequent generations in various channels, which have to do with these trips and visits and organizing. But I just wanted to cite this long memory, in the very interesting way that it came out just this month—at the end of October.

Dialogue of Civilizations

As Michele mentioned, I'm responsible for our Russian-language website, and I can report that, over the past two weeks, the most frequently visited page on our Russian website is an item which dates from 1993. Now, we've posted a lot in the last two weeks. We're posting Mr. LaRouche's webcast, with Russian voiceover. We have just posted Helga LaRouche's new public appeal—which everybody should sign, you can find it on the Schiller Institute site and the LaRouche PAC site—for the LaRouche Plan to be put on the agenda. So, we have plenty of current material.

But, the interview of Lyndon LaRouche done by Victor Kuzin (a prominent Russian human rights activist, already during the Soviet period) in 1993—as a matter of fact, exactly 16 years ago, on Nov. 1, 1993—was our number one entrance point to the site, and most visited page over the past two weeks. I think it had a couple of thousand people looking at and reading the interview.

Why did this happen? Because, on Oct. 10, Lyndon and Helga took part in the 7th annual forum, called the World Public Forum, "Dialogue of Civilizations," which is held on the Greek island of Rhodes. And Mr. LaRouche's speech to that meeting was on the Four Powers, the need for an alliance, and cooperation,

Helga Zepp-LaRouche travelled the world, organizing for LaRouche's strategic policies. She is shown here (right), addressing professors and students at Beijing University, May 1996. October 1997 found Zepp-LaRouche in New Delhi, where she spoke to the Himalayan Research and Cultural Foundation on the Eurasian Land-Bridge (below).



EIRNS/Richard Magraw



Schiller Institute

chief executive of Russian Railways, a very large, state-owned, Russian infrastructure company. So, there were many Russians in the audience at the Rhodes Forum.

One of them was a well-known journalist, the deputy editor of a nationalist weekly newspaper called *Zavtra*, which means “tomorrow.” And, Mr. Nagorny of

Zavtra, on Oct. 21, less than two weeks after the Rhodes Forum, published a summary, in *Zavtra*, of his interview of Mr. LaRouche. The full transcript, by the way, is appearing in the current issue of *EIR* [dated Nov. 6, 2009], so those of you who don’t yet subscribe to *EIR Online* can get a subscription, and read Alexander Nagorny’s conversation with Lyndon LaRouche.

Victor Kuzin, inspired by the interview’s publication in *Zavtra*, wrote an open letter to the President of Russia, Dmitri Medvedev, and sent it to President Medvedev’s blog. That letter said many things, including the following: “If we wish to restore a sovereign Russia, I believe that Mr. LaRouche’s position on the current financial and economic crisis deserves special, very serious attention, because it is not based on short-term considerations. It is competent. It is backed up by the experience of accuracy in forecasting over decades. It is globally responsible, and it indicates a real way out of a general catastrophe.”

And Mr. Kuzin included his name and ID, and the

amongst Russia, the United States, China, and India, to take the initiative to create a new world credit system. And, as he put it there, “The task as I defined it, is for Russia, the U.S.A., and China and India to agree, as a group of countries, to initiate and force a reorganization of the world financial and credit system, with long-term agreements of the same type that Franklin Roosevelt had uttered before his death.” (Again that key reference point, 1944-45.)

“The intention of Roosevelt, all these years later, could have been realized, and we could do that today. That’s our chance.”

And he went on to spell out how this would be the end of globalization, and the monetary system, which he stated is now a disease.

Now that forum, the Rhodes Forum, is actually co-initiated and co-sponsored by three individuals. One is Greek, the other two are from two of the Four Powers, Jagjit Kapur of India, and Vladimir Yakunin, who is the



Lyndon LaRouche gave the keynote address to a conference of the Institute of Sino-Strategic Studies, attended by scholars and political activists from the U.S., Taiwan, and the People's Republic of China, in Whittier, Calif., August 2002. He is shown here at a press conference following the speech. China Daily published an interview with LaRouche in 2005 (right).



EIRNS/Samuel P. Dixon

fact that he had interviewed LaRouche in prison, in 1993, and he gave the link to our site. So, that's how we came to have thousands of people reading an interview from 16 years ago, as highly relevant to the question of whether these four countries could, and will, take the initiative to bring the world out of the danger of an immediate Dark Age now.

So, I think we'll be reviewing how we got to the point where the Four Powers are so important today—that's what Helga addressed in her Oct. 29 webcast.

Steinberg: Okay. I'm going to take us all back, listeners, 20 years, through the voice of Helga Zepp-LaRouche herself, and then I'll ask Oyang, who is a young man in his 20s, to comment on the significance of these events 20 years ago. Some young people who are in university right now, weren't even born. Others were too young to remember. But this was a defining moment, a turning point in history, and we're going to hear a message that Helga sent to the American population in 1989, about this historic event:

A Message from the Historic Year of 1989-

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Dear Americans: I think you all have seen in recent days, these extremely excit-

ing, moving pictures from Berlin, now that the borders between East and West Germany have been opened. And the Wall in Berlin, while it is still there, has practically come down. When this happened on the joyful 9th of November, in the first evening, 100,000 people immediately came over from East Berlin to West Berlin, to taste what the new freedom would look like.

On Sunday, 3 million people came, and the stream has not ended since.

So, also, into West Germany, people came. They embraced each other, and the people were so happy, and the West German people, they overcame all normal kinds of behavior. They showed a tremendous hospitality. They opened champagne. They gave food. They invited people for dinner. People were climbing the Wall on both sides.

The "Ode to Joy," the symbol of the fight for freedom, was sung on the most important street in Berlin, the Ku'damm, and the symphony of West Berlin played, for free, the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, and they performed, two times, "The Magic Flute."

Well, let me tell you, I think this is a genuine, real revolution. It's a revolution of agapē, of love, of charity, not a revolution of rage. And as one woman from the D.D.R. [East Germany] said correctly: Schiller, in this

situation, proves to be the real revolutionary. And you remember the famous sentence in the “Ode to Joy”: “All men become brethren.”

So, if you think back, how quickly did this happen? Well, one cannot forget that the man who predicted this, on the 12th of October [1988], namely, Lyndon LaRouche. Lyn and I went to West Berlin more than a year ago, and he made his very famous Berlin speech at that time, which simply said that the Soviet Union, within a very short period of time, would face a tremendous food shortage, and the collapse of their physical economy. That the West, as a war-avoidance policy, should offer a crash program for Poland to take that burden off their shoulders, and prove with Western technologies and methods, how an economy can be built in a very short period of time.

This should be offered to the Soviet Union, in return for the demand for free elections in East Germany, and Poland, and with the prospect of having a German reunification soon.

Well, being there with Lyn, I can tell you, nobody at that time believed that this was the realistic political proposal.

Shortly afterwards, in the later part of October, Lyn called for a worldwide anti-Bolshevik resistance movement. And again, I can tell you, people said, this may be a noble cause, but it is not very realistic in our time.

You all know that two days later, after Lyn made this call for an international anti-Bolshevik resistance movement, Lyn was indicted, railroaded, and then put in jail. But, the year of '89, where he was sitting innocently in jail, proved that he was absolutely on the mark, concerning the collapse of the Soviet Union. The convulsions started already in the beginning of the year, and then in the month of May, in Peking, on Tienanmen Square, the students demonstrated for freedom, and they used the Statue of Liberty, as a symbol, and they used the “Ode to Joy” as their melody.

So, the massacre could not stop their fight for freedom.

In June still, the Gorby-mania was at a high point, when Gorbachov came to Bonn, West Germany, but we predicted—Lyn, in particular, said immediately after the Tienanmen Square massacre happened on the 4th of June, that this would mean the end of the condominium between the Superpowers. And he has proven again to be extremely correct.

Already, in the month of August, in the D.D.R., the resistance took some concrete form. In the beginning, it

started with a mass demonstration in Leipzig, which became bigger and bigger. The attendance became larger and larger. Then, people added candlelight demonstrations, every Monday, to demonstrate for the cause of freedom, and that they did not like this dictatorship any more.

In the months of September and October, these candlelight demonstrations doubled every Monday. On the 10th of October, you still had the 40th anniversary of socialism in the D.D.R., which was not a celebration—it was more like a funeral. Honecker was still there, but everybody knew this was—socialism as an ideology is coming to an end. And, only four weeks later, on the 9th of November, the borders to West Germany were opened.

Well, we have indications that the fact that there were demonstrations of 1 million in East Berlin, and people were shouting “We are the People, We are the People,” and the fact that there was a general strike practically about to erupt the moment when they opened the border, well, the SED [D.D.R. ruling party] leadership knew they could not hold out any longer. Especially, because, since the beginning, 200,000 people, of a people of 16 million, had left—many qualified workers, and engineers and so forth. And so they felt really that their system would collapse if they don't go for reforms.

So, what will happen now? The SED will have a special party day by mid-December. They will have to allow other parties and organizations, and there is no way how this will not lead to free election, and I'm totally convinced, German reunification will happen.

So, it is very important that Germany, in this situation, develops an identity to be a force for good in the world. And therefore, I'm working, together with all my colleagues and associates, that Germany is not just happy to be now this country where unity is hopefully possible in the very near future, but that we pick up Lyn's proposal to help Poland. Because people in Poland are starving, and they will face an extremely hard Winter.

So, Germany must help Poland in its economic reconstruction, because Poland is really culturally part of the West, it's part of Europe. And therefore, because they have the same culture, it has a very strong affinity to absorb technological progress, and the way of technological development through West and East Germany into Poland, is the most natural one. We are also trying to get France totally involved in this question of German

reunification, as an anchor, and security that this reunification takes place with the total orientation of being part of the West.

So, we will help the Soviet Union, but in return for the unification, in return for free elections, not only in the D.D.R. and Poland, but eventually everywhere. We have to create a new alliance between Paris, Bonn, Berlin, and Warsaw, and this is also where the railroad system has to be enlarged, because the biggest problem of the Polish economy right now, or one of the biggest problems, is that they have no transport, and they need a totally new railway system. So, the key will be to link the rail system going from Paris to Bonn to Berlin, into the Polish economy, and build new railways in Poland.

So, that means basically, if we do this, I think Poland can be saved.

This is right now the thinking in West Germany. I think people have a tremendous cultural optimism, and I think what we have seen in East Germany, and what we are seeing, coming like a wave of similar reactions into West Germany, is really a revolution of *agapē*, of love. And I think, well, there are very rare moments in history where people can intervene, and turn the situation for the better. I think we are facing, right now, such a moment.

And I want to say this: That Lyn, who anticipated this in a nearly prophetic way, I think, and I think you should really think about it in this way: If the walls in Berlin can come down, the walls of injustice will come down soon in the United States. Thank you.

Potential Relative Population Density

Steinberg: You listened to the voice of Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder of the Schiller Institute, speaking to Americans in 1989, right after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the head of the BüSo [Civil Rights Solidarity Movement] political party in Germany, wife of American economist and statesman Lyndon LaRouche, is now at the forefront of organizing, with her husband, the Four Powers agreement.

Now, let me be clear, listeners, what we're talking about. There is no way out of the American political and financial crisis, without allying with Russia, China, and India. That's what LaRouche's Four Powers agreement is about. And you can send your questions in to this radio show...

Now, I'm going to turn the discussion back to Rachel Douglas, and first, Oyang Teng, who probably has some insights and questions about this.

Teng: Yes, it's true what you said, this is something important for people my age, or roughly my age, who were children when this was happening. I actually was in Germany in August of '89 on a family trip. I can say that when I was six years old, the geopolitics of Soviet-American relations, and things like that, weren't my first priority, but what's become clear in the last few years—particularly organizing in this movement—is sort of a shocking realization that I lived, and my generation lived, through a revolutionary moment, a moment when an entire system collapsed.

Now, as something that's an internal experience, I think that's maybe much more sharply felt by people who were there, by older generations. But nonetheless, it's part of our experience, and it becomes more and more clear when you think about the aftermath, the '90s, the craziness around the dot-com bubble, which was much closer to my own experience in the Bay Area at that time.

But then, reflecting back on what Lyn and Helga and others have brought to light about the missed opportunity, and I watched Natalia Vitrenko's presentation [*EIR*, Nov. 6, 2009], which is on our website, just yesterday, and I think it brought it home there too: There is a real, utter collapse, physical economic collapse, in the former Soviet and the East bloc countries, which to my mind, really underscores what Lyn is saying now about the potential relative population density of the planet having dropped to the level of about 2 billion people. In other words, that we can only support about 2 billion people under current policies. And what she was discussing in terms of the depopulation in Ukraine, the complete deindustrialization there, what's been discussed in the case of Russia, the near-collapse of the space program, the collapse of industrial production, the collapse of the population, the life expectancies—I was wondering, just having run through this in my mind, if maybe Rachel could say something about that, in terms of really getting a visceral sense of what it means, not as a number out of the air, but really what it means to say that we can only support a few billion people now. That that is what's facing us, as far as a rapid collapse of population. That it's actually happened—the process has already been set in motion.

Douglas: You know, Oyang, I remember this idea, this truth that you just referred to, striking me very hard in 1994, at our first international conference held in the United States with Lyndon after he came out of being a political prisoner. And with some of our Eastern Euro-

The LaRouches travelled to India in January 2003, to promote development of the “Strategic Triangle” of cooperation among India, China, and Russia. They visited Kolkata (Calcutta); the University of Jaipur, in Rajasthan (below); and New Delhi, where they met with Indian President K.R. Narayanan (right). The clipping shows front-page coverage of LaRouche in India’s leading daily, The Hindu, May 27, 2003.



Office of the Indian President

I have ground into my head the Russian initials for potential relative population density, which are “POP.N,” because I worked intensely on translating, helping translate, the book into Russian. And I said, “Oh!” This idea suddenly came alive to me, very personally—because it was personal for him—and concretely. Oh, yes, the potential relative population density of Ukraine has fallen below the level of the population!

And what Natalia Vitrenko, the Ukrainian economist and political figure, spelled out in the presentation from a couple of weeks ago, which Oyang mentioned, is, indeed, that the absolute population of Ukraine today, at 46 million, is 7 million less than what it was at the time that the Soviet Union broke up. And it’s 13 million less than what it would have been, had there simply been a linear extrapolation of the previous rates of expansion of population. So, people have died, in large numbers, in this part of the world, as kind of a pretaste of what the entire planet is destined to. Some places have gotten there earlier, like countries in Africa, with the hideous looting of their populations by London-centered finance.



EIRNS/Mary Burdman

pean guests, already then, just five years after the Wall had come down, we gave three years after the Soviet Union broke up, a seminar in Washington, D.C., at which a young Ukrainian political figure named Taras Chornovil, who had taken it upon himself to translate the book *So, You Wish To Learn All About Economics?* into Ukrainian—we had put it out in Russian, he, from there, translated it into Ukrainian—just said, very matter of factly, in his presentation about the precipitous collapse of the living standard, industries, transport, employment, health care, in Ukraine; he said: Well, what we have in Ukraine is that potential relative population density has dropped below the level of the population.

Now, this was not an unfamiliar term to me. In fact,



What you have to see is that it was deliberate—it was *deliberate*. And the parties involved were Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of Britain; François Mitterrand, and George Bush, Sr. We said this throughout the period: that, unless you moved immediately to implement, as Helga said in that clip, railroad construction, investment that would be mutually beneficial, building up industry, resuscitating the infrastructure—unless you did that, these areas would be turned very,

very quickly into the new sources of loot to try to prop up the financial bubble. And that's what happened.

When we say "the lost opportunity," it's not that people just sat around and did nothing, and things didn't go so well. It's that there was a conscious looting and stealing policy which killed huge numbers of people, as it killed the economies in these parts of the world. That took place in Russia throughout the '90s, as LaRouche had warned them, under President Yeltsin, and they're still living with the consequences.

And just this year, just this Spring, documents were released, in which Margaret Thatcher was confirmed to be saying to Gorbachov, to be expressing her, and Britain's, utter opposition to the reunification of Germany. They wanted to keep the division of Europe, and of the world, to manipulate the East-West conflict, and they wanted to prevent Germany from becoming an industrial powerhouse, which would undercut British interests on the continent of Europe, and Eurasia. Sounds like 100 years earlier.

Changing the Rules of the Game

Steinberg: I think one of the things we have to grapple with, as organizers, is, perhaps, denial. People think it can't happen, or it can't happen here, and there are signs that it is happening here. I mentioned, of course, briefly, 10.2% unemployment clocked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics last month, but we also have really criminal negligence, if not criminal intent, in refusing to deal with sanitation, with the spread of the H1N1 flu, lack of vaccines, lack of delivery, and the shutdown of the public health system. And this is going on globally.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the solutions, and what we have accomplished, just in this very, very brief period since Oct. 10, the Rhodes conference. Rachel, I'd like to ask you to speak a little bit more about the *Zavtra*, the *Tomorrow* interview, and there's also, I understand, some pretty exciting developments with a Chinese website.

Douglas: There are people volunteering to translate LaRouche's writings into the languages spoken in the Four Powers, because in each of those countries, there's an important layer of people who, either because they just got the idea now, but really more, because they have been, at some level, in a discussion or dialogue process with Lyndon LaRouche, going back 20 and 30 years, have grasped that he's right, and that you *must* have this cooperation.

The co-organizer of the Rhodes conference, Mr. Yakunin, was, two days later, part of the delegation of Russian Prime Minister Putin in Beijing. This is the annual government-to-government, heads of government, meeting, but it was by no means routine. And the nature of the bilateral agreements signed between Russia and China included not only sale of Russian natural gas for Chinese industry, or oil types of things, which have been on the agenda before, and are still on the agenda, but it included a whole new dimension of Chinese investment in building Russian infrastructure, in the Russian Far East, including some projects of Russian railways which are very optimistic ones, and are very important for the potential development of all Eurasia, and a relationship with the Western Hemisphere, including even the link over the Bering Strait, which is part of Russian Railways' plans up to the year 2030. Those have all been in jeopardy because of the crisis in the Russian budget, shortages of funds.

And so, for starters, China will be investing in helping to complete, and accomplish, the high-speed rail component of Russia's plans for their rail upgrading. There are whole port complexes, as at Vladivostok, being built. There are things related to raw materials, such that LaRouche said, we can see these agreements as a stepping stone to a Four Power initiative. He said, "It's not all the way, because you know what's going on in the United States"—the United States is not yet in the picture in the way that it must be. But implicitly, said LaRouche, if China, as the world's biggest holder of dollar debt—that is, U.S. Treasuries—instead of just having that money in their reserves, as something that they might lose at any given moment, as the dollar system pyramid of debt collapses, if they turn and invest Chinese resources in real infrastructure and industry development, in Russia, on a cooperative basis with Russia, then you've changed the rules of the game. And this is not just one more deal; this implicitly turns dollar holdings of China into something that they were not before. And LaRouche underscored that the Chinese-Russian agreements mean that China's U.S. dollar reserves are now worth something real, if they're being invested in infrastructure and physical production.

So, it's the right direction.

Now, you can tell it's the right direction by how furiously this idea is being attacked. And I've actually just been mapping this out over the last few days—that there are very blatant attempts to organize a backlash in Russia, against these arrangements with China, on the

grounds that this will be just one more country looting Russian raw materials, just the way Britain or the United States has wanted to loot raw materials.

There's some more sophisticated arguments saying, okay, well, Russia/China—that's all very well for cooperation, and maybe we can set some things up with the European Union, but keep the United States out. This line is especially being promoted in certain European circles, that are under the influence of, shall we say, Tony Blair's conception of the European Union as a new imperial entity.

Actually, I was informed by Mrs. LaRouche this week about publication in a German newspaper, the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, where a commentator wrote a major article saying that Europe should turn away from the United States, and toward Asia, and should have a new Monroe Doctrine to keep the United States out of the Eastern Hemisphere, out of Eurasia, and cited 1823, the Monroe Doctrine of the United States of keeping Britain out of the Western Hemisphere, as a precedent.

Now, I must say, this is a completely fraudulent argument, and we'll say so, because the Monroe Doctrine was not a geopolitical carve-up of the world into two hemispheres doctrine: It was an *anti-imperial* policy, authored by the man who would become our great President John Quincy Adams. And Adams also is the author of the concept of a "community of principle": that the best foreign policy for your nation, the policy that's really in your national interest, is the one that is consonant with the common tasks of mankind, what we also call the Westphalian Principle, after the Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the slaughter of the so-called Thirty Years War in Europe, in 1648.

But the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, the Community of Principle, came from John Quincy Adams, who, by the way, was a great advocate of a Russian-American alliance against British imperial interests. And I know we don't have time to go into this in detail, but I just want to say that, within the debates in Russia today, partly, in an important way, because of the extent LaRouche has insisted on reviving this concept of the Russian-American alliance against the British empire, there's a whole layer of people, especially from the foreign policy and intelligence communities, who know that that principle is efficient in history.

We had a curious example of that this week—to some people, maybe it appeared curious—when there was a tour of the United States by a Russian professor

named Igor Panarin. He's a dean at the Diplomatic Academy of the Foreign Ministry, and he's infamous for having various scenarios about the United States breaking into separate ethnic units. Those can be put on the shelf somewhere to gather dust, but what was striking is that at two speeches, one in Washington, D.C., and one in Texas, where members of the LaRouche Youth Movement were present, Mr. Panarin said the threat to the United States comes from London-centered financial interests. And in his presentation, he went through extensive references to the alliance between Catherine the Great and the American revolutionaries, the League of Armed Neutrality against the British during our War of Independence, and, especially, he referred to the Tsar Alexander II and Abraham Lincoln alliance in the U.S. Civil War. Anti-British alliances.

So, this notion of bringing back the vision of FDR, which was cooperation of the Soviet Union, the United States, and China, for a post-colonial world—India at that point was only just getting its independence from the British—but really, it was the germ of the Four Powers agreement. That idea is so much alive, and so realistic. Some people in Russia, some people in the United States, as Michele said, think that it's pie in the sky. Why should an alliance with Russia, China, and India solve our problems? Or on the Russian side: What do we need these blasted Americans in Eurasia for? Don't they just cause trouble?

That suicidal, and shallow, and manipulated thinking can be overcome, with the revival of these powerful historical ideas, of the common interests of the Four Powers. And Lyndon always says that the importance of the Four Powers is not only that Russia and the United States are two nuclear powers, and China and India have the largest populations in the world; it's that these countries are different. They represent different cultural traditions. Informed by those traditions, looking to the best of each others' traditions, their combined force is great enough to defeat the enemies of all mankind.

Cooperation on a 50-Year Perspective

Steinberg: Oyang, I'm going to turn to you, because, apropos of what Rachel just said about people not seeing the power of the Four Powers, we just got a question in from Chesapeake, Va., from a listener, who obviously supports the Four Powers goal, but says: "Monkey wrench in the Four Powers goal. Good conversation, but my mind is focused on the attempts here in the U.S.A. to foil LaRouche's plan. Particularly, I am thinking about



EIRNS/Helga Zepp-LaRouche

In Moscow, in April 2004, LaRouche addressed the Vernadsky State Geological Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences; he also spoke at the Moscow Academy of Finance and Law (shown here), among other activities. The inset shows coverage of LaRouche in the Russian financial publication Currency Dealer, in December 2003.



the House vote this evening”—by which, I believe he’s referring to the Nancy Pelosi-Barack Obama attempt at dictatorship to force the vote on the Nazi health-care plan.—“What do you say about that?”

Oyang, I’m going to let you take a crack at this.

Teng: Well, I guess I can paraphrase LaRouche on that. His comment today was, we don’t know what’s going to happen. What we can know is what we’ve set in motion, and what we should concentrate on, I think, are those lines of development that Rachel was going through, as far as the Four Powers. And frankly, you’re not going to get anything out of the Congress. It’s probably a waste of a lot of emotional energy to worry too much about the Congress, per se, since we know exactly what we’re dealing with there, under Pelosi and the rest of them.

It seems like the organizing perspective—I think one feature of the Four Powers now, which has come more to the surface than even in ’89, ’90, ’91, is this element of the Moon-Mars project. Because it seems to me that you have to read these historical moments for what they are, and the kind of impetus that you need to provide now, in terms of a conception of what people’s common interests are, what are the things that are worth fighting for. I think it’s encapsulated in the conception of the cooperation on a 50-year perspective. And a 50-year perspective, one, is obviously going to be centered

on Eurasia, is going to be centered on these Four Powers. Just as sort of an objective fact.

But then, a 50-year perspective from the standpoint of wanting to get to the point, as Lyn has laid out, of say, the capability to carry out an accelerated trip to Mars. Use that to sort of pull people forward from the future; and it’s not an impossible task, especially given the fact that China, Russia, and India seem to be the most enthusiastic and the most ambitious countries as far as their space programs go, relative to what they have right now. There’s a lot of planning, and a fair amount of cooperation, and much more that’s possible, around that.

And it seems, from that perspective, then you actually have a conceptual, and a sort of emotional foothold, to deal with the more practical elements of cooperation on the ground—the rail, power, water management, and those kinds of things. But to the extent you get stuck in the court politics of any of these countries, it’s just going to be demoralizing, and you’re not going to be able to do much.

Steinberg: Now, staying on that Moon-Mars mission—that’s a key part of the LaRouche Plan. One of the main things that you mentioned, accelerated propulsion, doesn’t that beg the question of fusion power, which is something our organization was founded on?

Teng: Yes. The thing that, to me, is so exciting

about this—the project as Lyn has defined it—is that here you would forcing a shift into a nuclear-based economy, a shift into a fusion-based economy. And it's a shift which is not just a linear kind of change—you're not just upgrading a technology, say, quantitatively, but really qualitatively, in terms of how it actually changes the self-conception of the population, if you're mastering processes which have implications for interstellar flight, which have implications for materials processing on the Earth, for taking test cases, like this region of Siberia, which LaRouche said again today, really *is* in the mutual interest of China and Russia.

You have this massive unpopulated, or underpopulated, underdeveloped region, in Siberia, which is heavy with mineral resources. The only way you're going to be able to develop those is not by extraction, per se, but by intensifying the mode of operation, and the only way to chart that pathway in a way that's feasible, is through fission and fusion. And you begin to get into a domain of operation—you've sort of taken down all these external barriers that people point to, and say, these things, the lack of energy, etc., these are the things that prevent cooperation.

Now, you're really in a domain where you've defined the common interests of mankind, you're acting on them. You realize that that's the only way, that's the only policy that any individual country can act on.

So, I think an aggressive push on that front, breaks some of the ingrained axioms about how you're supposed to discuss international relations.

Steinberg: I'm really glad you said what you said, quoting Lyn about the Congress, and I would add to our listener from Chesapeake, Va.: Lyndon LaRouche often points to Percy Bysshe Shelley's "Defence of Poetry," especially the final paragraph, which says, near the end, or at the end, "Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of mankind." It's ideas that change history, and the idea that we are the people, changed history in East Germany 20 years ago, and the mass strike here in the United States—"We are the people"—can change it in the direction that Oyang just was talking about today.

Rachel, I thought we were going to be able to go through, in detail, the various wonderful interventions that you participated in, Lyndon LaRouche's, I think it was 1995, first economic presentation in Moscow

Douglas: '94.

What Makes a Human Being?

Steinberg: Wow, the very same year that he was released from prison. And the 2001 Duma presentation. So, we have one minute.

Douglas: We can do those on another occasion, because those were the venues—Lyn's testimony in the Economics Committee of the Duma, or a seminar with the leaders of the Academy of Sciences, or a dozen other things. But the real intervention was what Oyang just said. The real intervention is LaRouche's conception of what makes a human being, and therefore, what makes a patriot, working with patriots of other nations.

And I'll end with a couple of sentences from that 1993 interview, where LaRouche was sitting in prison, interviewed by Mr. Kuzin, whose country was under the thumb of the bankers' dictatorship, from international finance, and here's what LaRouche said to him:

"The real intelligentsia deals with ideas in the following way, in the fashion of a scientist and a discoverer. What does he do? Like Mendeleyev, the Russian chemist, Vernadsky, the biogeochemist—such a person works some place, he teaches, he walks in the street, and he sees the Russian people. And he asks himself, who am I in relation to these people? Then, one day, he looks in the mirror, in his mind, and he sees something in himself which reminds him of Mendeleyev. And he says, well, I'm one of these people, too, but I've developed something in myself. My job is to develop it in other people.

"What Russian can want to go into the street and see his cousin drunk in the gutter? He says, what is this? Is this an animal? Or what is it? Or, does he say: This person also has in him this quality which I call 'the living image of God.' And it's demonstrated by the creative principle. And he says, I do not wish to see my cousins as beasts any more. Yes, we have to work, we must have agriculture, we must have industry. It must be done as human beings, not as beasts. And the answer comes: Can we do it tomorrow? No. They'll continue to suffer in drudgery, but their grandchildren shall not.

"And that is true patriotism. That is the function of the intelligentsia, and of leadership, whether in Russia or Ukraine," said LaRouche.

And it's true here too.

Steinberg: That was a quote from Lyndon LaRouche, sitting in prison in 1993. Nothing can imprison the spirit of that man, and we're out of time. Thank you for listening. Join our fight for the LaRouche Plan.