

**Citizens Electoral Council of Australia conference
 “The World Land-Bridge: Peace on Earth, Good Will towards All Men”,
 28-29 March 2015, Melbourne, Australia**

From Panel 4 The World Land-Bridge: It’s Being Built! (continued)

The BRICS Process Is Transforming Ibero-America

Dennis Small, Ibero-America Intelligence Director and Editorial Board member, *Executive Intelligence Review*, USA

Craig Isherwood: Welcome back to this afternoon’s panel, Panel Four, on the subject of “The World Land-Bridge: It’s Being Built!”, which is a continuation from Panel One. This panel is going to be looking at Ibero-America, Africa and Egypt in terms of development. After each speaker (apart from the last person, who will be on video tape), we will be having a question-and-answer period. as well.

On Google Hangouts, direct from the United States late at night, is Dennis Small. Dennis is the Ibero-America Intelligence Director and Editorial Board member of *EIR* magazine. Dennis has had a very long history of dealing with all the characteristics of all the Ibero-American nations, and so we are very pleased that Dennis can address us on the subject of “The BRICS Process is Transforming Ibero-America”. Welcome, Dennis, to our conference, and I’ll let you take it over from here. Thank you.

Dennis Small: Thank you very much, and it certainly is a great pleasure to be able to speak to you, especially on an auspicious occasion such as this, where we are witnessing, even as we are speaking right now, a massive avalanche of nations who are signing on to the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; really, signing on to the entire BRICS process. The last 48 hours have seen not only Russia and Brazil joining—the Brazil angle is particularly interesting, as I’ll discuss briefly a little bit ahead, since it is one of the BRICS members, and *the* BRICS member from South America—and, in addition to that, Spain, Holland, Denmark and Georgia have also joined on with the AIIB. So this really is a total avalanche that’s going on at this point, of countries joining in on this, all over the objections and the hysteria of Barack Obama and the Queen of England on this entire thing. Now, I think it’s important to state something that should be obvious, but isn’t to a lot of people who observe events around the world, which is that avalanches are not explained by the behaviour of individual rocks! Avalanches are caused by a broader process which sweeps rocks up in them and produces an effect, and if we do this in the right fashion, *this* avalanche is going to bury the British Empire in the rubble where it belongs.

The chessboard—to switch metaphors on you right away—was really kicked over, on the global scene, in particular with the July 2014 BRICS/UNASUR joint summits in Fortaleza, Brazil and Brasilia, Brazil. I’m speaking not only of the BRICS summit, which did happen on the 25th of July, but the next day was a summit of the BRICS with UNASUR, which is the Union of the Nations of South America. And it was the combination of the two, which unleashed the process which we’re seeing

today, in terms of the global, very rapid expansion of a replacement system for the current, bankrupt international financial system.

This global process, dating back in this expression to July of last year, got a new, very important boost on, as it happened, the same day—three events happened the same day, which was March 12th—when two gentlemen from Germany, [Hans-Walter] Steinmeier and [Helmut] Schmidt, and then a putative Presidential candidate in the United States, Martin O’Malley, all made statements which rocked the system to its very roots. The O’Malley statements are particularly important, because they placed the issue of Glass-Steagall front and centre in American politics, and, in particular, in the Presidential campaign; and this is absolutely essential, because Obama is the single biggest and most important obstacle to this global process that is under way by the BRICS, expressing itself in many continents around the world, and Obama is someone who has to be removed from office. Lyndon LaRouche was, in discussions today, reiterating this as the crucial thing that has to happen immediately: he must be removed from the Presidency of the United States, or what is otherwise a very promising situation in Africa, in Eurasia and Ibero-America and elsewhere, is going to run into a little problem, which is that Obama and company are well along the way to triggering global thermonuclear war, and they *will* do that if they are not stopped. So that’s the immediate situation we’re facing.

Now, to locate what the BRICS summits—of the BRICS and UNASUR—in July of 2014 actually helped trigger, avalanche style, it’s important to look back just one month or two; obviously we could go way back in history, but just look back about a month before, where the country of Argentina was in the middle of a big battle—still is—against the vulture funds that were trying to impose looting on the country, whose consequences would clearly be simply the genocide of the population. And the government of Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner was absolutely refusing to go along with the vulture funds; she was standing up for the sovereignty and the development of the country, and was not caving in.

In June of 2014, *Executive Intelligence Review* published an article and asked a very simple question: would Argentina become the first nation in the trans-Atlantic financial system to jump ship, to get off the sinking *Titanic*, to say, “We’ve had it with this system, we’re going to go in different direction” towards what was, then, clearly the motion towards the Eurasian Land Bridge, but not yet the political explosion that occurred with the BRICS? And we answered that question in the affirmative: that, yes, Argentina would be bolting, it would be leaving. And Mr LaRouche put it very simply: they don’t have any choice; they have no choice, if they want to survive, other than to do that. And if they were to do that, Mr LaRouche forecast, you would see a wave of support throughout South America, throughout Ibero-America, and they would be pulled in the same direction because of an underlying historical tendency in the region, because of the leadership provided by Argentina, but especially because of the context of the global avalanche that was already under way—the rocks just hadn’t started moving yet, but that process was there. And LaRouche was right.

What happened with the July 2014 summits of UNASUR and BRICS, as you can see in the first slide which I'd like to show you on the screen, which is a map which simply shows the combination of the BRICS countries and of the UNASUR countries together, and what you have in the agreements that were reached at that summit, is approximately half the population of the planet. Half of humanity, at that meeting, split and went in a different direction. And it was the relationship of what the BRICS were planning to do, and were doing, and pulling UNASUR behind them with Argentina leading the way, which caused the effect.

Now the significance of this—and I'll come back in a minute to what actually, I think, were the most important features of that BRICS/UNASUR combination—[is that it] led to a process where the entirety of the continent did, in fact, move along with the BRICS. You do have half the planet now moving in this direction. It's growing day by day, with the countries joining the AIIB from Asia and elsewhere. You have things moving in Africa as well.

But what's really interesting, is what's going on in Europe right now, because Greece, today, is in a situation which is similar to what we saw with Argentina in the early part of 2014. I think we can and should ask the question: is Greece going to be the first European nation to jump ship and to say, "We're out of it, we're out of the euro, we don't want any part of this; we're going to Plan B, we're going to the BRICS, we're going to develop economic relations that will allow us to have sovereignty, to have our population survive and not undergo the genocide we're facing today"? I think it's fairly safe to say, I'd venture a guess—or a forecast—that, by the time of the next BRICS summit, which is going to be in July of this year in Ufa, Russia, we will see a process with Greece in the leadership, because leadership is crucial in this, where Europe will be in motion, already very dramatically, towards the BRICS. In fact, I think that's what's already going on, which is what we're seeing with this avalanche into the AIIB.

So, as we look at the South American, or the Ibero-American situation in a little bit more detail, keep in mind that we're talking about the current situation, but we're also looking at the past, and we're looking at what the future is rapidly becoming. This is a single, unified process.

At the BRICS/UNASUR summit, everyone's attention, during and since, has been focused on two institutions that were created: one is the New Development Bank, and the other is the Contingent Reserve Arrangement. Those are important, they're very important developments, they are the seed crystal of a new international financial system. But, I don't think that was what was most important about that summit. It may have been what was most flashy, and what was most sexy, but not most important.

What was most important is that a series of agreements, bilateral and multilateral, were established for the rapid development of the physical economy of the region. The physical economic agreements that were reached there, and the process that was set in motion there, is far more significant, in terms of changing the global dynamic, than simply financial institutions. Financial institutions have to be adapted for that physical-economic requirement.

Now what did they set up? Well: nuclear energy, and then moving forward into space and into fusion power as well, co-operation with Russia and China in this area; the development of education and scientific and technological advancement for the youth; a series of programs which have begun a shift into a future-oriented economy, looking at the physical-economic side of things. You have countries like Ecuador, which had been devastated by looting under the debt system, that are now talking about building a “science city”. You have Bolivia, one of the most impoverished nations in the entire region, with huge difficulties, has decided—to quote their own Vice President—that nuclear energy is the new technology of the future, it is the fire, as Prometheus brought fire to human-kind, and Bolivia is now moving towards nuclear, they’re training an entire generation of youth, who previously had no hope whatsoever, in nuclear energy.

Argentina, however, has continued to provide the real engine of the process in the whole region, and is the most important thing going on there. Argentina has just begun the construction of their fourth nuclear plant, and this is being done in combination with China; China has come on board. Back in 2001, Argentina, after decades of looting, defaulted on their debt, and in 2003, under the husband of the current President, then-President Nestor Kirchner—his now-widow Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner is the President today—they imposed a unilateral debt reorganisation and a write-down of the debt, a very significant “hair-cut”, which turned the country around and allowed them to get back on track for actual physical-economic development. They’re involved in launching their own rocket into space. They have developed their own spacecraft, which has been put into orbit for them so far. They have the highest wage and pension levels anywhere in Ibero-America. They’re rebuilding their entire railroad system.

Again, this is because Argentina has a background and has a history of a strong orientation towards a constitutional Hamiltonian system, The Argentine constitution is modelled on that of the United States, and Argentina, like the United States, did have a National Bank. It actually established a National Bank in the country, a Hamiltonian National Bank, in 1892. So much was it a Hamiltonian bank, that in its founding documents they cite Hamilton, so they knew exactly what they were doing. This is what was there, and under the Kirchner presidencies, first Nestor and then Cristina, what happened is they very explicitly based their development approach on Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his policies.

Let me read you one or two quotes from President Fernandez de Kirchner, to give you a flavour of her approach. Just back on March 1, in her speech before the National Congress, which was a kind of a State of the Union speech, while 300,000 citizens were listening outside in the plaza on giant TV screens, she talked about the fact that Argentina was building a new future and new strategic alliances. And she said, “You cannot be so stupid, so colonised, so intellectually subordinate, so lacking in neurons, as to not see the reality of the world. China is on its way to becoming the most important and largest economy in the world. We are in a different world: no-one could imagine in 2008, what was going to happen in the world today.” And in earlier remarks during that same speech, she had talked about the financial crisis of 2008.

She said the only thing that happened in response to that, was more bail-out of what she called the shadow banking sector—“And all,” she said, “for new derivatives; fundamentally, they went to tax havens.” So she knows what the score is, and I think her leadership has been very important in Ibero-America, in pulling the whole continent in the direction of the BRICS as per the agreements established with UNASUR.

Now what were some of the other physical-economic agreements established at that meeting, which are already under way? If you'll show the second slide, please: this is very interesting. This shows you a little bit of how the world actually works, in terms of physical economy. The Chinese have begun to build, with Nicaragua, a new inter-oceanic canal that cuts through the isthmus of Central America, and is going to be gigantic in terms of its capabilities. It will be able to handle ships *ten times* the size, the deadweight, of ships now going through the Panama Canal, so what is now a bottleneck will become a through-way, internationally.

What I've drawn on this map is a very simple indication: from Belem in Brazil, which is very near the largest iron mine in the entire world, in Carajas, Brazil (I know that Australia is also very big in iron ore, also in exports to China), what Brazil is going to be able to do is, instead of shipping across the Atlantic as it now does, which is a 22,800-km route and takes 36 days, if they ship through this new Nicaraguan canal, which will be ready in about five or six years, it cuts the time down to 32 days and the distance down to 20,500 km. That's about a ten per cent difference, which in international shipping is quite significant, but let me just add—I can't go into this, there's not time to do so—but if you look at the World Land-Bridge map, which I have on this map as well and I'm sure you've seen and discussed throughout the course of your proceedings, with high-speed, or mag-lev technology for this entire World Land-Bridge, you will be able to travel the rail route from Belem, up through Central America, up through the United States, across Canada, across Alaska, under the Bering Strait, down through Siberia and Russia, down to Shanghai. And that route, although you can't tell from this map projection, if you actually look at a polar projection, is about the same distance as the sea route. But it won't take 32 days to get there; it will take about 30 hours, 40 hours. You're talking about an increase of one order of magnitude, of reduction of the time required for transport of goods and passengers. Where technology is taking us in the future, is towards these kinds of gigantic leaps.

Another very important development project that was established, and is already under way and being built, as you can see in the next map, is for a transcontinental rail route crossing South America, from Brazil over to the Pacific coast where Peru is located. I've marked on the map two possible routes: one a northern route, which just goes through Brazil and then cuts over to Peru—in between you have the Andes; this is not a minor problem! It takes quite a bit of engineering, but it's absolutely do-able—and then there's the southern route, which goes through Bolivia as well as Peru, which is preferable just because it's good to involve more countries in this. And this is a long-standing dream. Mr LaRouche has proposed this kind of trans-continental railroad going back decades, we've published about it, but

actually the project, and the whole idea of integrating Ibero-America in physical-economic terms, dates all the way back to [Wilhelm von] Humboldt in the 19th century, who toured the Americas and designed a whole plan to actually link up the river systems of South America to one continuous river system of the Rio de la Plata, the Amazon and the Orinoco. His idea was you cross the Caribbean and go into the United States and up the Mississippi and the Missouri: one integrated physical-economic project. This has been around since Humboldt's time. Now, it's being done.

If you look at the last map, this is a locator map so that you know where the countries are that I'm speaking about: Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Peru. I've also marked Mexico down, because, in closing, I want to say a couple of things about Mexico. Mexico is like Argentina, where Mr LaRouche has visited, and met with the President of Argentina in 1984, met with the entire scientific elite of the country, laid out the policy of nuclear energy, discussed beam weapons with them, and is known, is an institution in Argentina; it's a very live process in that country today which matches and mixes with their own tradition of Hamiltonian nationalism.

So Mexico, where LaRouche is—he's almost a folkloric hero in Mexico, because his relationship with President [Jose] Lopez Portillo back in 1982 was absolutely essential for laying out the parameters for the kind of development which Mexico also requires. Mexico, too, has had a U.S.-constitutional basis for its policies in many periods of history, including Lopez Portillo, and, interestingly enough, in this recent period coming off the BRICS meetings, Mexico, despite its unfortunate proximity to the United States—when Obama is President, which limits their ability to do a whole lot—Mexico had signed on to a series of deals with China for high-speed rail, for a rail line crossing the isthmus of Tehuantepec where Mexico narrows, for a series of projects. That, unfortunately, was cancelled because the Mexican President was subject to massive pressure, first from Obama's White House—we know this as a fact—and then, secondly, just a few weeks back, he was invited to London, where he spent some time having a banquet with the queen, he rode in the gilded carriage of the queen (we don't know what happened inside, I shudder to think about it), and he emerged from this process of being browbeaten and having his arms broken, cancelling the deals with China and reasserting a commitment to the United Kingdom to let *them* come in and exploit Mexico's oil.

This is bad, but it's not the worst thing in the world, because the world is changing; this is not going to stick, because Mexico has a tradition, the avalanche is under way, and LaRouche's ideas are out there in Mexico in a prominent way. The avalanche depends on leadership—there always has to be leadership to channel the thing; it depends on this global process; and it depends on the meltdown of the system that's going on, and that is occurring.

Let me conclude, just to give you an idea of how scared people are of LaRouche's ideas, in Mexico as in all of Ibero-America, because it is this which is dragging the continent along with the BRICS process. The LaRouche organisation in Mexico, which is the equivalent of the CEC, but in Mexico—they don't have a big electoral capability as you have there, but long years of presence in Mexico—it's

called the Mocila, the LaRouche Citizens Movement of Mexico. Our members there were recently permanently barred from entering the Congress of Mexico, because they were accused of disrupting meetings in the Congress. What actually happened was that at a meeting of GLOBE International, which is a legislators' group run by the British—GLOBE, pushing green policies for Mexico, had a forum there. They hired private security, inside the Congress of Mexico, which is a violation of law, and when a couple of our women members in Mexico stood up to denounce Malthusianism and the “green economy”, three members—all women—were beaten up by these goons hired by GLOBE. We were then accused of disruption.

GLOBE then proclaimed bankruptcy, ran out on their debt to Mexican Congressmen, made the Mexican Congress pay for it, and then forced Mexican Congressmen to ban our organisation from setting foot inside the Mexican Congress. Now some may say, “Well that just shows, you know, they're very powerful.” I think it shows that they're very weak. I think they are completely terrified, the British are completely terrified of the process under way globally which in Ibero-America is moving forward very, very rapidly, and I think we can very much look forward to a period immediately ahead where that same kind of process is going to be repeated in Europe. Then, getting rid of Obama, the way is cleared to the kind of transformation, globally, which is required. So I'll leave my remarks at that, and if there are still a few minutes left I'm more than willing to answer some questions.

Craig Isherwood: Okay, I wanted you to know, because I think we were muted with the microphones, that when you talked about the avalanche sweeping the British Empire away, there was a roar and a cheer in the crowd here. Just so you know that we're of one mind, alright?

Dennis Small: Alright! Alright.

Craig Isherwood: Okay! I'll ask Oliver to ask you a question.

Oliver Carter: My friend, I see Australia's missing out on the World Land-Bridge. It's obviously because of deep water. Now, why hasn't someone come up with a solution for this? I suggest we could connect in with that Land-Bridge, and we should. It can be done, I believe, by submerged pontoons holding a tube through which a train could run. I leave it over to you whether you think it possible. Thank you.

Dennis Small: Well I'm certainly no expert in submerged pontoon technology, but I agree with you: anything is possible, so long as we set our minds to it, and that it's coherent with what needs to be done and can be done. It's absolutely possible to do. There are all sorts of technologies and capabilities that simply need to be developed, all of which have been held back because the intention of the British, as you're well aware, is to make sure that those things never occur. So why should a little water, even salty water, be an obstacle to the complete integration of Australia into the World Land-Bridge?

In point of fact though, if you look at it from an even higher standpoint, we have the World Land-Bridge. We have the Maritime Silk Road as well. But the real road of the future, the real transport corridor of the future, is to outer space, is to the solar system. And Australia is as close or as far as Russia or China, or the United

States, or Argentina or Zimbabwe, to the Moon and to Mars. And that's the true highway of the future, that's where man must go. To do that, the most important kind of unity is that of the sort that we are constructing here today, and the political movement which we're building internationally. That will make it possible to solve all of these problems. Water? It's really not that big a deal. I'm sure we can work a way around it, and some engineers who have studied this matter will come up with a viable solution.

Jim Hazzard: Dennis, what's happened to the LaRouche organisation in Argentina? And is this dangerous, for Argentina not to have a LaRouche organisation there to protect the country in the way that the CEC is protecting Australia?

Dennis Small: It's a very good point, and, as you know, when you take the kind of leadership role that Mr LaRouche has taken—and just to emphasise the point I was trying to get at in my remarks, in all of these processes, they don't work without leadership—you can have all the collapse that you want, you can have all of the general tendency that you want, but if you don't have the actual leadership, whether it's of nations, even small nations, or individual leaders within them, to chart the way and to provide the answers and to have the courage to act on them, then things don't happen. Things that should happen and can happen, don't happen.

That's one of the reasons I think Mr LaRouche has been emphasising the case of Joan of Arc so emphatically in the recent period. It is simply the way the world has actually worked. That *is* man's nature. In the case of Argentina, as in every country around the world, we were subjected to operations organised by enemy forces—the British Empire, by the Obama White House, and others—and it led to a situation where the people who were associated with our organisation there thought that it would be wiser to separate themselves from the international LaRouche organisation, that they would do their own home-grown version of things. That, of course, never works, and in fact that's a seed-bed for exactly what the enemy wants to do. So the long and the short of it is that our small but very feisty organisation in Argentina was damaged. We do not have members in Argentina at this point. We will at some point in the future, of that I'm quite confident, because Lyndon LaRouche has an absolutely enormous influence institutionally and with a following in that country. We still have many people, hundreds of people, in very important positions, who know LaRouche, who follow him.

I think the second part of what you're asking is very important, because the reason that this was done, among other things, was to try to blind-side the Argentine government as to what was going on internationally. Because the LaRouche movement always provides, whether large or small, that view into the totality of the international situation, which patriotic and nationalist forces need. If they don't have that, they may have every desire to fight, they may be totally willing to fight, but they won't know whom they're fighting! They won't know what the enemy is actually up to. They won't know what the flanks are and how to hit him on his weak side. So that effort to blind Argentina, precisely moving into this international situation, was, I think, part of the intention of what was done. Needless to say, knowing that that was their intention, we're doing various things to make sure that they do not succeed in

that objective, and to make sure that Argentina is not blind-sided. I think that the integration of Argentina with the BRICS, and especially some of their relations in Europe at this point, are quite significant, and we do know that they follow what Mr LaRouche does very closely—just not as directly as it ought to be. So that’s about all I want to say about that, to not go into details that shouldn’t be put out publicly.

Alen Praporski: I’m part of an organisation called Fair Money Australia, which is a brand-new organisation. It deals with the way money works in society. My question is about the National Banking that you’re talking about, and I applaud that decision, because from what I understand, that talks about money being created by the sovereign state with no debt attached, and that’s all fine. And that will be used, as I believe, to do all these magnificent projects, which is amazing. That’s why I’m here! My question is, what happens with the privately-owned banks and their right to create money in society, as it is now?

Dennis Small: Private banks should have no right to create money. They unfortunately do, it’s true, but they should have no right to create money, because money—first of all, money doesn’t really exist in any real way, it’s just a convenience. It’s always important, when you’re analysing an economy, to not start from money. Start from the physical-economic reality: we are a species which has a characteristic way of reproducing itself within nature, as all species do. Our characteristic way of reproducing ourselves is by developing our creative capabilities to master science and classical culture, so that by constantly advancing we actually change our own species-nature. In other words, we’re the only species whose species-nature is to change itself in its characteristic, and we do that through mental activity, through creativity.

That’s the fundamental point of economics, not money. Because that being the case, the crucial question is: How do you organise and foster such creative activity, such that the physical economy prospers to be able to maintain an ever-growing potential relative population density, which is the metric, the moving metric, which LaRouche has designed to discuss a physical economy. And that’s the crucial question.

If you do that, then the issue of money just falls into place. You don’t have a financial system, you need a credit system, in which certain instruments, financial instruments, are created and used by sovereign nation-states—not by individuals—for the purpose of fostering the creative development of the productive powers of labour. Within that context, of a state performing that function for the betterment of the common good of the population, you then have the institutions—the financial institutions—which are organised downwards from that overriding principle.

And therefore, in a situation like today, where you have two quadrillion dollars in financial assets that are backed by absolutely nothing other than the threat of thermonuclear war; two quadrillion dollars that is growing at a rate like a cancer, while the physical economy is collapsing, the solution is really fairly self-evident: you wipe out that two quadrillion dollars, and you create a credit system on a Hamiltonian basis, which answers to the physical-economic needs—that is to say, will foster the

creative development of every single human being on the planet. And that's the way to deal with this thing.

Wall Street? It clearly has no reason to exist! I mean, Wall Street the address has a reason to exist, it's actually a very interesting place to visit. There are buildings, there's some statues. If you like American hot dogs, they have good hot dog stands down on Wall Street in New York City. I mean, I don't have a problem with Wall Street as a street, I have a problem with Wall Street as the centre of the U.S. side of the British Empire's banking system. *That's gotta go!* (For the good of the hot dogs, as well as the people.)

Craig Isherwood: Thanks very much, Dennis, I think that was a good note to leave it on. Saving hot dogs and getting rid of the British Empire! Thank you.

Dennis Small: My pleasure.