

**USA og Europa må gå sammen med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig**

**– Den Europæiske Union er færdig, med eller uden briterne**

*Jeg vil begynde direkte med at diskutere den meget dystre trussel om en international konflikt, der nu er ved at rejse sig, især fra den krudttønde, der udgøres af Syrien, Nordafrika og Mellemøsten. Det syriske område, hvor, på trods af den fælles indsats fra udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov for at finde fælles fodslag, så truer Obamas afvisning af at give Saudi Arabien og Tyrkiet besked på at trække sig med at få det hele til at eksplodere.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 19. februar 2016:**

# **USA og Europa må samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig**

*Faren for en massiv, endnu større strøm af flygtninge, der kommer fra Afrika og ind i Europa, så vel som også den fortsatte krise centreret omkring Mellemøsten, betyder således, at Europa er absolut dømt til undergang, med mindre der finder et fundamentalt skifte i politikken sted. Og dette betyder, at USA og Europa indledningsvis må række hånden frem mod Rusland og Kina.*

Engelsk Udskrift.

## **US & EUROPE MUST REACH OUT TO RUSSIA & CHINA TO AVOID WAR**

International LaRouche PAC Webcast

Friday, February 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's February 19, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly, Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac.com

I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC science team, and we're joined via video, from a remote location, by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence

Review. The three of us, along with several others, had a chance

to have a discussion earlier today with both Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, so what you're about to hear will be informed by

that discussion.

Now, I'm going to just start right off the bat with a discussion of the very dire threat of an international conflict

arising, especially from the powderkeg of Syria, Northern

Africa, and the Middle East. The area of Syria, where, despite the efforts of Secretary John Kerry to find common ground with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Obama's refusal to tell Saudi Arabia and Turkey to stand down is threatening to blow this entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert Parry, the editor of that publication, in which he says the risk that the multi-sided Syrian war could spark World War III, continues, as Turkey and U.S. neo-cons seek an invasion that could kill Russian troops, and possibly escalate the Syrian crisis into a nuclear showdown.

What Robert Parry says in this article is that Barack Obama took questions from reporters on Tuesday, but he did not take the one that needed to be asked: which was whether he had forbidden Turkey and Saudi Arabia to invade Syria, because on that question could hinge whether the ugly Syrian civil war could spin off into World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in a strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the point of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff. So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many more of the details, and then we'll come back to our

institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also answer. So, Jeff?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Matt. Well, as we were going through the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he actually drew a distinction between the bluff, and what he said

much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia

are up to. It's folly because they are caught in their own madness, and don't even realize the consequences of what they're

doing in the real world. They don't have the capability to carry

out the kind of provocations that they are threatening, and the

danger, of course, is that that does not mean that they're not going to try to do it.

Putin stepped into the Syria situation at a critical moment last September, and the entire situation has shifted radically since that point. The Russian intention is {not} to simply accomplish a military victory on behalf of the forces of President Assad. They're creating the conditions to force the intransigents, in this case Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, some of

the other Gulf states, and always lurking in the background when

you're dealing with Saudi Arabia and the Muslim Brotherhood is the British. So, Putin has established a clear sense of control

over the situation. Undoubtedly part of Putin's configuration is

that Obama has been greatly weakened by the actions of Russia; on

the economic sphere, the actions of China; and there are sane military forces in the United States who recognize the folly of

what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see

nothing  
but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on  
the  
verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place  
where  
you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course  
Asia  
and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but  
relative  
to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and  
in  
the United States, we see a disintegration of the political  
and  
economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of  
course,  
Africa has been on the target list of the British and other  
European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time.  
But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and  
growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment  
of  
geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has  
called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis  
in  
Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire  
European  
financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly  
bankrupt  
under the present conditions and terms of thinking that  
dominate  
Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning  
to  
see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of  
the  
people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in  
the first place.  
So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance  
minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the

destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself, now saying there must be a Marshall Plan to rebuild Syria, to rebuild other parts of the Middle East, and only on the basis of a Marshall Plan, which gives people a clear incentive to go back to their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what applies to the Middle East applies doubly for Africa, where the U.S.-British-French overthrow of Qaddafi unleashed absolute hell throughout the African continent.

And so the danger of a massive, even larger flow of refugees coming out of Africa into Europe, as well as the continuing crisis centered in the Middle East, means that Europe is absolutely doomed unless there is a fundamental change in policy.

And for starters, that change means that the United States and Europe must reach out to Russia and China. You had the recent visit by President Xi Jinping of China to Saudi Arabia, to Iran, and to Egypt, and what Xi Jinping made very clear is that China is prepared to move towards the building of the Silk Road infrastructure, the New Silk Road land route, the Maritime Silk Route, which will come up through the newly expanded Suez Canal – China will do that. In fact, just this week, the first freight train from Eastern China arrived in Iran, and this is part of the entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the cornerstone of their foreign policy.

So, they're presenting a win-win alternative. And in the case of Europe, there is no alternative. Europe is so politically

and psychologically bankrupt – the leadership of Europe is so bankrupt that China, through this Middle East development portion

of the One Belt, One Road policy, offers the only viable basis for this Marshall Plan idea to actually be put into practice. And

were it not for the Putin intervention, beginning last September,

we couldn't even be contemplating the possibility of that kind of

solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

Now, Mr. LaRouche emphasized in this context that Europe is completely gone; it's completely bankrupt, and there are solutions, but the present leadership is unprepared to consider

that kind of level of rethinking. In the United States, we're very close to the edge, but the United States {can} be saved and

the solution to the problems in the United States begins with removing President Barack Obama from office immediately, and moving to wipe out the thoroughly bankrupt Wall Street system. Because until that system is put through basically a bankruptcy

shutdown, then none of the viable and available solutions are going to be there. But, if you were to get rid of Obama, if you

were to wipe out Wall Street,—and, for example, immediately passage of Glass-Steagall would be one critical element for that

process to happen almost overnight – then we have a history in

the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a

real economy.

All of that means the United States coming into alignment with what we see going on with China, with Russia, with India, with others. In other words, the United States becomes part of a

genuine trans-Pacific collaboration, and under those circumstances, Europe itself would have no choice but to get on

with the program.

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries – you have clinical insanity and folly,

which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized,

Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary

actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of

their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only

way to solve this problem.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended

Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr.

LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent

poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week

will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough

to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released

by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns.

Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald

Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have

the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is

sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as

fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union

-

and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem.

So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union,

then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials

in Europe, even including Schäuble at the Davos Conference earlier this month, said that if the Schengen agreement, the open

borders agreement in Europe is broken, then the European Union will cease to exist. And already in Poland, in Hungary, in other

countries on the edge of Europe but within the European Union, they're already building those walls. So in effect, the European

Union, as it's presently constituted, is a dead letter; it really

doesn't exist. And the countries of Europe, either collectively

or individually, are going to have to come to face the reality that their banking system is thoroughly bankrupt; they've lost so

much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint

is no longer capable of self-reliance, self-preservation. So, the

whole thing is going under; and of course, there's a certain irony in the British threatening to leave the European Union, since the bankruptcy of the entire trans-Atlantic system is largely the result of policies that were created in London, and

were then spread about Europe and the United States. You could almost say that Europe was doomed from the moment that Margaret

Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy.

