

# **Den Nye Silkevej og Irans rolle: Afskrift af Hr. Abbas Rasoulis tale til Schiller Instituttets of EIR's seminar på Frederiksberg den 18. april 2016**

Kommer senere på dansk.

Abbas Rasouli, the First Secretary at the Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran in Denmark: Address to {EIR}-Schiller Institute Seminar "Extend the New Silk Road to the Middle East and Africa" April 18, 2016

## **THE SILK ROAD AND THE IRAN FACTOR**

ABBAS RASOULI: In 2013 China proposed to build an "economic belt along the Silk Road," a trans-Eurasian project spanning from the Pacific Ocean to the Central Asian countries all the way to Europe.

The New Silk Road already have momentum. In early 2015 China announced \$62 billion of its foreign exchange reserves will be made available to the three state-owned policy banks that will finance the expansion of the new Silk Road.

Beyond Central Asia the economic belt along the Silk Road can also provide the vehicle for China's expansion of its trade relations with both the Middle East and Europe. And here is when the Iran link comes into the equation. In February 2016 a freight train from Yiwu in China's eastern Zhejiang province arrived in Tehran. The China-Iran "Silk Road train" is a part of the overland component of China's One Belt, One Road (OBOR) initiative. The train used the existing rail links from China through Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan before entering Iran. It took the train just 14 days to cover the roughly 10,399 km long journey to Tehran whereas ferrying cargo via the sea from Shanghai, which lies 300 km north of Yiwu, to the Iranian port of Bandar Abbas takes 45 days in comparison. It is expected that construction of new high-speed rail links through Central Asia will enable trains carrying goods to run further on to European markets. Besides facilitating Sino-Iran trade, these railway lines will contribute to Iran's emergence as an important Eurasian trade hub. Iran will thus be integrated more into the economies of East and Central Asia as well as Europe. Bilateral trade between Iran and China grew from \$4 billion in 2003 to \$53 billion in 2013. In January 2016, during the visit of Chinese President Xi Jinping to Iran, the two sides agreed to increase trade to \$600 billion over the coming decade. So the operation of this railway link will prove an important factor in the development of trade between Iran and the countries along this economic belt.

The important thing about the Iran corridor is that existing road and rail links between China, Central Asia and Iran only needs to be modernized whereas some parts or all of the other corridors have to be constructed from scratch, each with their own security and geographical challenges.

The Yiwu-Tehran railway is just one of the many projects that enhance regional connectivity, bringing together China, Central Asia, the Persian Gulf and West Asia.

India, has also been eyeing overland access via Iran to Central Asian and European markets too. In this connection the North-South Transport Corridor (NSTC), a multi-modal trade transport network that includes sea and rail transport from India

via Iranian ports on the Persian Gulf to as far as the Baltic Sea

via Russia, was initiated by Russia, India and Iran in September

2000 to establish transportation networks among the member states

and to enhance connectivity with the land-locked region of Central Asia. Among the few routes in this corridor the Mumbai-Chahbahar or Bandar Abbas (Persian Gulf)-Anzali-Astara (Iran Caspian Sea)-Astara (Azerbaijan)-Baku-Russia-Kazakhstan is

receiving much attention. With the completion of this route Iran

will emerge as another important transit hub in the Asia-Europe

trade giving India overland access to Europe as well.

Of the 1500 km Bandar Abbas-Bandar-Anzali railway link only 50 km remains to be completed, but the 164 km Anzali-Astara link

is still at negotiation stage. A working group made up of India,

Iran, Azerbaijan and Russia has been formed to look into raising

finance to construct the Anzali-Astara (Iran)-Astara

(Azerbaijan)

railway connection. All parties appreciate the urgency of moving

this project forward and as recently as last week, Russia, Azerbaijan and Iran agreed to speed up the project.

The North-South corridor, when completed, is expected to significantly reduce the time of cargo transport from India to Central Asia and Russia. At present, it takes about 40 days to ship goods from Mumbai in India to Moscow. The new route will be

able to cut this time to 14 days.

The primary objective of the NSTC project is to reduce costs in terms of time and money over the traditional route currently

being used between Russia, Central Asia, Iran and India. With improved transport connectivity their respective bilateral trade

volumes are most likely to increase tremendously. According to various studies the route, once fully operational, will be at least 30% cheaper and 40% shorter than the current traditional route.

Though every country is important in any transport chain, Iran, neighbor with 15 countries, is not only a hub for distribution to the neighboring countries of about 400 million but has the added advantage of being a strong economy between giants at each end of these corridors namely China, India, Russia and Europe.

Some of the economic advantages of Iran are:

- \* The 18th largest economy in the world by purchasing power parity (ppp);
- \* A diversified economy with a broad industrial base;
- \* Resource-rich economy;
- \* Labor-rich economy;
- \* Young and educated population;
- \* Large domestic market;
- \* An increasingly sophisticated infrastructure and human

capital base providing the foundation for an emerging knowledge-based economy.

\* A market of 80 million with easy access to another market of 400 million.

In a global world where international trade is taking on greater significance, transport costs and delivery time are two

of the most important factors in the choice of the mode and route

of transporting goods.

The completion and modernization of the North-South and East-West Transport corridors will cut transport costs and delivery time thereby enhancing trade between East Asia, South Asia, Central Asia, Middle East and Europe.

---

# **Et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden: Afskrift af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale til seminaret på Frederiksberg den 18. april 2016**

Kommer senere på dansk.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Addresses Seminar in Copenhagen,  
April 18, 2016 [unproofed draft]

## We Need a New Paradigm for Humanity

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Well, thank you very much for this kind introduction.

Dear Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to start my presentation with showing you a point of view which may be unusual to discuss the strategic situation, but I think it is quite adequate.

This is a time-lapse video where you can actually have a view from space. This is the kind of view normally only astronauts, cosmonauts, taikonauts have. They all come back from their space

travel with the idea that there is only one humanity, and that our planet, which is very beautiful and blue; however, it is very

small in a very large solar system and an even larger galaxy, not

to mention the billion galaxies out there in our universe.

With that view comes, naturally, the question of the future.

Where should mankind be in 100 years from now, in a 1000 years,

in 10,000 years? Well, you have to exercise your power of imagination. In 10,000 years, we probably are well beyond having

colonized the Moon, we have completed very successful Mars missions, we will have a much, much better understanding about our solar system, our galaxy, and we will have gotten a much deeper understanding about the principle of our universe.

Just think, that it took 100 years before modern science could confirm that Einstein's conception about gravitational waves was correct. Ten thousand years of the past human history

has brought tremendous progress. But just think that this growth

can go on, exponentially. And since there is no limit to the

creativity and perfectibility of the human species, in 10,000 years we can have a wonderful world.

So, let's look from that view, into the future, to the present, to have the right perspective.

Yesterday, the {New York Times}, in the Sunday edition, had an article saying "The Race Escalates for the Latest Class of Nuclear Arms," portraying in detail that the United States, and

Russia, and China are developing new generations of smaller and

less destructive nuclear weapons, which would make them more useable. They quote in the article James Clapper, the Director of

the National Intelligence of the United States, that the world has now entered a new Cold War spiral, where, basically, totally

different laws and rules govern, than it used to be the case with

Mutual Assured Destruction.

The previous NATO doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction proceeded from the assumption that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is so horrible, because it will lead to the annihilation of the human race, that nobody in their right mind

would ever use it. And therefore, it was a deterrence that these

weapons would never be used.

This is now no longer valid. What they are now discussing, openly, on the front page of the {New York Times}, is that what

we, for a very long time, only we and a few of military experts,

have said, namely, that these modernized tactical nuclear weapons, like the B12-61, in combination with stealth bombers, with hypersonic missiles, can actually lead to the winning of a

nuclear war.

Ted Postol and Hans Kristensen, very respected military analysts, have detailed at great lengths, why the idea of a limited nuclear war is completely ludicrous, and it is the nature of the difference between thermonuclear weapons and conventional weapons, that once you enter a nuclear exchange, that it is the logic of such a war that all weapons will be used, and that will be the end of mankind. We are closer to that possibility than most people dare to even consider, because if they would, they would not remain so passive as they are now. This is why I want to make emphatically the point—and this is the purpose of conducting meetings like this seminar and many other conferences we are engaged in—that we have reached a point in human history where geopolitics must be superseded with a completely new paradigm. And that is why I started with the view from space. We need a new paradigm, basically saying goodbye to the very idea of geopolitics, which has caused two world wars in the 20th century. That new paradigm must be completely different than that which is governing the world today. We have, right now, rising tensions in the South China Sea. Policymakers and the neighboring countries are extremely worried about what will happen in the period between now and the trial in The Hague. You have the largest maneuver around North and South Korea right now, where people in the region are extremely worried



that the slightest provocation could lead to an exchange of nuclear weapons.

You have the NATO expansion up to the Russian border.

Countries like Poland and Lithuania are asking to have these modernized nuclear weapons located on their territory, even that

makes them prime targets.

The United States is continuing to build the anti-ballistic missile system which, supposedly, was against Iranian missiles,

but after the P5+1 agreement has been reached, it is obvious this

was always a pretext and the aim was always to take out the second strike capability of Russia.

Then you have the entire region of Southwest Asia, still being a terrible destruction and consequence of failed wars.

North Africa is exploding. You have new incidents between NATO and Russia, all of a sudden in the Baltic Sea, which was, up to

now, a calm region where there are no conflicts, or, there have

been no conflicts.

In the Middle East briefing, discussing President Obama's trip to Riyadh on the 21st of this month, they say that this trip

will open up a new page of NATO in the relationship to the Middle

East, that what Obama will try to establish is a new relationship

between NATO and the Gulf Cooperation Council countries.

So, we have a situation where the {New York Times}, also yesterday, and I'm quoting these papers to say that these are not

some opinions of us, but this is now the public discussion, that

what is really at stake in the South China Sea is not so much the

fight around some uninhabited reefs and cliffs, or some tiny islands, but it is the American effort to halt China's rise. And not only China's rise, but that of Asia. China, Asia arising; the trans-Atlantic region is in decline. Just now, we are heading towards a new financial crisis, and all signs are, that we are going into the same kind of crash like 2008. Already since the beginning of this year, \$50 billion corporate defaults were taking place, which is on the same level like what happened in 2009. What the United States is trying to assert under this conditions, where the trans-Atlantic world is in decline or marching towards collapse, to insist that nevertheless a unipolar world must be maintained. The problem is, that unipolar world, effectively, no longer exists. But still, what carries American policy to the present day, is the Project for the New American Century, the so-called Wolfowitz Doctrine, which is a neocon idea which says that no country and no group of countries should ever be allowed to challenge the power position of the United States. In the age of thermonuclear weapons, the insistence to maintain a non-tenable world order could very quickly lead to the annihilation of civilization. It is a fact: China has made an economic miracle in the last 30 years which is absolutely breathtaking. And it is continuing, despite all the media rumors about China's economic collapse. India has by now the largest growth rate in the world; it's above

7%. Many other Asian countries have explicitly formulated the goal for themselves to be developed countries in a few years. The

Chinese economy right now is rebounding. They just announced that

in the next five years China is going to import \$10 trillion worth of imports. They will invest \$600 billion worth of investments abroad. Every day 10,000 new firms are being created

in China.

So, if you look at the development, especially since President Xi Jinping announced in September, 2013 in Kazakhstan,

that the New Silk Road, the One Belt One Road, is put on the agenda. In the Two and a half years since that time, more than sixty nations have joined with China in this development. They have created the New Silk Road, the Maritime Silk Road; these nations have created a whole set of alternative economic-financial institutions, such as the AIIB, which, despite

massive pressure from the United States not to do so, immediately

was joined by sixty founding members. The New Development Bank also started just now its functioning. The New Silk Road Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the Shanghai Cooperation Bank, and

many more. All of these were created because the IMF and the World Bank had not invested in the urgently required infrastructure.

These banks are now engaged in very, very impressive, large projects. For example: China invested \$46 billion in the China-Pakistan corridor. When President Xi Jinping recently went

to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iran, consequently Iran, fool-heartedly, declared that they are now part of the One Belt

One Road, New Silk Road development. Greece is now talking

about

that after China is investing in the Port of Piraeus, that Greece

will be the bridge between China and Europe. The 16+1, that is the East and Central European countries, just declared that they

absolutely want to participate in China helping to build a fast

train system in these countries. Those projects which the EU has

not bid, China is now building. Part of it is, for example, the

Elbe-Oder-Danube Canal, which will connect the waterways of these

countries. When President Xi recently was in the Czech Republic,

President Zeman announced that the "Golden City" of Prague will

be the gateway between the Silk Road and Europe. Also, Austria and Switzerland are now fully on board and see the benefits of their country's joining with the New Silk Road.

When President Xi Jinping at the APEC meeting in October 2014 offered to President Obama to cooperate in all of these projects in a "win-win" perspective, he not only proposed economic cooperation, but he put on the agenda a completely new

model of international relations exactly designed to overcome geopolitics. The new model is supposed to be based on the respect

for sovereignty, non-interference into the internal affairs of the other country, respect for the different social system the other country chooses to adopt. It would really be, in a certain

sense, a fulfillment of the principles which are laid out in the

UN Charter anyway.

How was the Western response? Very, very ambiguous. The

United States in spite of this, never really responded to President Xi's offer. They keep insisting on a unipolar world.

For example, in the TPP, like in the TTIP for Europe, it is said

very, very clearly, the U.S. sets the rules of trade for Asia and

not China. Recently, the American Defense Secretary Ash Carter,

and also NATO commander General Breedlove, declared the enemies

#1 of the United States are, first, Russia, second, China, third,

Iran, fourth North Korea, and only fifth terrorism.

Now that is in spite of the fact that many other statesmen, such as United States Secretary of State John Kerry and Foreign

Minister Steinmeier, and many others, have recently also stated,

that all crucial problems of the world cannot be solved without

the cooperation of Russia, and China. For example, the P5+1 agreement with Iran, would never have come into being without a

constructive role of {both} Russia and China . Without Putin's very intelligent intervention in the military situation in Syria,

this situation could not have come to the potential of a political solution.

Also, apart from the military pressure, there is massive pressure on the new institutions such as the AIIB and the New Development Bank, to {not} be outside of the casino economy but

to follow the "international standards."

Now, in these times of the Panama Papers, of the various LIBOR scandals, of the money laundering of many of these banks,

it is a sort of laughable thing, what should be these "international standards" of the Western financial system. Now, let's be realistic. At the IMF/ World Bank meeting which just concluded in Washington over the weekend, behind the scenes there was complete panic, but nobody dared to speak about it openly, behind the scenes people were talking, what former IMF boss Strauss-Kahn has said repeatedly, publicly, that we are heading towards the "perfect political storm." That if one of the too-big-to-fail banks collapses, it will lead to a crisis much, much worse than 2008.

At the recent Davos Economic Forum, the former chief economist of the BIS William White said that the world system is so utterly overindebted, that there are two roads only possible:

Either you have an orderly writeoff of the debt, like in the religious Jubilee, so that you just say "these debts are not payable," and you write them off, or it will come to a disorderly collapse.

Now, the situation is all the more urgent, because unlike 2008 when everyone was talking about the "tools" of the central bank, like interest rate reduction, rescue packages, bailouts, all of these tools don't function any more. As a matter of fact, when the competition for more zero interest rate, or even negative interest rate, when into high gear in the last month, when, for example, the Bank of Japan or the central bank of Norway, or the ECB declared a zero interest rate policy, or even a negative interest rate policy, it boomeranged! It had the opposite effect: Rather than leading to more investment, in the

real economy, it led to a deflationary escalation of the collapse.

When Mario Draghi, the chief of the ECB, recently announced, "yeah, yeah, we have a discussion about helicopter money."

And

Ben Bernanke echoed it and said, "yes, now we need helicopter money," meaning electronic printing of {endless} amounts of worthless money, virtual money, they de facto announced that the

trans-Atlantic financial system is absolutely in the last phase.

Because after helicopter money comes only evaporation.

But this is only the most obvious of the crises. Another one, which is in a different domain, but equally systemic is the

refugee crisis in Europe. Now, I supported Chancellor Merkel when she initially said, we can manage that, we can give refuge

to these people, and for the first time, I was saying "this woman is doing the right thing." I know there was a lot of international criticism, but she acted on the basis of the Geneva

Convention on refugees, but it was the right thing to do. But the reactions from the other European countries, revealed an underlying, basic flaw of the EU, a flaw which was not caused by

the refugees, but it was revealed by the first serious challenge,

that in the EU, as it has been conceptualized in the Maastricht

Treaty going up to the Lisbon Treaty, there is no unity, there is

no solidarity; and with the collapse of the Schengen agreement which allows free travel within the internal borders of the EU,

the closing of the so-called Balkan routes, to prevent refugees

from coming, the basis for the European common currency is also gone, because without the Schengen agreement, the possibility to have the euro last is extremely dubious.

Now, with the recent response by the EU to basically have a deal with Turkey, I mean, this is beyond the bankruptcy of the whole EU policy if you can top it. At a point when the Russian UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, presented the UN Security Council with evidence that the Turkish government, is continuing up to the present day to supply ISIS with weapons and other logistical means, to then say, we pay Turkey EU6 billion, for what? To have them receive refugees; and Amnesty International has already said, there is no guarantee that these people will be protected, but rather that Turkey is sending them back to the war zones, like Syria, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

So, if you look at the pictures of Idomeni, where the Macedonian police are using tear gas against refugees who are absolutely desperate; if you look at the fact that Greece is now, rather than having refugee camps which would somehow process these unfortunate human beings, they have, on pressure of the EU, been turned into detention centers. Pope Francis was just in Lesbos, together with the Greek Patriarch Bartholomew, and this Patriarch said, the present EU policy on the refugee crisis, is the completely bankruptcy of Europe. The Doctors Without Borders left their job in Greece, because they said they cannot be accomplices to the murderous policy of detention, where the



police decide who is a patient and not doctors. Instead of protecting the people running away from wars and persecution, they are now being treated as criminals.

Immediately, days after this disgusting EU-Turkey deal, it turned out that it's a complete failure, the so-called "European

values," human rights, humanism, well—they're all in the trashcan, because now the refugees, obviously still fleeing for

their lives, go to Libya trying to get into small boats to Italy.

And just yesterday the news came that another 400 people drowned

in the Mediterranean. And this will keep going on. And it will

haunt the people who are refusing to change their ways.

Now, there is a new element in the situation which may cause sudden surprises, and that is a program which was presented by CBS, a week ago Sunday, in the so-called "60 Minutes" program portraying the coverup, of the U.S. governments from Bush to Obama, of the famous 28 pages omitted in the publication of the

official Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 by the U.S.

Congress; and as many people have said, and was said in this

program, this pertains to the role of Saudi Arabia in 9/11.

Yesterday, {all} the U.S. talk shows, and all the U.S. media, pointed their finger to the coverup of the Bush administration and even to the present day of the present government, that there

is a coverup of criminal activity.

Now, the Saudi Arabian government reacted very unnerved, and this was again reported in the {New York Times}, that they would

sell off \$750 billion in U.S. Treasuries, if the U.S. would allow

a bill that would allow Saudi Arabia to be held responsible in court, for their role in 9/11. Now, that's not exactly a sign

of  
sovereignty, but of despair. There are several U.S. Senators,  
among them Mrs. Gillibrand from New York, who demand that this  
whole question of the Saudi Arabian role in 9/11 must be on  
the  
agenda when President Obama goes to Riyadh this week. Which  
in  
any case, may not happen, but it will not be the end of the  
story  
because the genie is now out of the bottle.

OK: How do we respond to these many, many crises? Well,  
there is a solution to all of these problems. The trans-  
Atlantic  
should just do exactly what Franklin D. Roosevelt did in 1933,  
in  
reaction to the world financial crisis at the time.  
Implement  
the full banking separation – Glass-Steagall – and the whole  
offshore nightmare which is being revealed in the Panama  
Papers,  
and remember, that this firm Mossack Fonseca is only the  
fourth  
largest of such firms, and 11 million documents still need to  
be  
read through, and processed. But we have to go back to the  
kind  
of international credit system, as it existed in the Bretton  
Woods system, before Nixon ended the fixed exchange rate in  
1971,  
opening the gate for floating exchange rates and especially  
the  
creation of offshore money markets for the unlimited creation  
of  
money and other illegal operations as it now is coming out.  
Then we need a writeoff of the absolutely unpayable state  
debt, which has accumulated and ballooned after the bailouts  
of

2008 and afterwards. And we have to basically get rid of the toxic paper of the whole derivatives markets, because they are the burden which is eating up the chance for the investment in the real economy.

Then, we need a Marshall Plan Silk Road; and the only reason I'm talking about a Marshall Plan, despite the fact that China

is {emphatic} that they do not want a Cold War connotation to the

New Silk Road, it gives people in the United States and Europe a

memory, that it is very possible to rebuild war-torn economies,

as it happened in Europe after the Second World War.

Now, with the ceasefire which was negotiated between Foreign Ministers Kerry and Lavrov, you have now a still-fragile, but you

have the potential for a peace development in Syria, and soon other countries in the region. But it is extremely urgent, that

the peace dividend of this ceasefire is becoming visible for the

people of the region, immediately. That is, there has to be a reconstruction and economic buildup, not only of the territory and the destroyed cities, but the entire region, has to be looked

at as one: From Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the North

Caucasus to the Persian Gulf. Because you cannot build infrastructure by building a bridge in one country. You have to

have a complete plan for the transformation of this region, which

mainly consists of desert.

Now, the idea is to have a comprehensive plan, greening the deserts, building infrastructure, creating new, fresh water from

desalination of ocean water, of tapping into the water of the atmosphere through ionization, and various other means. And then build infrastructure corridors, new cities, and give hope to, especially, the young people of the region, so they have a reason not to join the jihad, but to become doctors, to become engineers, to care for their family and their future. Now this is not just a program any more, because when President Xi Jinping visited Iran about two months ago, he put the Silk Road development on the agenda for this region. So, all you need to do, is extend the Silk Road, and the first train has already arrived in Tehran; you have to continue to build that road, from Iran, to Iraq, to Syria all the way to Egypt. Other routes should go from Afghanistan, to Pakistan, to India. From Central Asia to Turkey to Europe, and this obviously can only work because the problem is so big, that all the neighbors of the region, Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, but also the countries which are now torn apart by the refugee crisis such as Germany, Italy, Greece, France, and all other European countries must all commit themselves to work on such a Silk Road Marshall Plan for the reconstruction and economic buildup of the Middle East/Southwest Asia, {and} all of Africa, because the economic situation is equally dire in that continent. The United States must be convinced that it is in their best interest to cooperate in such a development, and stop thinking in terms of geopolitics. Now, the United States should only be encouraged to cooperate in the development of these regions,

but

the United States needs {urgently} a New Silk Road itself.

Because if you look at the condition, not only of the financial

sector in the United States, but especially the physical economy;

if you look at the social effects of the economic collapse, like

the rising suicide rates, in all age brackets of the {white} population, and especially rural women in the age between 20 and

40, the suicide rate is quadrupling and even beyond. This is a

sign of a collapsing society.

Now, China has built as of last year, 20,000 km of fast train systems. Excellent, top-level technology fast-train systems; it wants to have 50,000 km by I think the year 2025.

How many miles of fast train as the U.S. built? I don't any.

But if the United States would join the New Silk Road and participate in the economic reconstruction, as Franklin D. Roosevelt did it with the Tennessee Valley Authority plan, with

the Reconstruction Finance Corp. in the '30s, the United States

could very, very quickly be a prosperous country, and could again

be regarded by the whole world as "a beacon of liberty and a temple of freedom," which was the idea of America when it was founded.

So, the whole fate of the whole world will depend if we all succeed to get the United States to go back to its proud tradition of a republic, and stop thinking like an empire, because that cannot be maintained in any case; because all empires in the whole history of mankind always disintegrated when

they became overstretched and collapsed. There is not one exception to this idea.

Now, therefore, let's go back to the idea from the beginning: Let's approach all problems in the present from the idea, where is the future of mankind? Where should mankind be?

Do we exist, or will we destroy ourselves. And that requires a

change in paradigm, which must be as fundamental and thorough, like the paradigm shift from the European Middle Ages to the modern times. And what caused that shift was such great figures

as Nikolaus of Cusa, but also Brunelleschi, Jeanne d'Arc, and many others; but what they introduced was a rejection of the old

paradigm—scholasticism, Aristotelianism, all the wrong ideas which led to the destruction of the 14th century, and they replaced with a completely {new} image of man, man as an {imago

viva Dei}, which was a synonym for the unlimited creative potential and perfectability of the human being. It led to a new

image of man which created a blossoming of science, of modern science, of the modern sovereign nation-state; it made possible

the emergence of Classical arts.

And that is what we have to do today: We have to stop thinking in terms of geopolitics, and we have to focus on the common aims of mankind. Now, what are these "common aims of mankind"? It is, first of all scientific cooperation to eradicate hunger, poverty, to develop more and more cures for diseases, to increase the longevity of all people. We have to study much more fundamentally, what is the principle of life? Why does life exist? How does it function? What, really, is the

deeper lawfulness of our universe? And that must define the identity of human beings, which is unique to the human species.

And I have an idea of the future, which will be full of joy. Because we will discover new principles in science and in classical art, and we will create a new Renaissance. As the Italian Renaissance superseded the Dark Age of the 14th century, what we have to do today, is we have to revive the best traditions of all great nations and cultures of the world; and make them known to the other one. Have a dialogue of the most advanced periods of Chinese, of European, Indian, African, other cultures, and revive—and that is being done in China, already—the great Confucian tradition, which is in absolute correspondence with the best neo-Platonic humanist ideas of Europe. We must revive the great Vedic tradition in India, the Gupta period; the Indian Renaissance of the late 19th to the 20th century. We must revive the Abbasid Dynasty of the Arab world; the Italian Renaissance; the Andalusian Spanish Renaissance, the Ecole Polytechnique in France, the great German Classical period. The great Italian method of singing in Verdi tuning and the bel canto method. And if all of these riches of all the different countries become the common good of all children of this planet, and everyone can learn universal history, other cultures as if it would be their own, I can already see how humanity can make a jump, and how we can create the most beautiful Renaissance of human history so far. I think everybody who is thinking about these questions, has a deep understanding, that we are at the most important crossroad in human history. And it is not yet clear which way we will

go,  
but it is clear to me, that we will {only} come out of this  
crisis if we mobilize the subjective emotional quality, which  
in  
the Chinese is called {ren}; and the European equivalent, you  
would call {agapē}, love. And we will only solve this problem  
if  
we are able to mobilize a tender, maybe even {passionate}  
love,  
for the human species. [applause]

---

**Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind  
i Sydvestasien og Afrika:  
Afskrift af Hussein Askarys  
tale på Schiller Instituttets  
og EIR's seminar på  
Frederiksberg den 18. april  
2016**





Kommer senere på dansk.

Hussein Askary Speech in Copenhagen to the Schiller Institute-  
*EIR*

Seminar "Extend the World Land-Bridge to Southwest Asia and  
Africa," April 18, 2016

{Hussein Askary had fair number of graphics and charts, which  
he  
used to illustrate his presentation.}

TOM GILLESBERG: The next speaker is somebody very unique  
and unusual, Hussein Askary originally comes from Iraq and  
had  
to get out under very nasty circumstances, as many others.  
But  
that became a blessing at least for our organization, because  
Hussein, through Norway, ended up to become part of the  
international LaRouche organization in 1994, and has since  
then  
been contributing quite fantastically to our international  
work.

And he is one of the authors of the original {New Silk Road  
Becomes the World Land-Bridge} report; but then also made a  
decision, that this cannot simply stay in the English  
language,  
or Chinese. This also has to be in the Arabic language. So  
Hussein took it upon himself to translate this into the Arabic  
language and then also of course, write some extra parts to  
it,  
which is necessary for the present circumstances in Southwest  
Asia to have.

This report just came out. It was release on March 17, in  
Cairo, in a meeting presided over by the Egyptian  
Transportation  
Minister who then introduced Hussein, and the hope of course  
is  
that this will become something read and studied and acted on  
in

the whole Arabic world, as well as the rest of the world. So Hussein?

HUSSEIN ASKARY: You have heard Helga today, giving a very stern and sobering warning about the state of affairs in the world, the dangers are very real to the world today. What I am going to do, and please don't misunderstand me, I'm not going to

give you a picture of how rosy and nice things are, either in Southwest Asia, the so-called Middle East, or in Africa, but, as

they say in sports, you have to keep your eye on the ball. What

Helga just said, is that there is a new paradigm in the world, which can lead to a completely different, and new world order. And it's that paradigm, within which myself, the Schiller Institute, and the people we are talking to, we want to direct their attention to that new paradigm.

I'm thankful to Leena Malkki for her beautiful singing, and, especially, the {Aida} aria. It was actually performed at the opening of the Suez Canal, the second Suez Canal, last year. The idea of great projects, the idea of great challenges, like Hela was explaining, this idea of being in space, looking at

the world from space, and, also, the idea of major projects, like

the Suez Canal, like the Three Gorges Dam in China, the New Silk

Road, the effect they have on people, is that they challenge their imagination, and challenge their creativity, because they

represent major difficulties, major technical problems, intellectual problems, that have to be solved, before you achieve

these major projects. And that transforms the idea of people. It

also gives people an idea of a creative constructive identity,

and the position of man in the world, on this Earth, and also in the universe. That is why we try to work on these concepts of the New Silk Road, the extension of the New Silk Road, to {inspire} people to think outside of the box, outside of the box of geopolitics, which Helga was trying to explain. We have to get out of geopolitics. We have to act {human} again. But that has practical implications. There are practical problems, and other issues, and even scientific issues we have to resolve. So, for those who are not familiar, this is the extension of the New Silk Road. The New Silk Road has existed as the new strategic policy of China since 1996, but we want to expand this into a global collaboration, a blueprint, as Tom said, a concept for peace and cooperation among nations. We have to connect the Economic Belt of the Silk Road (the one with the yellow), which is already being built. As Helga said, the first train arrived from China to Tehran last month. There are projects going on in Siberia. So there are trains going from Asia to Europe. There is no problem with that. We need to extend it into the Southwest Asia region, the so-called Middle East (I can explain later why I say Southwest Asia, and not the Middle East), and into Africa, and of course, into the Americas. So, you can see that the red lines are where we have the biggest deficits, the biggest deficits in infrastructure, both transportation infrastructure, but also in other needs, deficits in water, and deficits in electricity.

What is different in the Arabic part, which I rewrote certain parts of it, like the Southwest Asia part, we also added

the Arabian Peninsula, also, to the idea of the connection to the

New Silk Road. This is no longer simply a Silk Road; this is the

World Land-Bridge, which can unite all the continents of the world.

In 1996, I had the great fortune to work with Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the team of {EIR} to make the first major study

of the New Silk Road, and it was that one which was adopted by the Chinese government as the strategic policy of China. It was

also a thick report like this.

This work is being done, mostly in East Asia, Central Asia, Iran, Turkey, Russia, all these nations are involved, but what is

lacking is the connection to the rest. So it has been 20 years since that idea emerged, but there was no response from the countries in the Arab world, for example, or in Africa.

Now, the idea with all these lines is not only about trade.

We want to warn people, that we are not talking about moving goods from China to Europe. That's not our concept. That's a

byproduct. What we mean by the New Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, that we need to create development corridors: a development corridor where you bring power, water, and technology

to areas that are landlocked, that are far from industrial zones,

and, explore the resources, human and natural resources of that

region, to develop new centers of economic activity. Like landlocked nations, like in Central Asia, or the Great Lakes region in Africa. That's the concept. It's not about trade, although trade is an important aspect of this.

In 2002, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, the American economist and political leader, the husband of Mrs. LaRouche, was in Abu Dhabi, in a conference about oil, and the role of oil in world politics, and the future of oil. And there were many ministers of oil actually from the Arab countries – the gentleman to the right is the energy minister of the United Arab Emirates – and Mr. LaRouche shocked everybody, and said that the Arab countries, or the Gulf countries, have to gradually stop exporting raw oil, and actually use raw oil and gas as an industrial product, for petrochemicals, plastics, where every barrel of oil will give many times its value, rather than burning it as energy. He said that you should use your position in the world, as a crossroads of continents. You have to utilize that position as a crossroads for world trade, but also, the connection between Africa, Asia and Europe. So I added these to the Arabic version, because I think that this is a very unique area in the world, not only that its strategic location is very unique, no other part of the world has that; you also have two-thirds of the world's energy resources, so-called, oil and gas in that region, but also, most importantly, you have about 450 million people. Most of them are young people. And actually, many of them have a good education. You also have nations with a very ancient history and culture, and a very historical identity, like Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, and

so on, and they also have an idea of themselves as becoming key players in the world, but we hope that they will become key players in the world in the economic, scientific and cultural sense.

The problem is that all these advantages have been turned into disadvantages. So this region has become a center for global politics, for global geopolitics, and that is why we see the conditions we have in the whole Middle East region becoming like this.

Our idea is, now we have this new situation with the Russian intervention, the prospect, the possibility of having a peaceful political solution in Syria, the prospect of uniting many powers to fight ISIS and al-Qaeda, and so on, both in Iraq and Syria, and also in Libya. But this should be followed, as Helga said, we need a Marshall Plan, we need an economic development plan, to establish peace on a true basis.

The reason I joined the Schiller Institute in 1994, was that I was in Oslo, and I was working as a translator, and there was a Palestinian children's delegation coming with Yasser Arafat; and I was going around with them, and, at that time, you had the Oslo peace agreement. A week later, I saw a sign that the Schiller Institute was having a meeting in Oslo. They had a very interesting title. They said in the meeting that if you don't start with the economic development of the Palestinian people, the people in Jordan, Syria, Israel, and so on, if you don't base the peace process on a solid economic basis, this whole thing will fail. And the peace process is, of course, dead now, both

because of that, but also because of geopolitics which has prevented reaching a true peace.

So, therefore, to establish true peace, we need an economic and scientific program. Helga referred to president Xi Jinping's

visit to the region in January this year. I consider this as an

historic turning point, actually, because at that point, in late

January, Saudi Arabia and Iran were at the point where there was

a big risk of a direct war between Iran and Saudi Arabia, because

of the beheading of a Shi'a clergy in Saudi Arabia, which led to

demonstrations, the burning of the Saudi Embassy in Tehran, and

so on. So the Chinese intervention came at a very crucial point,

where they said, "Look, all these religious conflicts and problems you have with each other, can lead the whole world into

a disaster. Why don't we work on our method? We offer you to join

the New Silk Road. We offer economic development, and technology,

and even financing, so we can connect all of your countries which

are in conflict with each other together into this global process." And this is very, very important. And nations in the region have to really grasp that opportunity now, and, instead of

discussing the fate of President Assad, they should discuss what

kinds of economic projects they should work together on.

One of the issues that I didn't mention, is that, for example, even as Helga said, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, they can



join this, if they stop this other policy, because we also have one of the largest concentrations of financial power in the Gulf countries; the so-called sovereign funds of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries is about \$2 trillion. This can be transformed into credit.

In the report, I propose the establishment of the Arab Infrastructure Investment Bank. A bank which will be financed by these rich countries, which would have a capital of \$100-200 billion, and that capital will only be earmarked for infrastructure and development projects.

So every nation has a role in this. And in the report, we have also added, which is not in the English report, a plan, a general outline for the reconstruction of Syria, by utilizing Syria's position also as a bridge for the Silk Road, both from Asia, and from Europe, into Africa. We also propose the construction of a Syrian National Reconstruction Bank, which is

very important. We have a very important chapter in the report about how nations can internally finance major infrastructure programs. Because, the big question, which comes all the time when I am in Arab countries, or in Africa, is, they say "OK. This

sounds good. Who will pay for this? Where will the money come from?" Actually, you don't really need money, in that sense. You

can create the money, but you have to know where to use that money. As Helga said, the central banks in Europe and the United

States are pumping massive amounts of liquidity into the financial and banking system. But none of that is transformed into technologies or projects, public projects, or housing projects, or industrial projects in Europe or anywhere. So

money

is being printed, but it is not being used.

But there is a method, which we call the Hamiltonian national credit system, which every nation can actually internally generate credit to finance part of its national development plans, and this is one thing we put in the Syria plan. Because every time there is a war like in Bosnia, in Lebanon, and so on, you have donor conferences, where every nation says that we will give you so much money, 100 million, 50

million, but there is no centralized idea about how to rebuild the whole country. It all depends on donations, small drops which

come. We want something massive. We want something big. Foreign

governments should contribute to that by exporting technology to

Syria, for example, which Syria cannot afford to build, or afford

to buy, in the current situation.

Also, a part of our plan for Southwest Asia is to fight against desertification, by managing and creating new water resources, stopping the expansion of the desert. This is the Iraqi Green Belt project to stop the effect of sand and dust storms, which actually is a big problem for many cities in Iraq,

sometimes even reaching into Iran, by building a Green Belt, planting trees in a large scale, a belt by using both ground water and water from the rivers. This is a kind of national program which can unite the people of Iraq for an idea of their

future together. Not Sunni, Shi'a, Kurdish, Turkish, and so on,

and so forth. These are the kinds of projects, real physical projects, which will challenge people to work together in a country like Iraq.

Now, I took this Egyptian model, because in Egypt, you have

a very terrible situation, which is the accumulation of 30 years of destructive economic and financial policies, mostly caused by former President Mubarak's and Anwar Sadat's collaboration with the IMF and the World Bank. There should be a shift in the way Egyptians consider their economy. Because Egypt always waits for the IMF or the World Bank, the EU or the United States to give some money so that they can start something new. And usually money does not go to large scale. Europe, the United States, the UN, the IMF and the World Bank will {never} finance large infrastructure projects. That's the policy. Small, small, small is beautiful. That's what they say. But in Egypt, with the new leadership in Egypt, you have the focus on mega-projects, which is a necessity. If you want to save Egypt's economy, Egypt's entire infrastructure has to be built from scratch again. There should be new industrial and agricultural centers, which they are focusing on. Using high technology, they try to attract the highest levels of technology, and internal financing. You know, President el-Sisi, when they wanted to build the Suez Canal, there was no money, as usual, they said. So what he did was something unique. He went outside the central bank. He went outside the budget, and said, "I will go on TV, and I will tell the Egyptian people that we want to build this canal. It's crucial for our nation. We want you to give the money."

In 2013 I wrote a memorandum for Egypt, an Egyptian Economic Independence Document, I called it. Actually, inside Egypt, you can raise more than \$100 billion, because there are resources inside Egypt. People, even today, buy dollars. They take part of their salary, and buy dollars or gold, and keep it at home, so that financing disappears from the system. It's not reinvested in the system. People keep their money because of the unstable economic situation. But if you encourage the Egyptian people with this kind of national development projects, which will put their kids to work, unemployed young people, they would come out with the money. And this is what el-Sisi did. I wrote at the time, that they should build a National Development Bank, not just one fund for the Suez Canal, as they did. But as soon as President el-Sisi came on TV and said, "We want to build this canal, but we don't have the money. We want the Egyptian people to pay for it." So they went out, and in one week they raised \$8 billion. And people were queuing late into the night; I met a banker last year, who said, "We had to stay open into the night, because people were queuing at the banks to buy the bonds!" Egyptians are real patriots. They love their country, but if they are encouraged by good leadership. Of course, the Suez Canal is not giving back what was supposed to be already from the beginning, because world trade has collapsed. The level of transit in the Suez Canal has gone

down, not because of Egypt's policy, but because the world economy is going down. Global trade has been collapsing. But the idea is to use the Suez Canal as a development zone. And this is what I got from people in the Suez Canal Authority – that they are not only thinking about transport of goods, but they want to utilize that route to build new industrial zones around the canal, like we showed in the development corridor idea. And, of course, Egypt has a very key role, both in the Arab world – it's the most important Arab country – and also in Africa. Now Egypt has one big problem – it's the demographic problem. People say that Egypt is overpopulated. That's not true. Egypt is not overpopulated. Cairo is overcrowded! Ninety million people live on only 5% of the land of Egypt; 95% of the land of Egypt is empty. It's not used, but it's not overpopulated. The United States and Europe have been financing the Egyptian government with hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning, so that women will have fewer children. But no projects were built to expand Egypt's economic potential to accommodate to the new generations, so that they can have new agricultural and urban centers out in the desert! After I was in Egypt last year, I wrote a report for a major economic conference in Egypt to attract investment; but these are the ideas which came out of both the conference, and my observations about Egypt's role in the New Silk Road. In Egypt,

people were very negative to the idea of the New Silk Road, because they said that the transshipment on the Silk Road will take away trade from the Suez Canal – that shipments will go from Asia to Europe by land, and we will lose. So there are a lot of people in Egypt who are actually against the idea. But I was telling people, “Look. It’s not about trade. If you have economic development, you will need more Suez Canals to accommodate the trade. But if the world economy is not growing, there is no development, there will be no trade. And people will compete on attracting trade into other areas.”

So the idea is to develop Egypt’s economy, but also contribute to more development and more trade among nations. And

it’s in utilizing Egypt’s position to connect to Sub-Saharan Africa, to North Africa, the Middle East, and to the Arabian Peninsula. Interestingly, after I was in Egypt, last week the Saudi King was in Egypt, and they decided to build this bridge.

At Sharm el-Sheikh, there is a connection over the Gulf of Aqaba.

I think that the Egyptian President invited the Saudi King to support the building of this bridge between the Saudi territories and southern Sinai, which will turn Sinai from an isolated area,

suddenly into becoming the center between two major economies. There are now big problems in Egypt, because the President made a terrible mistake by conceding sovereignty over the Tiran

and Sanafir islands to the Saudis. There was a dispute between the two countries for many years, but President el-Sisi suddenly declared that they are Saudi islands, and now there is a big

uproar in Egypt. And the mistake was that there was no public discussion about it. The parliament didn't have anything to say

about this. So, now there will be a review of the agreement.

But

the idea of this project is very important.

Now, for Egypt to get out of that demographic box, is for Egypt to expand its economic activities into the desert. This is

the development corridor proposed by Dr. Farouk El-Baz, who is a

space scientist, and he is right now an advisor to the President.

And he designed this idea of creating the new valley, the new Nile Valley, by building railways, roads, and new urban centers.

I added these green zones, because these are actually becoming new agricultural areas that the Egyptian government wants to invest in, by creating new farmlands – they are talking about 4

million acres of land, and settling young people into these regions, and building new agro-industrial centers. But what is needed is to extend the development corridor, the black line, into the economic zones.

This is the Africa Pass. One of our Egyptian friends, an engineer, presented this at our conference in 2012, it's the same

idea, connecting Egypt to North Africa, to Europe, and into the

Great Lakes region of Africa. Now, the Great Lakes region countries, like Rwanda, Burundi, the eastern Congo, Uganda, they

have massive problems of economic development, also because they

are very far from the transport corridors of the world. We wrote

a series of reports two years ago about the cost of shipment

of a container. The Danish shipping company A.P. Møller-Mærsk has statistics that the cost of a shipment of a container from Singapore to Alexandria is \$4,000, to Mombasa in eastern Kenya,

it becomes \$5,000; but to the capital of Uganda, it goes to \$8,000, because there are no good roads to ship that container!

Into Rwanda and Burundi it reaches \$10,600 per container. So they

cannot bear the cost of shipment of containers that maybe have technology inside them, and machines, and that is a major problem

for these so-called land-locked countries. So you need to have new lines of transport which will reduce the cost of the transport.

Now these are ideas which the African nations, the African Union, have had for many years. There are many very nice plans,

but the attitude of the rest of the world to Africa, because Africa, by itself, does not have the technology, at least, to build these projects, and there has been no willingness in Europe, or the United States, to finance, or contribute to building the projects proposed in any of these major reports, to

integrate the infrastructure of Africa and enhance economic development. Because without infrastructure, you cannot have economic development.

But some of these lines are now coming on the agenda, thanks to the intervention of the BRICS nations, and also of China. For

example, the Cairo-Cape Town highway idea, President Jacob Zuma

of South Africa, presented this actually twice at the BRICS summit in 2013 and 2014, and he said, "This is a crucial, a key

element in the development of Africa. We need to work with the



BRICS nations and China, Russia and India to build these projects." There are 400 road and rail projects involved in this.

But this is a big challenge, both in terms of financing, and in terms of technology.

There is also the possibility of connecting the river systems of Africa for river transport, like in Europe, the Main-Rhine-Danube Rivers are an important transport artery, and development artery. In the same way, you can connect the Nile to the Great Lakes, to the Zambezi River through a number of canals, and so-called trans-modal transport systems, where you can ship from rivers to rail, and back to rivers, to lakes, and so on, in an easy way.

Filling the gap which the United States and Europe have left for many, many years, now the Chinese—. Well, in Europe, we have a very problematic and twisted relationship to poverty, to poor countries, to underdeveloped countries. Europeans look at Africa as a burden. It's a problem. How do we solve this problem?

But the problem is that the whole focus has been on aid, emergency relief, and so on, and so forth, but that really doesn't solve problems. I mean, people talk about genocide. In Africa, every year there are 4 million children who die. Now, talk about a war crime. There are 700,000 children before the age of five who die every year in Africa. So, you cannot solve these problems with small aid projects here and there. You need to think big. You need to provide those people with adequate transport, electricity, water systems, and this cannot be done

by  
so-called aid programs. In Africa 600 million people don't  
have

access to electricity, out of 1 billion.

But you look at the Chinese, when they look at an  
underdeveloped country, they see an opportunity. They see  
potential. They see a "win-win" strategy – new markets, new  
areas of development, and they should intervene in that  
situation.

It is the same idea that President Franklin Roosevelt of the  
United States had. All of his fights with Churchill were  
exactly

about this problem. Roosevelt told Churchill in the middle of  
World War II, that you British are very stupid, because you  
suck

the blood of the Africans, and you get pennies, you get  
nothing,

by sucking their blood. But if you develop Africa, as  
independent

nations, as modern nations, as we did with the United States,  
then you will gain much, much more; if you treat them as  
humans,

if you develop their infrastructure, schools and hospitals.

And this is exactly what the Chinese are thinking about. Out  
of the problem, they see an opportunity. Prime Minister Li  
Keqiang was in East Africa, and also Nigeria in May 2014, and  
immediately said, "We want to help Africa to connect all the  
capitals with railways," which is a big deficit problem. And  
they

started from East Africa. And now there are projects being  
built

from Lamu, a new port, into the land-locked South Sudan, into  
Uganda, into Rwanda and Burundi. And China is both financing  
major parts of this, but also contributing to building it, to  
solve the problems of the land-locked countries and the need  
for  
development.

China recently completed, it's not running yet, but part of the railway is running, from Djibouti to Addis Ababa. There is an old railway, which is not functional, built by the French colonialists, but now there is a new, electrified railway, which goes from Djibouti to Addis Ababa.

Two interesting things about this railway are, firstly, that Ethiopia is always associated with famine and food problems. Some

of these problems still exist. These are on the way to being solved, but to bring food from the ports to inside the country usually took two months, because of the lack of infrastructure.

So starving people could not have food in time. Even if the food

existed in the port, coming from around the world to Djibouti, it

was almost impossible to bring the food to the people who needed

it. Now, that food can be shipped in 10 hours, to the capital, and also to other areas. The other interesting fact about this railway is that China is not just building the railway, and financing it, but training and educating engineers and workers to run these systems.

Now, Ethiopia has a massive infrastructure plan for connecting all the major cities of Ethiopia, with the railway and

roads. The other thing about the railway is that it is all electrified. And the Ethiopians will use all these new dams they

are building, to electrify the railway. So they don't need import

oil, and gas and diesel to run the railway system. They will domestically provide the energy to run the trains.

So, Ethiopia, I am very sure it will never be associated

anymore with famine and poverty. Ethiopia is a great nation, a very proud nation. They have massive resources, but these resources have been dormant, have not been utilized. But now, with the Chinese intervention, and also India is active there, these resources will be developed.

This is just a metaphorical picture. This is the Mombasa-Nairobi railway being built by a Chinese and a Kenyan worker. In Africa, the propaganda goes that the Chinese never let the locals work in these projects. They bring their own workers, they bring their own engineers, their own technology, they build the thing, and then they leave. It's not true. They always involve local workers. They train them, because they cannot run these systems; the locals will have to run these systems themselves.

But they are also training the labor force in Uganda. They are building an Army Corps of Engineers, so that the Army can play a positive role in the development of the country. Traditionally, the Army Corps of Engineers played a very important role, even in advanced countries. So this is part of the same project.

Another important infrastructure project for Africa is Transaqua. Lake Chad is drying up, which is a known fact, and 30 million people are affected, because they live as fishermen, or they have grazing land around the lake in Chad and Nigeria, and Niger. All these countries are affected. There are 30 million people around that region, and there will be massive migration actually from the Lake Chad region. So there is an idea called Transaqua, which was developed by one of our friends, an Italian engineer, to bring 5% of the water from the Congo River, or

the  
tributaries of the Congo River, and build a 2,800 km.-long  
canal  
into the Chari River, and then flow downwards into Lake Chad,  
to  
refill the lake; but also to have a new economic zone, and  
build  
the Mombasa-Lagos highway, which was one of the plans I showed  
earlier.

So you can transform that part of Africa, which in people's  
minds is a complete jungle, into a new economic zone, but also  
to  
bring water to the Lake Chad region.

Now, there are some other issues I want to address. One of  
the big deficits of course in Africa, is the energy  
consumption.

And as I said not everybody has that; the average  
international  
level of energy consumption is about 2,800 [kw?] but that's  
not  
equal. The only two countries which are exception are South  
Africa and Libya, before that. So the energy needs in Africa  
are

{enormous}! I mean Africa has a lot of wealth, but also the  
hydropower potential which has never been built. But the  
attitude of the Western countries, like the Obama  
administration,

they have something called "Power Africa Initiative," that  
certain nations in Africa will get energy provided. But  
they're  
not talking about hydropower, they're not talking about  
nuclear

power, they're not talking about coal or gas or so on.

They're

talking about so-called "renewable" or "sustainable energy."

And

the International Energy Agency has a criteria for access to

energy, which is a modern access to energy is about 100kw-hours per year per person. And this diagram shows very ironically, that that amount will be consumed by an American in three days!

But they expect Africans to live with that for a whole year! Here's just one more ironical idea: My refrigerator can consume many times as much as an Ethiopian individual.

These are the criteria for President Obama's Power Africa plan, that the plan will eventually help these nations come to this line, while the real needs are that big now, and they will be that big in a few years. So, all these ideas to help Africa from the Obama administration, they're not adequate! It's just a complete bluff. It does not help, if you just look at the numbers.

And this is also another irony of the Obama administration policy. These are the sources of energy for the American people, the American economy, and these are what the Obama administration {doesn't} want you to do. So it's "do as we say, not as we do."

So the United States produced 37% of its energy from coal, that's forbidden for Africa; 30% produced by natural gas, that's a very suspicious policy, because there's the carbon problem; 19% nuclear – absolutely no nuclear for Africa; 7% hydropower – the United States is very suspicious of hydropower projects, and so on and so on. So what is left is solar, so-called geothermal, and biomass, which the United States produced only 0.1% of its

needs. But that's recommended for Africa. [laughter]  
So anyway, the idea is that if Africa joins the new paradigm shift, African nations, they have exactly, in African families and African individuals, they have exactly the same needs as we have; as we have in Europe or in the United States. There is absolutely no difference. So they're trying to convince the Africans that they should just, maybe, if they're lucky they could get a lightbulb at home, so the kids can read, by having a solar battery. They will not bite!  
I mean, if you bring electricity to a village, what people will do, is not simply have a lightbulb, if you bring electricity to a village, – and one of our friends made a study in India – is that people will start to want to use new devices. They have to have other appliances at home, you need to have a stove, so women don't have to many hours and cut trees and come home and cook with the wood, and suffocate with the smoke. Farmers will have to have tractors. They will need to have workshops which use electricity; people will want to have TV sets, computers. They want to build industrial projects. They will need refrigeration which is a big problem in Africa, because most of the food produced in the Sub-Saharan goes wasted because there's no refrigeration.  
So just to give yourself an illusion that you will provide every African lightbulb, just forget about it! Because the needs of those people are so immense, and they will not give up on their right to have a living standard which is similar to ours.  
Why shouldn't they have it? And this is what – here, in the

ideology in Europe and the United States I know, they should not have this kind of technology, they should not have this kind of development in Africa, because that's not "sustainable." Which is not true. It is sustainable, if you provide the tools and the technology to do that. Actually in Africa, there are more resources than in Japan or in the United States and Europe, to sustain industrial development!

So the problem is in the policy. The problem is how they look at Africa, and how they look at the problem of poverty and so on. And that has also to change, exactly as we changed with geopolitics, we have to change our attitude to the problems of Africa, and have really the right methods to solving them, and treating African nations as equal to us, and African families as equal to us, and African individuals as equal to us. Nobody here will give up their living standard, and live in the forest – maybe some people who do, there are some Danes and Norwegians... [laughter] But we want to have education. We want to have warm housing, we want to have clean water; we want to have a future for our kids; we want to have trains which go on time. This is what the Africans want. You know, there's nothing different, we're all one human race!

So, when you design policy and you say, "No, Africans should have 'sustainable energy,' not nuclear power," then you are breaking with that idea of a real human family and equality. So I think I'll stop here. [applause]



Dias til talen:

