

# **Hele menneskeheden behøver Den Nye Silkevej nu! LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast 11. marts 2016**

Engelsk udskrift: Matthew Ogden kommenterer Helga Zepp-LaRouches besøg og tale i Indien om behovet for en Marshallplan/Silkevej i Sydvestasien; Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches meget skarpe kommentar om EU's korrupte aftale med Tyrkiets Erdogan om mod betaling at tage syriske flygtninge tilbage, og Jason Ross fra LPAC Videnskabsteam taler om Gottfried Leibniz og nødvendigheden af kreativ nytænkning, som Kina i dag legemliggør.

**WE NEED THE NEW SILK ROAD NOW FOR ALL OF MANKIND! –**

International Webcast for March 11, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon. It's March 11, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday night broadcast from LaRouche PAC.com. I am joined in the studio

today by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science Team and Mr. Jeff Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and the three of us had the opportunity to have an extensive discussion

with both Mr. LaRouche and also Helga Zepp-LaRouche earlier today.

Now, as you know, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just recently returned from an extraordinary trip that she took to India. This

is the first time that either one of the LaRouches has been to India since I think at least 2003; so this was a very

important

trip, and during that visit to India, Helga was a featured speaker on one of the keynote panels at a discussion in New Delhi

called the Raisina Dialogue Forum. This was a major conference which included international representation, former prime ministers, former heads of state, finance ministers, elected parliamentarians, and so forth.

Now during that speech, Helga LaRouche focused her remarks on the necessity for a new win-win, Marshall Plan development project for the Middle East and North Africa. She remarked that,

in the wake of Xi Jinping's visit to Iran, to Saudi Arabia, and

to Egypt where he brought the development vision of the Chinese

New Silk Road, that now was the time to adopt what she's been calling for, for years: which is, a New Marshall Plan to develop

that region of the world and to create a new era of peace and prosperity for a region of the world that has suffered so much under perpetual war, and a total breakdown of society.

Now this is very relevant, because obviously, as a representative of the Schiller Institute from Germany, Helga LaRouche was speaking directly from the standpoint of the perspective of a European, who is witnessing the unprecedented refugee crisis of millions and millions of refugees fleeing the

Middle East and North Africa, and flooding into Europe.

Our institutional question for this week actually focusses directly on that topic, and what I'm going to do is read the institutional question, and then give Jeff Steinberg and opportunity to go through, both specifically and more in general,

what both Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche's remarks were concerning this question, and some broader questions as well.

So the question is as follows:

*"Mr. LaRouche, German Chancellor Angela Merkel has blamed European nations for unilaterally shutting the Balkan route for migrants. She said that this has put Greece in a very difficult situation, and such decisions should be taken by the whole of the EU. Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, and non-EU member states – Serbia and Macedonia – have all acted to stem the migrant flow. The European Union and Turkey – from which migrants reach Greece – have set out a plan to ease the crisis from their perspective. Under the proposals that have been hammered out at a summit that occurred in Brussels on Monday, but still to be finalized, all migrants arriving in Greece from Turkey, would be sent back. For each Syrian returned, a Syrian in Turkey would be resettled in the EU. European Council President Donald Tusk has said that the plan would spell the end of 'irregular migration to Europe.' What is your view on the EU's new migrant policy?"*

So, Jeff.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: To put it very mildly, Mr. LaRouche was extremely blunt. You've got to start from the standpoint that this is a rotten deal; it's not going to work. And furthermore, that nobody has any business making any kind of backroom deal with President Erdogan of Turkey. Here's somebody who has been a principal sponsor of the jihadist terrorism, including the Islamic State and the Nusra Front; who has robbed his country blind; he's one of the most notorious thieves on the planet. He's killed his own people. He shut down the entire opposition newspaper, and, quite frankly, he's carried out a 6 billion

euro

extortion operation against the European Union.

So the problem, in fact the disease that we're dealing with, is the tendency that's rampant in the entire trans-Atlantic world, to make these kinds of rotten deals with people who have

no business being allowed to remain in power. You have an entire

trans-Atlantic system that was really, in effect, characterized

this week by two developments. Number One: this rotten deal with

Erdogan, which should never be allowed to happen. And number two,

by the announcement by the European Central Bank head, Mario Draghi, that the ECB was going to replicate the insane policies

that were carried out in the United States under the Quantitative

Easing, bail-out, and Dodd-Frank bill, all of which are universally known to have been complete and total failures.

So,

Draghi announced zero interest rates, and announced that the QE

policy of the ECB would be extended up to \$80 billion euro a month, and furthermore, that the ECB would begin purchasing absolutely worthless private sector bonds to keep what one columnist called the "zombie banks" in business.

Now, there's been an absolute revolt in Germany, in particular, against this Draghi policy, because the net effect is

that, with zero interest rates, people are going to be pulling their money out of the actual savings banks and regional commercial banks, through which all of the lending into the real

economy takes place. And as the result of that, you're going to

see rampant bankruptcies on top of the already advanced complete

breakdown of the European real economy. All of the European too-big-to-fail banks are already hopelessly bankrupt.

So you've got these two examples of absolute policy insanity, of attempting to operate and make compromises and "reforms," within a system that is already dead. As Mr. LaRouche

said, you don't make deals with dead people; there's nothing in

it for you. There's no future in it. Yet that's exactly what we're seeing as the dominant phenomenon throughout the trans-Atlantic region.

Now the fact of the matter is that there are viable solutions. In the case of the United States, you could just simply say, the Wall Street debt is unpayable, and we're going to

just simply cancel it, and we're going to go back to the traditional American, Hamiltonian credit system, and we're going

to just simply let Wall Street sink, period. It's already bankrupt. The people involved in it are absolutely correct – they should have been frog-marched off to jail a long time ago.

So, by and large, when you talk to people in the political system at a relatively high level, you're dealing with a system

that is absolutely paralyzed with fear, and overwhelmed by corruption. Because you press the issue, and you'll get widespread admission that the system is doomed, we're headed for

another blow-out far worse than 2008; it could happen any moment

now. It could happen Monday morning when you wake up. And furthermore, you could cancel this rotten debt, wipe out those cancerous aspects of the whole system, and you could go ahead to

rebuild, but based on a completely different set of premises. Same thing with the arrangement with Turkey. There's no grounds whatsoever for paying 6 billion euros in extortion, knowing that a character like Erdogan is going to come back again

and again and demand more, and will continue to threaten to unleash massive waves of migration, while at the same time Turkey

is trying to sabotage the efforts of Lavrov and Kerry to bring an

end to this five-year monstrosity of a war that's been going on

inside Syria.

So, if you operate within a dead system, you are doomed to go down with it. Now there are things that are working in the world today. Putin is functioning. Putin is carrying out very effective flanking operations in Syria. China is functioning, and

is in fact functioning at a much higher level from the standpoint

of real economic growth. And China is willing to invest in real

physical economic growth all across Eurasia, down into Africa, into Latin America. And furthermore, China is leading a global science driver policy. The plans to actually land an orbiter on

the dark side of the Moon have been discussed frequently in recent weeks on this broadcast. China is now the leading R&D nation on the planet, and they embody the principle of human creativity. They're not trying to draw deductive, pragmatic, practical conclusions from policies that have failed. You can never derive success by trying to scrutinize and analyze systematic failure. You need human creativity, and you see that

in China.

Increasingly, there are nations that are grouping around these opportunities that are posed for real development,

centered  
around China. Russia has taken certain measures to assure that  
Russia survives, and that Russia has the military and material  
resources to be able to conduct the kind of flanking  
operations  
that may very well save Syria and the Middle East, and major  
parts of Africa, from the genocidal destruction that will  
occur  
if the existing trans-Atlantic forces, led by the British  
Empire  
and stooges that they've got at their disposal like President  
Obama, with his Dodd-Frank madness; like Mario Draghi; like  
the  
corrupt Erdogan.  
So, anytime that there's an offer to make a rotten deal with  
a rotten SOB like Erdogan, the obvious answer should be, run  
in  
the other direction. Don't do it. And so, in response to the  
question that's been posed, this is a rotten deal that is  
doomed  
to failure, but it's typical of a much larger problem, which  
is  
the tendency to be stuck thinking inside the deductive box  
when  
the only avenue for survival for mankind is to think  
creatively,  
and align with those people who've demonstrated that they've  
got  
a viable commitment to the future.  
You find that in China. You find that in many of the actions  
taken by Putin in Russia, and it's pretty scarce everywhere  
else.  
And it's certainly virtually nonexistent in the entire  
trans-Atlantic region.

**OGDEN:** Thank you very much, Jeff. I also neglected to  
mention in my remarks in the beginning that, coinciding with

Helga's trip to India and these very important developments with  
Xi Jinping's visit to the Middle East. The Arabic version of the  
EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the New  
Land-Bridge," which was available in English and also has been  
translated into Chinese; has now been translated into Arabic.  
And  
I think Helga LaRouche's foreword or preface to that will put it  
very appropriately; that "either this is an extraordinary  
coincidence or an act of divine intervention" that this would  
be  
available at a time like this, when this is precisely what you  
need. This sort of vision for a new Marshall Plan, the World  
Land-Bridge, to bring development to this part of the world  
which  
is in such dire need of it.  
Now, as Jeff summarized quite succinctly, what Mr.  
LaRouche's focus in our discussion was, is that we are on the  
edge of a total implosion of the trans-Atlantic system. That  
you  
have a community of nations which is, in its present form,  
dead,  
because of its own behavior; it has brought this upon itself.  
On  
the other hand, you have nations such as China and others, who  
are engaged in a process of real physical economic progress.  
And  
this was a willful choice that was made by China to invest in  
exactly the types of things that would create a future  
potential  
of growth, scientific development and otherwise. So, Mr.  
LaRouche's question was, why would you associate yourself with  
a  
dead system, when the alternative is immediately at hand?  
So, Mr. LaRouche had a much more developed idea, however, of



what it is that brings success to a nation and to the human race in general. And he was very specific to say that real creativity is never a replication of the past; real creativity depends on new ideas that are new in a very real sense. That creativity is always {ad novo}, he said; and it's not achieved through the reform of a bad system. But it is only achieved through the introduction of an entirely new principle which is truly new. He said, Einstein is a good example of this; the personality of Brunelleschi is an ideal example of this. But the goal is never to deduce what the solution to a crisis must be from some sort of precedent; but rather, to ask the question, "What is it that we actually wish to accomplish for the future of mankind?" And, with that question in mind, therefore, what must be done? What must be done to achieve that future? And we tend to fail to ask that question, and we get too consumed by the details of the present; when we should be thinking from a total global standpoint about what we wish to achieve in the future.

Now, I think at a time like now, where it's very clear that the nations of Europe and the United States are imploding, socially, economically, politically; what brought us to this point? But also, more significantly, what must be done to save civilization now? And we discussed, I think very appropriately, that when a nation loses its {raison d'être}, when a nation loses its mission, it tends to implode and fall in upon itself. And

we

can learn a lot from the mission that China has, and the optimistic vision of the future which is shared by all of its citizens. So, with that said, I would like to invite Jason to come to the podium. As you know, Jason Ross has been conducting a

many-part series of presentations, classes on the LaRouche PAC website on the unique genius of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz; this

is a series which will continue. But I would like to invite him

to the podium now.

JASON ROSS: Well, this year, 2016, is the 300th anniversary of Leibniz's death in 1716. Leibniz lived from 1646 to 1716. And

a number of the disputes that he was in, the discoveries that he

made, are very freshly relevant for us today. Both historically

from the standpoint of understanding where we came from, and because there are disputes that continue to the present. Disputes

over the nature of the purpose of the nation, disputes over the

nature of the Universe, disputes over the nature of mankind.

To discuss one of those, I'd like to frame it by contrasting the views of Gottfried Leibniz and Isaac Newton. Many people are

probably familiar, certainly if you've been watching this website, with the concept of the dispute over the calculus. That

Leibniz plagiarized the calculus from Newton, as Newton and his

friends said; no. Did Newton steal the calculus from Leibniz, who

invented it first? Let's leave that aside; that's really not

at

issue for what I want to talk about today. Let's consider the dispute that was represented between the British outlook of Newton and the outlook of Leibniz in terms of the purpose for humanity, as seen in their views of creation and of the Universe

as a whole. In the very last years of Leibniz's life, he was engaged in a dispute via letters with a follower of Isaac Newton,

Samuel Clarke. And in this discussion, one of the primary topics

that came up was the basis of considering God to be great. On this, the two differed in a very fundamental way. Newton, via Clarke, said that God's greatness came from his power; Leibniz,

while not disputing that, said that God's wisdom is also one of

His perfections, and that in leaving this out, you have a total

misunderstanding about God.

Now, I'm not going to make a theological point about this today. I want to look at this in terms of the existence of the nation-state. While Newton said that because God can do anything,

that shows how wonderful He is; and while this same outlook – a

religious outlook – was applied to man and society by John Locke

and Thomas Hobbes, who said that a powerful ruler of society really exists for himself, and that people form a society through

a compact to not infringe upon each other, not with the idea to

have a mission together, but simply to get along as a way of putting under control the impulses of people to steal from each

other and this sort of thing. So, on the one side, you have

the  
notion that the state exists, the ruler exists and is  
justified  
in existing to maintain power; that that is the basis of  
legitimacy of a ruler – holding power. It's a somewhat  
circular  
reason.

On the other side, you have Leibniz, who – in keeping with  
his view of God being worth reverencing, respecting, loving  
because of His wisdom; and having chosen in making the  
Universe,  
to make it the best of all possible universes that could be  
created. Leibniz applies that idea as well to society; saying  
that the justification, the legitimacy for a ruler for a  
nation,  
lies in how it is creating a happy society. And how it is  
imbuing  
its people with wisdom, and developing science and economy to  
create a more productive and a happier future. Happiness is an  
important thing.

So, if you consider that today, and you look at – Matt had  
brought up where is the {raison d'être}; what is the  
justification for the United States, for example, right now?  
What  
is our {raison d'être} right now under Obama? We don't have  
one.

Obama's destruction of the space program, which as a policy  
better encapsulates an attack on the future than anything you  
can  
imagine, has left us without a future in the stars; contrasted  
with other nations, being led by China, with a serious,  
comprehensive, really breath-taking mission of advancements  
that  
they have been making towards reaching out into the heavens,  
and  
the potential of developing new scientific breakthroughs in  
that

way.

So, as Jeff and Matt said, LaRouche, in the discussion that we had with him today, was stressing that, in creating the future, it is made {de novo}; it isn't something we deduce from

the past, although we can certainly learn from the past. The essential characteristic is making something where nothing of that sort existed before. He had singled out Brunelleschi and Einstein in this regard. Einstein, who made breakthroughs scientifically that did not follow from, or result from, the thoughts of his day; but rather, contradicted and overthrew them.

This is an example of the kind of thinking that's necessary. In

the United States in our most recent history, the time under the

Apollo program, as launched in its strength by Kennedy to go to

the Moon and back; this was in recent times, probably the most singly powerful example of a potential to reach that. That program didn't result in Einstein's per se; it didn't have that

kind of effect. Amazing technological developments were made. The

potentials that the space program has as a whole to make new scientific breakthroughs, however, is absolutely tremendous. So, consider China. China, which has brought hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in just the past few decades.

China, which currently lends out more internationally in investments in nations than the whole World Bank does. China, which has played a major role along with Russia in setting up the

BRICS; the Shanghai Cooperation Organization for Peace and Stability; the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, to address

the \$5 trillion or more needs for infrastructure within that

region of the world; offering loans that are without the conditionalities that are the hallmark of the World Bank. This ability to put into very specific practice a concept of “win-win”

cooperation, as it was put by President Xi; these specific ways

of cooperating with neighbors, with other nations for development

projects. As for example, the railroad operating in Ethiopia at

present, allowing the transport of food to the interior of the nation in a timely fashion; preventing the intensity of starvation that would otherwise be likely given the agricultural

disasters they’ve faced recently.

Take a look at space and science. China’s East Tokamak, a super-conducting tokamak, recently had a 50 million-degree plasma

held for 100 seconds; a breakthrough for them on their way towards developing fusion. Their space program – that was the first soft landing on the Moon in decades – the Chang’e 3 with the Yutu rover. Planning to come out next year, Chang’e 5, a sample return mission to the Moon; again, the first time in decades, and they’ll be only the third nation to have done this.

And then in a few years, a space first – not only for them, but

for the world – the Chang’e 4 mission, to land on the far side of the Moon. The first time ever; this is something new that mankind has never done before. It opens up new windows scientifically in terms of the potential the far side of the Moon

offers for different types of telescopes – such as radio telescopes. They’ll be able to show us things that no other – it’s the most convenient place to be able to do these things. It

simply is impossible from here on Earth, or in orbit; you need

a  
body to place these things on.  
So, I think when we think about what's the purpose of a  
nation, it can't be a short-term survival; it certainly can't  
be  
dominance per se, or maintaining a place in the world. For  
example, the United States; there's an unfortunate form of  
thought that the United States should be first in everything.  
Well, how did the United States become such a powerful nation?  
The policies that made that possible, the outlook that made  
that  
possible, the sense coming from the American Revolution that  
there's a mission for the nation that is beyond having  
sovereignty itself, per se; but lies in a mission for  
development  
and for the pursuit of happiness – as it's put – that's the  
concept that has to guide us today. Now, if we were to adopt  
this  
in the United States, which we must, as we force the adoption  
of  
this policy in our own nation, we have the potential for the  
US  
to play a very important role among other nations  
internationally  
in reaching these objectives. And there's really no reason for  
conflict among nations; it's simply not necessary at this  
point.  
There might be some specific examples, but on the whole, by  
throwing out the British-led creation of conflicts, and  
putting  
the US on a path towards cooperation, participation, and  
leadership on these sorts of ventures, we can regain in terms  
of  
history, the right to exist, or reason for existing; a mission  
for the nation.  
So, if we're going to turn around our domestic conditions,  
as we see frighteningly in the dramatic rise in deaths by drug

overdoses or suicides in other forms that are increasing dramatically; if we're going to do this, we have to have a mission.

We have to have a vision for the kind of future that we're going

to make that doesn't exist at present. The opportunities for this

exist; there are plenty of the particular policies that are needed. These things are known. What is necessary is a demand and

a change in direction in the United States without Obama, to adopt this orientation as our own. And if we do that, we can look

to the future with the knowledge that there is a reason for the

existence of the nation; and there's a purpose to be fulfilled,

and that we're taking up that purpose in our future which lies beyond the Earth and out in the stars.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. And I think we can use that as a promotional to encourage you to tune in to all of his

classes, which are available and will continue to be available on

larouchepac.com. And I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us here

as well, today. So, that's what we have to present to you here today; short and sweet. And we thank you for tuning in; and we encourage you to please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.