So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission, are tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes up with its own version of shutting down the City of London and Wall Street, a genuine full-scale Glass-Steagall separation of legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling, then Europe is completely doomed. And the only hope that they will have is that some sane future leaders, who emerge out of this political rubble, recognize before it's perhaps too late that aligning with China and Russia – which is exactly the opposite of the policies that are being pursued in Europe right now – is the only answer. So, I think that that's the context in which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part of that system of doom that's going to have to be changed in a much more fundamental – I'd say "revolutionary" – way. And the opportunities are there; they're presented there because Europe is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already established the rail links between central China and Germany. There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European

leaders are going to have abandon their folly. And that's a difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

OGDEN: Absolutely. And, let me just elaborate a little bit what Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized, which is that if you just look at the refugee crisis, for example, and the absolute breakdown of Europe to even absorb and handle this under the current economic conditions. This has pushed people to begin to

discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a

new program of economic development for the Middle East and North

Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan

for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche

emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating

underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry.

The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan, and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the

Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek a

better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this is

a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China

and Russia to develop the Middle East and North Africa along the Silk Road routes. This kind of cooperation between China and the rest of the world is what China is seeking in inviting the rest of the world to engage in; and this is the only way to solve the crises and shift the geometry overall which is creating the existential threat which is now being faced by Europe. Now, this new paradigm; this is exactly what we have been talking about for quite a while, but I think the foundation for a new paradigm cannot be seen as merely some sort of extension of former or present geopolitical ideas about how the world works. This is not merely a rearrangement of political and economic and strategic alliances between countries that would still be dominated by the same axiomatic world view which is what has brought us to this crisis point to begin with. Rather, there needs to be a true renaissance; a new calibration, a re-examination of what our view of mankind is. What our view of man as a species is, and what mankind's role within this galaxy and his relationship to the entire universe; and indeed, what his responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this universe must be. So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of the really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a

century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

JASON ROSS: Thanks. As I imagine everyone has heard by now, on September 14th of last year, a gravitational wave was detected

by the interferometer experiments that we had set up in Washington state and in Louisiana. Over a few months, that signal

was studied to make sure that that really was what had occurred;

and a paper was submitted in January and published in February announcing the news that a gravitational wave phenomenon representing the merging of two black holes had been detected. This meant that a change in space-time had been experienced in that detector; where maybe we don't know how the experiment worked.

Very briefly, two tracks at right angles to each other, allowed light to move up and down those tracks. Those tracks reach 4 kilometers long. Due to some very clever engineering, the

effect of length was 100 times that; and by the motion of these

gravity waves – meaning a change in the shape of space due to a

varying intensity of gravity due to these two black holes spinning around each other – the length of the two tracks varied

by an amount that was about 1/10 the diameter of a proton over a

track length of 4 kilometers. This is equivalent to the star nearest to us getting closer and further away by the width of a

hair. It's amazing that was actually able to be measured; that's

an astonishingly tiny change.

And it says something about the difficulties and why it's been – as Matt said – it's been a century since Einstein had proposed the existence of these gravity waves; and now they've been detected. So, the recent upgrades to these detectors here in

the US made this possible; there are other detectors around the

world. Some of them are being upgraded; new ones are being brought on line. There is a proposal for a space-based interferometry experiment – the Lisa experiment; which NASA had

been a part of, and has now left it to the European Space Agency,

currently scheduled to launch in 2034. Perhaps it'll be sent sooner than that, based on this news.

But what does all of this mean? What does it tell us about – what are the implications? Well for one thing, this means we really have an entirely new tool for looking at the universe that

we live in. All of our knowledge about the heavens beyond us, comes from sight, or various forms of sight. You can't smell a star, you can't taste it; you can't hear it, you can't fell it.

You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we learn

more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to Kepler

when he determined how the planets moved; the use of telescopes

in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen with

the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that see

what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes.

Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the

electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

side of the Moon, where China is going to be within just a few years sending a lander. The potential to do long wavelength

radio telescope work from that location; this represents something new.

But what we've got with this successful detection based on the change in space-time with the LIGO [Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory] experiments, this is something totally different. This is like bringing in a new sense all together. We've been seeing the universe; now we can probably hear it would be the best analogy. It represents a vibration, like the sound vibrations our ears are able to pick up. Only this

time, it's incredibly faint, and it's about space itself vibrating; that really is what it is. So, that's tremendously important.

On the history of this, it's important to keep in mind people are very excited about this; there's good reason to be, it's quite a development. But this can only indirectly be called

a scientific breakthrough; the science behind this – Einstein proposed this in 1916. He had some more thoughts and wrote another paper in 1918; some more discussion about it. Hypotheses

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to

model these types of things; all of that took place. But what could be called the fundamentally scientific change occurred 100

years ago with Einstein's theory of relativity; with gravity waves being one of the implications. Being able to detect them is

wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows

that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in

Einstein's time, certainly, or even a few decades ago. The development that we've made has been tremendous.

But I think it's fair to say this was not a scientific breakthrough in the real sense of science. It is a new sensation;

it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible,

we can compare it to the really awful influence of Bertrand Russell.

So, first on Einstein. We've got to recall that what Einstein did in laying out his revolutionary theories was not something that he derived; it wasn't something that he proved. It

wasn't something that he showed was true based on what was already known. What Einstein said about the universe contradicted

the Newtonian view of space and time that had become dominant. Einstein said that that simplistic view of space and time, which

went along somewhat intuitively with our senses, was in fact untrue; and that basic concepts like simultaneity, or knowing that two events happen at the same time, such a basic concept as

that. That there's one time that applies everywhere; Einstein showed that was untrue. That's a very unintuitive thought. The idea that space could have a shape to it; that's a very unintuitive thought. It's not suggested by appearances.

But what Einstein was doing was implementing a world outlook that goes back to Cusa – although I'm not going to talk about him right now – but to Leibniz and to Bernhard Riemann. If we consider the work of Leibniz, 1646-1716, the founder of physical

economy; there's plenty to say about him, and plenty will be

said on this website. One of the specific things that he looked at was in the world of physics, Leibniz's demonstration that there was no absolute space; that there was no absolute time. This was contrary to Descartes, Newton, and others. Leibniz said there's no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God, and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler. Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing that. Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or

wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include

those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power.

Now between the lines, what these two were also saying was a view of government and a view of society. Implicit in this is Leibniz's view that the legitimacy of a ruler or of government is

not simply from having gathered power; but from using it in a wise way to achieve good ends. That may seem a little bit far afield, but it's true; and this is part of the background on this

concept. That from the necessity for goodness came the nonexistence of absolute space; that's how Leibniz showed that.

He was right.

Bernhard Riemann, in 1854, delivered a presentation, wrote a paper on the shape of space. And Riemann said that since the time

of Euclid up to his time, no one had ever really taken on in a realistic way, what the basis of the shape of space is. That Euclid said things like the sum of the angles in a triangle are

180; Riemann said that may or may not be true. On a curved space,

for example, it's not true. The most important aspect is that Riemann didn't propose replacing Euclid with a similar geometry;

it's that he said that the basis of our understanding of space has to be the physical causes that make things occur within space. He was right; that was Einstein's approach. With relativity, he said that our understanding of space can't start

from a box; it has to start from physical principles that give rise to the effects in space, and to the relationship of objects

in space. So light, gravitation, these became the basis of space

for Einstein; and those concepts lie outside of space. They aren't geometrical concepts in the way Euclid's concepts were geometrical. Light is a real thing; gravity is a real principle.

So, Einstein, in following on this and implementing it, and developing his theories, developing his breakthroughs of relativity, created something that contradicted; he made a new hypothesis. To contrast that, let's look at the past 100 years.

We've now affirmed something that Einstein had proposed 100 years

ago; but where are the new Einsteins? Where are the new theories

that contradict? Where are the new concepts that don't follow from what we already know, but introduce fundamentally new principles? And more importantly, why is that not understood as

what science really is?

To say just a little bit about Bertrand Russell's role in all of that, LaRouche has called Russell the most evil man of the

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that.

Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

races, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

of. Proposing a scientific dictatorship, using murder to eliminate people who became intelligent and opposed the ruling class, keeping science secret from the majority of people; this

is some of the nice outlook that Russell had on things. He also,

in his own work as a "professional" you might say, worked on destroying the concept of science and turning it into mathematics. He did this before and after the year 1900; this is

somewhat earlier in his life, where he wanted to throw away what

Einstein ended up doing, which was creating a new concept that contradicted the past. And say instead, that every thought in the

future, will have to derive from thoughts in the past; that we can replace creativity with logic.

Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was

opposed to war, to conflict; especially to nuclear weapons. And,

included in that, technology itself; the concept that science is

dangerous, that perhaps science should be held back, because these technologies allow us to exterminate ourselves. The idea that the appropriate response to that would be to eliminate technologies, rather than to have a productive, future-oriented

basis for relations among nations. This really sprung up in a major way around anti-nuclear activism, of which Russell was a major proponent.

So, I think what we can reflect on, what we can take from the excitement around these gravitational findings, is that:

1)

it's an opportunity to really go back and really develop and understanding of who Einstein was. How did he think? Who was this

man, who a century ago, put forth the hypothesis that was detected in this way only this year. Who was Riemann? How did he

actually think? We can reflect on the opportunities that we have

for the use of these kinds of instruments to provide us an entirely new window to understanding the universe around us. Not

only are we seeing things in a different band, we're using a different sense all together. We're hearing the universe; we're

able to listen in on a completely different kind of physical process than the electromagnetic ones that are the basis of all

astronomy otherwise. Using light, radio waves, x-rays and that sort of thing. And I think it also demonstrates that the ability

to develop new technologies, to rise to a challenge, certainly exists. And we saw this in the Apollo program, which similarly,

going to the Moon itself did not involve as much new science as

it did new technologies, new social organizations to implement those technologies. Which we saw with some of the breakthroughs

of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational

waves. But we have to have grand objectives. I mentioned the LISA

experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar to

ones which did this recent detection, which NASA had been a major

player in and then pulled back on, as part of the Obama destruction of a national mission, a natural future. NASA, as the

leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

So, we have to have human objectives for the nation, for ourselves. We have to, as a nation, have objectives like what China's doing now; as represented by China's moves towards the Moon from the Helium-3 standpoint. From the sheer excitement of

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people are actually thinking about as citizens of this nation. "Wow! What are we going to send up there?" "What are we going to take to the Moon for the next trip?"

We've got a lot of objectives that have been defined that we have just been sitting on for decades. And if we eliminate the source of this culturally, the frankly unscientific view of science, this anti-human view of humanity, we can do great things. And we can do it by removing Obama and giving this nation a future-oriented mission again.

OGDEN: Well thank you very much, Jason. I think that's certainly exciting; the idea to be able to directly perceive changes in space-time itself. So, I'd like to thank Jason for his presentation, and I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us remotely today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

---

**Spanske Bankia skal  
tilbagebetale alle  
investorer,  
der er offer for 'bail-in',**

# **efter rettens afgørelse**

*17. februar 2016 – Den store spanske bankgruppe, Bankia, har meddelt, at de vil tilbagebetale de penge, som små investorer har tabt, i realiteten gennem tyveri; de små investorer, der købte aktier, som den spanske udlåner begyndte at udbyde på aktiebørsen i 2011. Mange tusinde husstande tabte betydelige summer – de blev offer for 'bail-in' (ekspropriering) efter den Cypern-model, der blev 'opfundet' af EU-kommissionen, efter, at man havde overbevist dem om, at de fik præferenceaktier i banken.*

Dette sker efter at Spaniens højesteret, i to retssager, der blev anlagt af sådanne investorer, afgjorde, at banken virkelig havde handlet svigagtigt og skal tilbagebetale pengene. Bankia indgik dernæst en aftale; den sagde, at investorer simpelt hen skulle indsende deres krav over for banken, og så ville pengene blive tilbagebetalt med 1 % i rente inden for 15 dage. Dette ville beløbe sig til totalt 1,8 mia. euro.

Bankia blev skabt gennem en sammenslutning af flere sparekasser i Caja-gruppen, der på det tidspunkt havde behov for en bail-out fra staten på 22 mia. euro.

---

## **Italiensk finansminister: Jeg er for Glass-Steagall, men det er EU ikke**

*13. februar 2016 – I et usædvanligt forløb sagde den italienske finansminister Gian Carlo Padoan i det italienske*

parlament den 4. februar, at hans regering går ind for en bankopdeling, men at andre EU-medlemsstater ikke gør det samme.

Padoan svarede på et spørgsmål fra senator Laura Bottici fra M5S-partiet (5-stjernebevægelsen) om, hvorvidt "regeringen ikke mener, det er afgørende vigtigt at gå frem så hurtigt som muligt imod en klar adskillelse mellem investeringsbanker og kommercielle banker, selv ved at komme de EU-reguleringer i forkøbet, der for indeværende diskuteres under retningslinje 43, 2014."

Bottici forklarede, "Denne adskillelse ville rent faktisk gøre det muligt at forebygge truslen om systemisk smitte, båret af krisen mellem indbyrdes forbundne banker, inklusive på grundlag af det faktum, at større banker beviseligt ikke altid er mere effektive, men at overdreven størrelse derimod, snarere end at nedsætte risici, har lagt større byrder på kreditinstitutioner.

"Adskillelse af bankaktiviteter ville gøre det muligt at beskytte almindelige menneskers opsparter bedre, medregnet den kendsgerning, at det ville eliminere interessekonflikter inden for kreditinstitutioner, der både indsamler opsparter og praktiserer investeringer, og ville dertil tilskynde mere til tildeling af ressourcer til realøkonomien, til ugunst for spekulative aktiviteter, der har været med til få finansielle markeder til at svulme op. En indsats for reguleringer er i gang i EU-kommissionen, men den har imidlertid mange smuthuller, der kunne neutralisere dens sigte."

Padoan svarede, "På det europæiske niveau, som den deputerede rejste i sit spørgsmål, diskuterer man en opdeling mellem investeringsbanker og kommercielle banker – hvilket i den ene eller anden form er blevet introduceret i andre lande uden for Eurozonen. Jeg må imidlertid sige, at en kortsigtet løsning ser ud til at være problematisk, fordi hver medlemsstat tenderer mod at forsvare nationale specificiteter, som ofte er

vanskelige at forlige.

"Indenfor disse rammer går Italien ind for, at der skelnes mellem roller i banksektoren, men i modsætning til andre lande er Italien også karakteriseret ved et mindre pres, fordi vores banker ikke har en relevant investeringsdel, og også af denne grund udgør en lavere risiko sammenlignet med andre lande."

Den italienske finansminister sagde med andre ord, at Rom-regeringen støtter et bankopdelings-regime, men at et sådant er umuligt inden for EU. Siden forskellen mellem opdeling og ikke-opdeling er lig med forskellen mellem overlevelse og selvmord, anviser Padoans udtalelse en klar kurs for handling for Italien: Ud af Eurozonen!

---

## **Fransk-tysk initiativ for skabelse af EU- Finansministerium**

8. februar 2016 – Præsidenterne for Frankrigs og Tysklands centralbanker, François Villeroy fra Banque de France og Jens Weidmann fra Bundesbank, har samtidigt i aviserne *Le Monde* og *Süddeutsche Zeitung* offentliggjort en fælles opfordring til skabelse af et Europæisk Finansministerium, der således ville gøre det af med den smule økonomisk suverænitet, medlemmerne af eurozonen har tilbage. Med denne udgivelse, der kommer blot en dag før det Fransk-tyske økonomi- og finansministerråds møde i Paris, og få dage før Ecofin-mødet for EU-rådet for økonomiske og finanzielle anliggender den 12. feb., insisterer de to på, at »eurozonens medlemslande klart må tillade et omfattende suverænitetsfællesskab og magtbeføjelser på

europæisk niveau«, som angiveligt skulle være »den mest ligefremme løsning til at genoprette tilliden i eurozonen«.

Deres forslag involverer etableringen af et reelt finansministerium for i det mindste eurozonen, men i sidste instans imidlertid for hele den Europæiske Union, og »en effektiv og mindre fragmenteret europæisk administration ... Disse nye institutioner ville genoprette balancen mellem ansvar og kontrol«.

*Süddeutsche Zeitung* tilføjer, at lignende, konkrete forslag er blevet fremlagt af medlem af Den europæiske Centralbanks direktion, Benoît Coeuré, at ECB-præsident Mario Draghi er sympatisk indstillet over for forslaget, og at der er sammenfald med forslag, der tidligere er fremlagt af den franske præsident François Hollande om skabelse af en Europæisk Økonomisk Regering for hele Europa. Den foreslæde overførsel af endnu mere suverænitet til »Europa« vil imidlertid med sikkerhed møde voldsom modstand i flere medlemslande, inklusive i den franske og tyske befolkning.

Deres opfordring, »Europa ved en korsvej«, er også udlagt på engelsk på Banque de Frances og Bundesbanks websider: [https://www.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user\\_upload/banque\\_de\\_france/La\\_Banque\\_de\\_France/Joint-Article-FVG-20160208.pdf](https://www.banque-france.fr/fileadmin/user_upload/banque_de_france/La_Banque_de_France/Joint-Article-FVG-20160208.pdf)

---

## **Suspendering af EU's stabilitetspagt for økonomisk**

# **bistand til Tyrkiet**

## **– danner præcedens for gennemførelse af Marshallplan**

2. februar, 2016 – EU-kommissionens præsident Jean-Claude Juncker bekræftede i går, at de 3 mia. Euro, der er blevet lovet til Tyrkiet, ikke vil blive regnet med som en del af donorlandenes underskuds-grænse.

Dette kom frem i forbindelse med den seneste kontrovers mellem den italienske regering og EU-kommissionen angående en suspendering af budgetreglerne, hvilket Italien havde forlangt til gengæld for de ekstra udgifter til indvandrerpolitikken – men som blev afvist i det italienske tilfælde.

Juncker sagde, at afgørelsen om, at stabilitetspagtens regler vil blive suspenderet for penge lovet til Tyrkiet, blev truffet og stadfæstet allerede sidste december. En talmand for kommissionen sagde imidlertid, at italienske anmodninger om at holde 0,2 % af dets nationalbudget uden for de samme regler, på grund af Italiens udgifter til landets eget rednings- og hjælpeprogram, vil blive gransket i detaljer "til næste forår".

Premierminister Matteo Renzi hævede stemmen som sædvanligt. "Vi Italienere mener, at indvandrere alle er lige. Det er ikke muligt at betragte de liv, der reddes i det Ægæiske Hav, som anderledes end dem, der reddes i det Tyrrhenske Hav. At udgifter til at redde børn, der sejler fra Tyrkiet til Grækenland, holdes uden for stabilitetspagten, er sluttelig en positiv kendsgerning. At betragte udgifter til at redde børn fra Eritrea, der kommer til Sicilien på anden vis, forekommer mig absurd og ulogisk. Kun en bureaukratisk perversion kan skelne mellem liv, der bør reddes.

"Vores job er at lede Europa, ikke at tage imod ordrer. Vi vil

yde vort bidrag til Tyrkiet. Hvis de [Bruxelles] ønsker at anlægge et søgsmål mod Italien, så lad dem."

Renzi blev hurtigt affejet af Manfred Weber, chef for den Europæiske Folkepartigruppe (EPP) i Europaparlamentet, der sagde, at "der er ikke mere plads til fleksibilitet", og at Renzi bør efterleve "europæiske forpligtelser."

Uafhængigt af resultatet af konfrontationen mellem Rom og Bruxelles/Strasbourg sætter afgørelsen om at holde de 3 mia. Euro til Tyrkiet uden for de berygtede budgetregler en præcedens, der kan bruges til at fremme ideen om en Marshall plan. Hvis det kan gøres én gang, kan det gøres igen, især, fordi midler, der er bevilget til produktive formål, vil skabe indkomster, der i det lange løb vil kompensere for underskuddet.

*Flygtninge fra Afrika med kurs mod Italien.*

---

## **Rødt flag for Deutsche Bank; Ny udløser for krise**

Februar, 1., 2016 – Deutsche Bank, den andenstørste i Europa med den største eksponering over for derivater i nogen bank i verden, er tæt på ikke at betale forfaldne beløb på en superrisikabel form for »bankkapital«, midt i tab på regnskabet til mange milliarder euro og enorme bøder for illegal aktivitet. Hastemøder mellem investorer og chefen for bankens bestyrelse finder sted, iflg. den tyske erhvervsavis *Handelsblatt* i dag.

De instrumenter, der er tale om, kaldes betingede konvertible obligationer ('contingent convertible bonds'), eller »co-co's«, der er så risikable, at ejerne ikke kan kalde manglende betalinger på dem for betalingsstandsning; betalinger på dem afhænger af bankens kapitalniveau. Deutsche Bank udstede blot 29. jan. en erklæring, hvor de sagde, at de »mener«, de kan erlægge deres co-co-betalinger, der nu forfalder. Men det gør ikke den store forskel, da der er klare beviser for, at bankens kapital er ved at bortsmelte i de massive tab, bøder og nye henlæggelser til retssager, som er nødvendiggjort af stadigt nye undersøgelser for kriminel aktivitet.

*Handelsblatt* kommenterede, at »sæden til bankens fallit er blevet sået«. Investorer mener, at banken har brug for en hurtig reorganisering for at overleve, og ikke den langsomme, som dens direktion forfølger. Chefen for en bestyrelse er blevet indkaldt til et slags hastemøde med store investorer/aktieindehavere, og kan blive bedt om at træde tilbage, som de to direktører allerede er.

Disse »co-co«-obligationer er ikke alene betingede – dvs., at betalinger på dem er betinget af bankens overordnede kapitalniveau – men er også konvertible – dvs., at, i en insolvenskrise konverteres de til egenkapital, lige som bail-in-obligationer, en egenkapital, der sandsynligvis er meget lidt eller intet værd.

De store, schweiziske banker, for at tage et eksempel, er fuldstændig proppet med »co-co's«; UBS og Credit Suisse har tilsammen for 18 milliarder schweizerfranc i sådanne udestående obligationer, og andre banker har promoveret dem som »den bedste værdi i bankobligationer« pga. deres højere rentesatser.

---

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:  
Kun en videnskabelig og  
kulturel renæssance kan  
standse den Mørke Tidsalder,  
der nu er ved at sænke  
sig over menneskeheden. Dansk  
udskrift**

(Zepp-LaRouche 32 min.)

*Kun, hvis man anvender en Marshallplan, en Silkevejs-Marshallplan i regionen, hvor alle disse lande ... arbejder sammen og siger: Vi vil tage hele området fra Kaukasus til den Persiske Golf, fra Afghanistan til Middelhavet, som ét område, og vi vil sætte en reel udvikling i gang. Vi erklærer ørkenen krig; vi skaber nyt vand! ... Så kan man udvikle landbrug. Man kan udvikle skovbrug. Man må bygge infrastruktur, der er lige så tæt som f.eks. i Tyskland. Tyskland er et perfekt eksempel på et*

*infrastrukturmessigt meget veludviklet land. Så kan man bygge nye byer, og man kan opbygge industrier.*

**GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid**

---

# **Grækenland revser depraveret EU-forslag om at gøre landet til oplagringstank for flygtninge, selv til gengæld for gældseftergivelse**

26. januar 2016 – I takt med de daglige rapporter om mænd, kvinder og børn, der drukner under turen fra Tyrkiet over Ægæerhavet til Grækenland, bliver det til overflod klart, at den Europæiske Union er ude af stand til at håndtere krisen. Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble gjorde ligeledes dette klart, da han opfordrede til en »koalition af villige« til gennemførelse af en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten – som EU er ude af stand til at gennemføre. Men kun en virkelig Marshallplan, der søger Afrikas og Mellemøstens integration i den Eurasiske Landbro (Verdenslandbroen), kan løse problemet.

EU-indenrigsministrenes uformelle møde om flygtningekrisen, der blev holdt i Bruxelles den 25. jan., demonstrerede endnu engang EU's fiasko.

Grækenland, gennem hvilket de fleste af flygtningene kommer, blev genstand for absurd pres og krav. Som svar herpå fordømte den græske, stedfortrædende minister for indvandringspolitik, Yiannis Mouzalas, der er læge og stifter af Doctors of the World (Læger i Hele Verden), kravene og truslerne om at udstøde Grækenland af EU's visa- og rejsefri Schengen-zone. Med kommentarer til Grækenlands private SKAI TV fordømte Mouzalas et belgisk forslag – at Grækenland skulle etablere en lejr til 300-400.000 flygtninge i Athen!

»Schengen er en del af et spil om at uddele ansvar: Hvis du ikke gør dette eller hint, så gør vi det her ved dig. Det er en straf«, sagde Mouzalas og tilføjede, at Grækenland ikke ønskede at deltage i en proces, der ikke ville føre nogen vegne hen. Han sagde, at europæiske lande uberettiget er »i panik« over spørgsmålet. Mouzalas har moralsk autoritet til at udligne denne kritik, eftersom Grækenland har været indstrømningspunkt for henved en million flygtninge alene i løbet af de seneste seks måneder samtidig med, at landet også må håndtere sin egen dystre, økonomiske krise. Landet har modtaget meget lidt hjælp fra EU. Han advarede ligeledes om, at flygtningekrisen i Grækenland ville blive en humanitær krise, hvis tusinder af flygtninge skulle blive indespærret i Grækenland.

I en artikel i *Financial Times* lancerer Gideon Rachman et forslag om flygtninge-for-gæld for Grækenland, hvorved Tyskland ville annullere en stor del af den græske gæld, og Grækenland ville være vært for flygtninge i lejre på græske øer, finansieret af Tyskland eller EU. Flygtningene ville dernæst blive sendt tilbage til Syrien, eller Irak, når krigen først stopper.

En sådan model har åbenlyse problemer, som Rachman indrømmer.

Det første problem er den nødvendige ændring af asylreglerne; hvis krigen trækker ud, kunne flygtningene sidde fast i lejre i årevis. Det andet åbenlyse problem er, at Grækenland selv befinder sig midt i en katastrofal, økonomisk krise. Rachman medgiver, at »en ophobning af flygtninge i Grækenland lyder rystende ...«

Rachman skriver, »Denne plan lyder, som om den er langt ude. Men den kunne allerede delvist være på vej, gennem forsøg og fejltagelse. Det vides, at EU-embedsmænd overvejer at 'afgrænse' Grækenland ved at blokere grænsen mellem Grækenland og Makedonien, som er hovedruten mod nord. Ifølge en rapport i *Financial Times* menes denne plan 'at finde støttet i Berlin'.

*Foto: Yiannis Mouzalas*

---

## **Indenrigsministre i EU holder stridbart møde om flygtningepolitik og Schengen-aftale**

25. januar 2016 – Indenrigsministrerne i EU holdt et stridbart møde i dag i Amsterdam, hvor de forsøgte at komme overens om, hvorvidt man skulle forlænge grænsekontroller i en periode på to år i overensstemmelse med bestemmelserne i Schengen-aftalen, der i øjeblikket tillader rejser, arbejde og ophold uden visa blandt medlemslandene. Forlængelsen beskrives som »midlertidig«, men reflekterer følelsen af panik og hysteri over, hvordan man skal håndtere indstrømningen af flygtninge,

samt frygt for, at Schengen-aftalen, og med den EU, kunne smuldre inden for få uger, rapporterede *The Guardian* i dag.

Seks EU-nationer har allerede gennemført grænsekontroller under nogen form, men iflg. BBC sagde den hollandske minister for indvandring, Klaas Dijkhoff, at medlemsstater inviterede Den europæiske Kommission til at forberede det juridiske og praktiske grundlag »for fortsættelsen af midlertidige grænseregler gennem artikel 26 [af Schengen-aftalen]«.

Ifølge flere rapporter deltog flere EU-ministre i angreb på Grækenland og truede endda med helt at udstøde dette land fra Schengen-arrangementet. Den østrigske indenrigsminister Johanna Mikl-Leitner sagde til *Die Welt*, at, hvis »Athen ikke omsider gør mere for at sikre EU's ydre grænser, så må man åbenlyst diskutere Grækenlands midlertidige eksklusion fra Schengen-zonen ... Grækenland har en af de største flåder i Europa. Det er en myte, at den græsk-tyrkiske grænse ikke kan kontrolleres«. Den belgiske minister for indvandring Theo Francken advarede, at grækerne må »bære konsekvenserne, og vi vil satse på en form for sanktionsmekanisme«, rapporterer *Associated Press*.

Ikke alle var enige. Talsperson for EU-kommissionen Natasha Bertaude tweetede, at »der er ingen, der taler om 'suspension fra' eller 'eksklusion af' Schengen – en sådan mulighed eksisterer ikke. Vi vil redde Schengen ved at gennemføre Schengen«. Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier hævdede, at ideen om en græsk udstødelse af Schengen er en »foregiven løsning«. Også Italien og Luxembourg afviste enhver tanke om en udstødelse.

Grækenlands minister for indvandring Ioannis Mouzalas svarede vredt og hævdede, at andre EU-medlemsstater havde forsømt at forsyne Grækenland med lovet personale og både til at afpatruljere øerne i Ægærhavet. Athen havde behov for 1.800 officerer fra Frontex-organisationen til grænsekontrol, men fik kun 800, sagde han; og kun 6 ud af de 28 skibe til

kystvagten, som man havde anmodet om, var ankommet.

Forskellige forslag kastes rundt, inklusive et om at oprette permanente lejre i Grækenland til husning af 300.000 flygtninge, samt lignede lejre i Italien.

---

# Kronik af den tyske finansminister Schäuble opfordrer Europa til tætttere samarbejde med Rusland om løsning i Syrien

25. januar 2016 – Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble har en kronik den 24. jan. i *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, hvor han erklærer, at Europa må yde et større bidrag end tidligere for at stabilisere Sydvestasien. »Vi berøres mere end andre kontinenter af det, der foregår i dette område. Og vi kan sikkert ikke undgå at blive mere engageret i en stor del af Afrika.«

Han tilføjer, at Rusland spiller en nøglerolle i enhver løsning på konflikten i Syrien og således også i enhver løsning på flygtningekrisen. En europæisk strategi for Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien kan afgjort ikke fungere uden Amerika, men den har også brug for Rusland: »Hvis jeg har forstået Ruslands sikkerhedsinteresser mht. islamisk

terrorisme korrekt, så har Rusland snarere problemer med sunnimuslimsk relaterede aktiviteter. Hvorfor kan vi således ikke udvikle en fælles strategi sammen med Rusland for at deeskalere konflikter mellem den saudisk-ledede sunni-koalition og den iransk-ledede shia-koalition?«

Eftersom termen »Marshallplan«, som Schäuble brugte ved forummet i Davos den 21. jan., da han krævede investeringer i størrelsesordenen milliarder af euro til genopbygning i Syrien, ikke forekommer i denne kronik, må man antage, at den blev skrevet før dette forum.

Størstedelen af denne kronik domineres af Schäubles favoritemne, nemlig at bruge denne krise til mere europæisk integration og overførsel af suverænitet. Han mener f.eks., at det ikke var en god idé at lade de nationale centralbanker forblive autonome vis-à-vis Den europæiske Centralbank. Han erklærede også, at en europæisk bankindskudsgarantifond og et europæisk bankopløsningsreglement er en nødvendighed, med vanskeligt at virkeligøre i øjeblikket, hvor nationale regler stadig mangler at blive harmoniseret.

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/naher-osten/f-a-z-e-xklusiv-schaeuble-will-zusammen-mit-russland-fluechtlingskrise-loesen-14031573.html>

*Foto: Flygtninge på grænsen mellem Makedonien og Serbien.*

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER 25. januar 2016: Løsningen på flygtningekrisen: Silkevejen og Marshallplan til Mellemøsten**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche  
responderer til  
den tyske finansminister  
Schäubles krav om  
en Marshallplan til løsning  
af flygtningekrisen**

*24. januar 2016 – Fuldstændig uventet for de fleste brugte den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble lejligheden som deltager på diskussionspanelet om »Europas fremtid« på det Økonomiske Verdensforum i Davos, Schweiz den 21. jan. til at foreslå, at en »koalition af de villige« skulle investere »milliarder« i udviklingen af Mellemøsten og Afrika. Dette kommer mindre end en uge efter Zepp-LaRouches seneste artikel*

om spørgsmålet, med overskriften: »**Løsningen på den europæiske flygtningekrise er en Silkevejs-Marshallplan!**«.

Vi må »investere milliarder i disse områder« for at dæmme op for strømmen af folk, der flytter til Europa, sagde Schäuble. »Vi behøver en Marshallplan for de områder, der er ved at blive ødelagt«, erklærede han. Og i betragtning af, at en række europæiske lande har nægtet at acceptere påtvungne kvoter af flygtninge, foreslog han en »koalition af de villige« til at finansiere en udviklingsplan og lovede støtte fra Tyskland. Han erklærede sig endda enig med den græske premierminister Tsipras i, at de ville være skamfuldt for Europa at forvandle sig til et »fæstning« og nægte de mennesker, der befinder sig uden for grænserne, adgang.

Stifter af Schiller Institutet Helga Zepp-LaRouche har længe foreslået et initiativ i lighed med Marshallplanen for Sydvestasien og Afrika, og hun er medforfatter af en **EIR-Specialrapport om projektet for Verdenslandbroen**, der inkluderer netop disse områder. I en artikel med et internationalt overblik, skrevet 22. jan., (»**Kinas Ny Silkevejspolitik er løsningen på flygtningekrisen!**«) spørger hun, hvad man skal mene om den tyske finansministers tilsyneladende pludselige skift i dette spørgsmål: At netop Schäuble, super-europæeren og bankernes mand og Trojkaens nedskæringsfortaler, pludselig skulle have åbnet sit hjerte for disse staters udvikling? Allerede Henrik IV forsvarede det synpunkt, at, for den gode sags skyld behøvede ikke alle at være motiveret ud fra de højeste idealer; for at opnå målet kræves der hos mange også, at deres egen skjorte brænder. For Schäuble ved, at, uden Schengen – aftalen om at ophæve grænsekontrol inden for EU – ingen euro, og uden euro, intet EU. Eftersom der ikke er nogen solidaritet i EU, er det bedre ikke at udøve pres, der blot gør nederlaget for Lissabontraktatens EU endnu mere åbenlyst, men blot forlade sig på 'de villige'.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fortsætter sin artikel med at understrege

betydningen af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jingpings nylige besøg i Mellemøsten og hans tilbud om, at disse lande kan gå med i politikken med den Ny Silkevej. Og det på et tidspunkt, hvor det overforgældede finanssystem har kurs mod et nyt kæmpekrak. Som finansminister er Schäuble udmærket klar over dette. Hvis han derfor er seriøs mht. en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten og Afrika, må han promovere Glass/Steagall-reformer i hele Europa, som den eneste måde, hvorpå en reglementeret afskrivning af den giftige gæld og en udvikling af realøkonomien kan organiseres.

Dette er, slutter Helga Zepp-LaRouche, prøven, der skal vise, om Saul virkelig har konverteret til Paulus.

---

## **EU-funktionærer tager skridt med henblik på at knuse statsgæld**

**19. januar, 2016** – Den hollandske finansminister Jeroen Dijsselbloem, præsident for Eurogruppen af Euro-områdets finansministre, og Andreas Dombret, repræsentant for Bundesbank i ECB-bestyrelsen, kom, hver især, i dag ud og tilskyndede til en nedgradering af beholdningen af statsobligationer i Eurozonens banker. Det er forslaget indeholdt i et udkast, der i december blev indsendt til den tyske Forbundsdag af den tyske vice-finansminister Jens Spahn. Forslaget ville tvinge mange sydlandske banker, særligt i Italien, til dramatisk at øge deres behov for reserver og afslører intentionen om at knuse de lande, der står bag udstedelsen af disse statsobligationer.

"Vi har brug for et mere realistisk regelsæt til behandling af risici ved disse statsobligationer, som bankerne ligger inde med. Krisen har klart vist, at en sådan eksponering ikke er risikofri", skrev Dijsselbloem i en kronik for *Wall Street Journal* den 18. januar. <http://goldlatestnews.org/articles/three-reforms-to-boost-europe-1453147413#>

"I betragtning af de seneste 6 års smertefulde erfaringer, er det blevet mere end åbenbart, at statsobligationer ikke er risikofri", blev Dombret citeret af Bloomberg for at sige. "I min optik er dette et spørgsmål, der må afsluttes, muligvis efter Basel III-reformerne", sagde han den 18. januar i et interview med medier, med overskriften "Glem Basel IV: Bundesbank advarer om bankernes risiko ved statsobligationer."

Dijsselbloem forsvarede ved samme lejlighed bail-in-regimet – når alt kommer til alt, opfandt han udtrykket "Cybernskabelonen", der skulle betyde forslaget om at gøre sådanne ekspropriationer generelle – og han opfordrede til at fremskynde processen, der fører til en union af kapitalmarkeder, der skal sætte standarden for "simple og transparente sekuritiseringer".

Som vi tidligere har rapporteret, så ville en union af kapitalmarkeder erstatte bankkredit som kilde til finansiering af små og mellemstore virksomheder. I realiteten vil det tvinge lokalbanker til at lukke eller fusionere med investeringsbanker, konfrontere firmaer med dyr obligationsudstedelse, som de fleste af dem ikke har råd til, og kanaliser familieopsparinger ind i kasinoøkonomien.

*Foto: Jeroen Dijsselbloem*

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 18. januar 2016:**

## **Nedsmeltingen af det transatlantiske finanssystem: Opbyg den fysiske økonomi**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---

## **Klassikeren Tremonti: Flyt den Europæiske Centralbanks kontor til Nürnberg**

*16. januar 2016* – Den 23. maj 2014, få dage før de europæiske valg, og kort tid efter, at det Europæiske Parlament havde vedtaget bail-in-reglerne, debatterede tidligere italienske finansminister Giulio Tremonti Lissabontraktatens 'Godfather', Giuliano Amato, om europæisk politik ved et arrangement, organiseret af Enciclopedia Treccani. Tremonti havde allerede afsløret bail-in i forskellige udtalelser og i sin nye bog, som *EIR* havde dækket. Men denne særlige begivenhed gik ubemærket hen, og en saftig udtalelse, som det er værd at genkalde sig i dag, blev overset.

Mod debattens afslutning blev både Tremonti og Amato bedt om at komme med en afsluttende udtalelse, og Tremonti sagde, at han gerne ville gentage sin idé med, at finanskrisen var ligesom et videospil: det første monster dukker frem; man slår

det ihjel, men så dukker det næste monster op, osv. Det første monster var subprime-krisen; det andet monster var statsgældskrisen; og det tredje monster, der nu dukker op, er bail-in-lovgivningen, sagde Tremonti.

»At stjæle borgernes bankindeståender er tragisk, men det er dette perspektiv, vi har kurs mod. Nået til det punkt bliver det meget vanskeligt. Det vil måske blive nødvendigt at flytte Den europæiske Centralbanks juridiske base til Nürnberg, for at det skal være i nærheden af stedet, hvor der fældes dom. Hvordan lyder det som en overskrift?«

Publikum, endskønt pro-euro og således fjendtligtsindet over for Tremonti, kunne ikke afholde sig fra at klappe, og mødelederne og Amato selv turde ikke gøre indvendinger.

---

## **NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR: Finanskak i Luftet: Et Nyt Paradigme nu!**

*Det sammenbrud af det transatlantiske finansielle system, som allerede er indledt på verdens børser, er ikke en udefrakommende naturkatastrofe, men en følge af en politik dikteret fra finansverdenen, der har været fundamentalt forkert. Hvis vi erkender det, kan vi erstatte de nuværende defekte værdier med et nyt paradigme, der vil sætte os i stand til ikke blot at overvinde krisen, men også skabe den største renæssance i menneskehedens historie. De første nødtiltag er den 4-punktsplan, som Lyndon LaRouche og Schiller Institututtet har fremlagt: 1) Indførelse af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, der adskiller normal, samfundsgavnlig bankvirksomhed fra den finansspekulering, der i stigende grad har overtaget bankerne*

*og finansverdenen; 2) National regulering og styring af finansverdenen inkl. udstedelse af statslige kreditter til opbygning af økonomien; 3) Iværksættelse af store infrastrukturprojekter, som f.eks. en Kattegatbro og et dansk magnettøgnet; og 4) Målrettet satsning på de videnskabelige felter, som f.eks. kernekraft, fusionskraft og rumforskning, der vil løfte hele samfundet op på et højere niveau. Samtidigt skal der så være en renæssance, hvor vi tager de bedste og smukkeste af vor nations og menneskehedens åndelige frembringelser, som f.eks. klassisk musik og kunst, og lader dem være den standard, vi sætter for menneskelig interaktion og aktivitet.*

*Vi bringer her første tredjedel af en tale, som Schiller Institutets danske formand Tom Gillesberg holdt den 4. januar 2016, om det bail-in, der er i vente som svar på finanssammenbruddet, og som kan høres i sin helhed på <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=10983>*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR med formand Tom Gillesberg den 14. januar 2016**

1 time 28 min.:

Eller klik her

---

# Italien kræver moratorium for EU's bail-in-lovgivning

12. januar 2016 – Fremtrædende økonomer har krævet et moratorium for EU's bail-in-lovgivning i Italien. Først blev det krævet af Luigi Zingales og Luigi Guiso i finansavisen *Il Sole 24 Ore*, den 30. dec., og i dag opfordrede Paolo Savona, tidl. chef for den italienske Statens Indskudsgarantifond, indtrængende regeringen til at fremlægge det.

Til forskel fra andre lande ejer, i Italien, »småsparere bankobligationer i stedet for bankkonti med indskud«, skrev Zingales-Guiso. Med de nye bail-in-regler vil indehavere af seniorobligationer blive involveret i en bail-in, og dette repræsenterer mere end 30 % af bankfinansiering for mange banker. Jo mindre bank, desto højere er denne kvote.

Denne situation må ændres, men det kan ikke ske natten over. »Vi må have en overgangsregel, der, til gengæld for et forbud mod salg af obligationer til bankkunder, fritager Italien i en midlertidig periode (12 – 18 mdr.). Dette bør regeringen forhandle med Bruxelles med større energi, end den lagde for dagen under de resultatløse forhandlinger under diskussionen om bail-in-reglerne.«

Savona går endnu længere i retning af faktisk at kræve en afslutning på bail-in og presser regeringen til at kræve »den samme behandling« som andre lande, der får moratorium mht. andre EU-regler.

I en artikel for formiche.it skrev Savona: »Hvorfor kræver Italien ikke et moratorium for bail-in, eftersom Europa er et 'politisk område for moratorier', der er gjort nødvendige af stive procedurer, som EU's retningslinjer har introduceret i

en verden, der forudsætter fleksibilitet?«

»Selvfølgelig bliver det, som alle moratorier, midlertidigt, i det mindste til vi finder en passende løsning til at beskytte bankkunderne. Det er, hvad de nordeuropæiske lande siger om moratoriet for Schengen-aftalen om befolkningernes frie bevægelighed, og det er, hvad der praktiseres i forbindelse med overtrædelser af Finanspagten og endnu mere i forbindelse med aftalen om overdrevent overskud på betalingsbalancen.«

»I det moratorie-plagede Europa er der ingen grund til ikke at beslutte, at retningslinjerne for opløsning af kriseramte banker bør suspenderes for at standse den tillidskrise, der har ramt bankkunder.«

*Foto: Paolo Savona*

---

# **Uro omkring bail-in breder sig i en grad, hvor Frankfurrtavis nedtoner spørgsmålet**

12. januar 2016 – Økonomisektionen i Frankfurter Allegemeine Zeitung (FAZ) bringer i dag en propaganda-artikel for bail-in,

tilsyneladende som reaktion på bankkontohaveres (og læseres) bekymring, efter at have modtaget breve fra deres banker, der gav meddelelse om, at bail-in-reglerne træder i kraft den 1. januar i år. Der er ingen grund til bekymring, i hvert fald ikke i Tyskland, der ikke er som Cypern, hævder FAZ. Alle bankindskud under 100.000 euro i Tyskland er beskyttede, og nødindgreb for at redde, f.eks. sparekasser er kun »hypotetiske«, og skulle der engang ske noget, så er der stadig skatteborgernes intervention – dvs., gennem statslige bankredningspakker, bail-out.

---

## **EU ønsker at installere neoliberal fascistisk regering i Grækenland**

*12. januar 2016* – Det europæiske oligarki er stadig ikke tilfreds med den græske koalitionsregering med Syriza-partiet og de Uafhængige Grækere, selv om denne har kapituleret til alle krav. Det ser ud til, at oligarkiet ønsker at få partiet Nyt Demokrati, der var oligarkiets bedste »partner«, tilbage til magten, men med en regering, der er endnu mere liberal og fascistisk end den foregående, der blev ledet af Antonis Samaras.

Weekendens valg af Kyriakos Mitsotakis som leder for Nyt Demokrati blæses op som de neoliberale og pro-europæeres nye, store håb. Selv om han portrætteres som et nyt ansigt og en »reformator« af indgroede interesser, er Mitsotakis en ætling af en af de ældste, politiske dynastier i Grækenland. Hans far, Constantine, var en tidligere premierminister, og hans søster, Dora Bakoyannis, der er medlem af Nyt Demokrati, er en

tidligere udenrigsminister og leder af partiets højrefløj. Mitsotakis selv er en Harvard-uddannet, tidligere bankier.

Han skylder sin valgsejr til den hårde kerne i partiets højrefløj. De to andre kandidater, der kom ind som nummer tre og fire, hhv. – Apostolos Tzitzikostas og Adonis Georgiadis – gav ham deres støtte. Hans ligeledes store sejr i Messina, en bastion for tidligere premierminister Antonis Samaras, antyder, at sidstnævnte også pegede på ham.

Samaras er sandsynligvis arkitekten bag Nyt Demokratis plan, fordi han bejlede til fascisterne, inklusive den ovennævnte Georgiadis, en hardcore ideologisk fascist og tidligere sundhedsminister, hvis nedskæring var, og er, ansvarlige for tusinder af dødsfald. En anden tilhænger af Mitsotakis, Makis Voridis, tidligere formand for parlamentet, da ND var i regering, er også fascist. Der findes et berømt billede af ham fra 1980'erne, hvor han bærer en økse på vej til at angribe en demonstration fra venstrefløjens.

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 11. januar 2016: Nordkoreas prøvesprængning// Köln banegård// Nyt paradigme for menneskeheden**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# Bail-in-regel-rodet i EU-medlemslande

*7. januar 2016* – Bail-in-reglerne vil tilsyneladende blive implementeret forskelligt i de forskellige EU-medlemslande. Små virksomheder er ekskluderet fra bail-in i den tekst, som Det europeiske Parlament har vedtaget og, f.eks., i den italienske lov for gennemførsel. Det er ikke tilfældet i Tyskland, i hvert fald ikke ifølge et brev, som Post Bank har udsendt til sine kunder. Brevet siger blandt andet, at for »virksomhedskonti gælder grænsen på 100.000 euro pr. indskyder«. Med andre ord kunne selskaber, i tilfælde af bail-in, se alle deres penge, der overstiger 100.000 euro, blive konfiskeret.

»Men en konto, hvor to eller flere personer har adgang som medlemmer af et personligt firma, selskab eller sammenslutning eller lignende, uden juridisk personlighed, vil blive slået sammen under udregningen af den øverste grænse på 100.000 euro og behandlet som indskud fra en enkelt indskyder.«

Dette tilbyder et smuthul i den EU-tekst, der siger,

»de følgende har samme prioritetsorden, der er højere end den orden, som krav fra almindelige, ubeskyttede kreditorer uden præference har:

- Den del af kvalificerede indskud fra individer og mikro-, små- eller mellemstore virksomheder, der overstiger dækningsniveauet iflg. bestemmelserne i artikel 6 af Direktivet 2014/49/EU;«

Den italienske lov har vedtaget denne formulering ordret.

Det er imidlertid kun en prioritetsorden for teoretiske godtgørelser, der er fastlagt, og ikke beløbet. Det beror alt sammen på »menneskers, ikke lovens, skøn«, som prof. Paolo Savona afslørede, i Milano Finanza (se 6. jan., <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=11036>).

*Foto: EU-parlamentet i Strasbourg, eller Babelstårnet, eller det skæve tårn i P-eu-sa, måske?*

---

## **Bevar fokus på Wall Street/London-nedsmeltingen**

*7. januar 2016 – Onsdag var endnu en dag med jordskred på aktie- og obligationsmarkedet, som medierne universelt har givet Kinas aktiemarked og valuta skylden for. Disse beskyldninger nåede grænsen for det absurde, da Kinas regering meddelte, midt på dagen i Europa, at den, fra og med 8. jan., ikke længere ville suspendere handel på markedet med »strømafrydelser«, og ville lade markedsniveauet bevæge sig derhen, hvor det ville – og dette hævdedes i de amerikanske finansmedier at have standset den globale deroute på aktiemarkederne! Hvordan det skulle forestille at være gået til, blev ikke forklaret. Men i al fald, så tog derouten atter fat i løbet af den europæiske og amerikanske eftermiddag, med styrtdyk i aktierne i olie-, bank- og råvaresektorerne i spidsen.*

Wall Streets, Londons og de europæiske bankers gæld, der er baseret på råvare- og ejendomsmarkedet, og som ikke kan

indløses, fortsætter med at være drivkraften bag kollapset, der i realiteten er udløst af »bail-in«-reglernes ikrafttræden (1. jan. 2016), der nu er i færd med at sænke banker og deres indskydere i hele det transatlantiske område.

*Financial Times* havde den 7. januar en artikel, der afslørede, hvad bank-bail-in har udløst i Europa. Med den beskedne titel, »Investorer gör voldsomt indsigelse mod bank-bail-in«, rapporterer artiklen om en lidet bemærket kendsgerning. Banker i Europa (og også i USA) er nu blevet pålagt at rejse kapital for hundreder af milliarder af euro, i form af de såkaldte »bail-in-obligationer« i 2016 – obligationer, der kan eksproprieres efter dekret fra de europæiske bankopløsningsmyndigheder i Bruxelles, når banken bliver insolvent eller nærmer sig insolvens. Men Europas banker rejste kun 196 mia. euro i alt i obligationer i 2015. Det var 10 % mindre end i 2014, og beløbet er faldet hvert år, siden 2009.

Disse banker kan således ikke rejse de hundreder af milliarder i »bail-in-obligationer« i 2016. Dernæst kommer *Financial Times* frem til pointen med det »sorte nul« på bankernes bundlinje. Mange hundrede banker vil forsvinde.

»Davide Serra, direktør for Algebris-fonden, der investerer i bankgæld, siger: 'Hvis man er en lille, europæisk bank, bør ens renteomkostninger ved udstedelse af seniorgæld (dvs. 'foranstillet' gæld, der har førsteprioritet mht. indfrielse ved en evt. konkurs i forhold til anden 'efterstillet' gæld, - red.), gå voldsomt i vejret. Dette bør også udløse en konsolidering af de mindre banker, da mange af dem kunne blive udelukket af obligationsmarkedet', advarer han.«

Faldet i udstedelsen af obligationer i 2015 er mere bemærkelsesværdigt, eftersom nationale finansmyndigheder forsøgte at få banker til at genkapitalisere og sælge »tabs-absorberende gæld« (bail-in-obligationer) i 2015, før Enhedsmyndigheden for bankopløsnings-fascisterne tog over.

Men, som *FT* beskriver det, så konverterede banker i Italien, Grækenland og andre steder i stedet obligationsgæld til egenkapital – aktier – »med betydelig discount« eller tab for obligationsinnehaverne. »Genkapitaliseringen« af de græske banker i efteråret 2015 skete næsten udelukkende på denne måde – gennem en delvis ekspropriering af innehavere af bankobligationer »med det formål at undgå at ekspropriere (bail-in) større indskydere«. Disse »større indskydere« ville have været forretningsforetagender, der ville være blevet – og i 2016 vil blive – udslettet over en kam.

---

# **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 7. januar 2016: Finanskrak i luften Saudi Arabien vil sætte Mellemosten i flammer**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Videoen er i 3 dele, som er samlet i en playliste.

Lyd: