

Mulighed for fred i Syrien. EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg forklarer, hvordan våbenhvilen kom i stand, og hvad der må til for at den bliver varig

LPAC fredags-webcast 26. februar 2016, dansk oversættelse.

Hvis man derfor sluttelig ønsker, at den syriske fredsaftale skal blive en succes, altså holde, så må man, ud over det presserende nødvendige behov for en Marshallplan/Landbrohjørneste for at sikre, at freden er varig, også fjerne Obama. Og man må bringe det britiske imperiesystem til fald.

Der findes muligheder for en erstatning, men disse erstatninger vil kun ske, når Obama er blevet fjernet af reelle forfatningsmæssige grunde, og på det tidspunkt, hvor Det britiske Imperium har fået en reglementeret begravelse.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

RADIO SCHILLER den 29.

februar 2016:

**Kun Silkevejen kan få
våbenhvilen i Syrien til at
holde**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**En Fredsplan for
Sydvestasien.**

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

**EIR Pressemeddelelse for
udgivelse af**

**den arabiske udgave af »Den
Nye Silkevej
bliver til Verdenslandbroen«**

The English and Arabic version is below the Danish.

På et tidspunkt, hvor flygtningekrisen truer med at blive til en hidtil uset humanitær krise, og som sprænger Den europæiske Unions sammenhængskraft og endda muligvis selve dens eksistens i stumper og stykker, er en vision om håb for udvikling af Sydvestasien og Afrika den eneste måde, hvorpå situationen kan

vendes til det bedre. På et tidspunkt, hvor den transatlantiske verdens finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at krakke, er udviklingsperspektivet for en genopbygning af Mellemøsten og resten af Sydvestasien til at udgøre en bro mellem Asien, Europa og Afrika den eneste drivkraft for økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

28. februar 2016 – Den arabiske version af EIR's specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, i sin fulde udstrækning, er nu færdig og klar til udgivelse og distribuering. Den 400 sider lange rapport (med et appendiks del 6 om Sydvestasien, der omfatter EIR's Projekt Fønix: En genopbygningsplan for Syrien) er blevet oversat af Hussein Askary (med færdigt layout af Ali Sharaf), og »Den Nye Silkevejs-lady«, alias Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har på smukkeste vis skrevet forordet, som følger:

En Fredsplan for Sydvestasien

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Washington, D.C., 26. februar 2016

Det er muligvis et udslag af et lykkeligt sammentræf eller af Forsynets indgriben, at den arabiske oversættelse af rapporten om Verdenslandbroen udkommer netop nu, hvor udsigten til en våbenhvile i Syrien er ved at blive en realitet. Overenskomsten mellem den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov har et potentiale til at bringe den fem år lange krig, der har kostet hundreder tusinder af mennesker livet, til en afslutning. Men i betragtning af de enormt komplekse omstændigheder i regionen bør det også stå klart, at en blot og bar kontrakt om at

standse kampene vil være for skrøbelig til at vare ved og overleve nye provokationer fra de samme kræfters side, der oprindeligt var ansvarlige for krigen.

Den eneste måde, hvorpå en varig fred kan garanteres, er den omgående iværksættelse af en omfattende udviklingsplan for hele Sydvestasien, med en udviklingsplan for integreret infrastruktur; en plan, der ikke alene genopbygger krigens ødelagte byer og landsbyer, men som anviser en langt mere fundamental fremgangsmåde for atter at forvandle denne region, der engang var en af den menneskelige civilisations vugger, og som på forskellige tidspunkter i historien var hjemsted for tidens mest fremskredent udviklede kulturer, til en af verdens mest avancerede. Målet må være at udløse regionens folks kreativitet og bringe deres produktivitet op på samme niveau som Europas, USA's eller Kinas.

Dette er absolut muligt, og i særdeleshed, fordi Ruslands og Kinas samarbejde repræsenterer magtfulde naboer, der, sammen med lande i regionen, kan udvirke denne udvikling. Hvis de udviklingsprojekter, som foreslås i rapporten, i bogstavelig forstand bliver gennemført med start fra i morgen, således, at udbyttet ved fred bliver synligt for alle parter i regionen, så kan våbenhvilen i Syrien og gennemførelsen af det, man kunne kalde en Silkevejs-Marshallplan, dog uden denne betegnelses tilknytning til en kold krig, blive en agent for et nyt scenarie for hele verden.

På et tidspunkt, hvor flygtningekrisen truer med at blive til en hidtil uset humanitær krise, og som sprænger Den europæiske Unions sammenhængskraft og endda muligvis selve dens eksistens i stumper og stykker, er en vision om håb for udvikling af Sydvestasien og Afrika den eneste måde, hvorpå situationen kan vendes til det bedre. På et tidspunkt, hvor den transatlantiske verdens finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at krakke, er udviklingsperspektivet for en genopbygning af Mellemøsten og resten af Sydvestasien til at udgøre en bro mellem Asien, Europa og Afrika den eneste drivkraft for

økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

Den arabiske *EIR*-rapport kan bestilles (kun i papirudgave) gennem *EIR* News Service og alle internationale institutioner, der er associeret med LaRouche-bevægelsen, herunder Schiller Instituttet i Danmark.

The English and Arabic version pdf. of
A Peace Plan for Southwest Asia
by Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

EIR press release in English and Arabic on the occasion of the release of the arabic version of "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge."

(The English, Arabic, and Chinese versions of the report are available from The Schiller Institute in Denmark at: +45 53 57 00 51 or +45 35 43 00 33, or si@schillerinstitut.dk)

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

**Den
udenrigsminister
fremlægger**

**kinesiske
Wang Yi**

en udvej i stedet for krig for USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry

24. februar, 2016 – Den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi, der talte ved en timelang pressekonference med den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry i forlængelse af deres møde i Washington tirsdag, fremsatte flere afgørende forslag, der, såfremt de accepteres, kunne få USA væk fra den selvmorderiske kurs, som præsident Obama har sat, for krig med Kina.

Med hensyn til Koreakrisen sagde Wang Yi, at han og Kerry var enedes om en formulering af en FN-resolution, der fordømmer den nordkoreanske prøvesprængning af atomvåben og test af missilaffyring. Resolutionen skal frigives efter begge regerings godkendelse. Men, tilføjede Yi, en sådan resolution "kan ikke tilvejebringe en grundlæggende løsning på spørgsmålet om koreanske atomvåben. For virkeligt at gøre dette, er vi nødt til at vende tilbage til sporet med dialog og forhandling."

Han sagde, at Kerry var enig i dette, men tilføjede, at den kinesiske side havde "fremsat et primært forslag: dvs., at vi ønsker at forfølge atomafrustningen af den koreanske halvø sideløbende med udskiftningen af den koreanske våbenhvile med en fredsaftale. Vi ved, at visse parter har et andet syn på dette forslag."

Dette markerer en betydningsfuld intervention. Nordkorea vil kun diskutere fredsaftalen, og Obama vil kun diskutere atomprogrammet. Pyongyang hverken kan eller vil opgive sit atomvåbenprogram under trussel om krig fra Obamas side, vel vidende, hvad USA gjorde imod Irak og Libyen, da disse stoppede deres atomprogrammer. Hvis der kunne findes en fredsaftale, der garanterede deres sikkerhed, så kunne de

overveje alternativer til atomprogrammet.

Kerry holdt sig til Obamas linje – opgiv atomprogrammet, og vi vil overveje en fredsplan – men Kina har derimod lagt en gennemførlig plan på bordet.

Wang Yi berørte også krisens aktualitet og sagde, at han og Kerry var enedes om, at “vi er nødt til at overvåge situationen på halvøen tæt i de kommende to måneder. Forskellige ustabile faktorer kunne overlape hinanden og have en virkning, så under de omstændigheder er det meget vigtigt, at de forskellige parter fører mere dialog for at forhindre, at spændingen øges eller situationen optrappes. Vi må især forhindre situationen på halvøen i at spinde ud af kontrol.”

Om det Sydkinesiske Hav sagde Wang Yi, at regionen, til trods for Vestens hysten op, er fredeligere end andre dele af verden, og at intet handelsfartøj er stødt på nogen trussel mod den fri sejlads. Forsikringspræmier er ikke steget en øre, sagde han (det frie marked siger, at der ikke er noget problem!).

På den anden side, sagde han, “håber jeg, at venner inden for medierne ikke kun vil se radaren (Kinas radaranlæg på en af øerne), men måske snarere, og nok så vigtigt, at der for hver dag dukker avancerede våbensystemer og udstyr op i det Sydkinesiske Hav, inklusive de strategiske bombefly, krigsskibe med missilforsvarssystemer – hvorfor har folk har valgt at se bort fra dem eller ignorere dem?”

Vores mission: »Vi må være helliget til kreativ opdagelse«

28. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Alle dele af planeten konfronteres nu med valget mellem to konkurrerende stemmer. »Spørgsmålet drejer sig om krisen«, erklærede **Lyndon LaRouche skarpt under sin dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 27. feb.** »Vil du dø, eller vil du leve? Det er de to stemmer.«

Halvdelen af menneskeheden – BRIKS og de hermed allierede lande, under anførsel af Rusland og Kina – har allerede valgt at leve og tilbyder at være med til at redde resten af planeten. Den transatlantiske sektor har indtil videre valgt at dø. Hvilken anden betydning kunne det have, fortsat at tolerere Wall Street og tillade den onde dræber Obamas tilstedeværelse i Det Hvide Hus? Hvilken anden betydning kunne det have, fortsat at tolerere den aktuelle farce omkring valg af præsidentkandidater, og tillade, at tidligere produktive arbejdere dræber sig selv i rekordstort antal, med narko, alkohol og direkte selvmord? Hvad med ødelæggelsen af NASA og den kreative, missionsorienterede anskuelse, det repræsenterede?

Den russiske præsident Putins intervention med en flankoperation i Syrien og den bredere, regionale situation, med begyndelse i september 2015, har på dramatisk vis omformet hele geometrien i de globale anliggender. Obama er mod sin vilje blevet banket ind i et samarbejde med Rusland om den aktuelle våbenhvile i Syrien, der fortsat holder under det amerikanske og russiske militærs voksende koordination. Dramatiske, positive forandringer finder sted i Iran, Egypten og andre nationer, der har valgt at alliere sig med BRIKS-udviklingen. Og befolkningen i USA – på trods af en årtier lang, britisk fordømmelsesproces ind i pragmatisme, og som nu

er ved at kvæles af et valgcirkus – responderer med uvant optimisme til LaRouche-bevægelsens mobilisering, der på enestående vis resonerer med det aktuelle, politiske fremstød fra både Putin og Xi Jinpings kinesiske regering. Når alt kommer til alt, så blev meget af deres politik, og mest eftertrykkeligt den Nye Silkevej, oprindeligt udtænkt og promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

Som et eksempel på denne begyndende renæssance står den særdeles succesfulde **Schiller Institut konference, der blev afholdt den 27. feb. »i skyggen af Johnson Space Center«** i Texas, med medlem af LPAC Policy Committee og tidligere demokratisk kandidat til Kongressen, Kesha Rogers, der genaktiverede og på ny gav liv til NASA-veteraner og andre omkring vores nødvendige mission: at mennesket sluttelig er en fornuftsart baseret i rummet, som Rogers understregede det. På samme måde var en *forandring* i modtagelighed åbenlyst til stede ved den nylige konference i Seattle, med Helga Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler; ved et arrangement på Georgetown University, hvor Matthew Ogden holdt hovedtalen; ved LaRouche-bevægelsens Verdenslandbro-konferencer i Hermosillo (Mexico) og i Lima (Peru), samt andre steder.

Det er LaRouche-organisationens enestående »helligelse til kreativ opdagelse«, som LaRouche beskrev det under sin diskussion med Manhattan-projektet, og udelukkende dette, der sætter os i en position, hvor vi kan forme den globale udvikling i retning af det gode. Men det pålægger os også strenge, interne betingelser, der kræver, at vi gør det klart, når organisationer *ikke* er en del af denne forpligtelse og således i stedet bliver forhindringer for vore bestræbelsers succes.

»Hele formålet med menneskeheden er dens evne til at gøre opdagelser, som den, der gjorde opdagelsen, aldrig selv helt vil høste frugten af«,

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

»Men kun personer, der er i deres adfærd er besjælet af denne ånd, vil være i stand til at levere et eksempel på det, som er nødvendigt for menneskehedens fremtid.«

Foto: Forberedelse til yderligere udforskning af rummet, det naturlige, næste trin i menneskehedens udvikling. Her arbejder ingeniører fra NASA og Lockheed Martin på NASA's Orion-rumfartøj, der efter planen skal opsendes i december måned.

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast 26. februar 2016: Mulighed for fred i Syrien

Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches tanker om muligheden for fred i Syrien, og Benjamin Deniston taler om tre nødvendige aspekter af rumforskning.

Engelsk udskrift.

Jeff Steinberg gives Lyndon LaRouche's thoughts on the potential for peace in Syria, and Ben Deniston speaks on three necessary aspects of space science.

TRANSCRIPT

JASON ROSS: Good evening. This is February 26, 2016, and you're joining us for the regular LaRouche PAC Friday webcast. I'm Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio today by Jeff Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review, as well as Ben Denison from the LaRouche PAC Basement team. The three of us had an opportunity to speak with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche this afternoon, and the comments you'll be hearing tonight reflect that discussion.

To start off, the topic is Syria. As few days ago, on February 22, an agreement for a ceasefire was reached, brokered by the United States and by Russia, giving today as a deadline for armed groups to register themselves with the terms of the ceasefire, which is to take effect tonight. The institutional question to Mr. LaRouche, reads: "In your view, what efforts will make this Syrian peace process a success?" And I'd like to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. Well, let's start with the positive side of the equation. As Jason just indicated, there is an agreement. It's been accepted by the Syrian government. It's been accepted by – at least nominally – by a number of the rebel groups. The only exclusion is ISIS and the al-Nusra, the al-Qaeda group inside Syria, who are both on the United Nations list of international terrorist organizations, and have not even been asked to participate. They are the targets, and they will continue to remain the targets as the ceasefire takes place in other parts of the country, and among other groups, both government and opposition rebel groups.

There are many difficult and complicated challenges here, obviously starting from the fact that you're talking about a ceasefire that will be going on simultaneous to ongoing combat. And the Russian government, the Syrian government, have made clear that they do intend to continue taking the war to the al-Qaeda and Nusra Front areas. And of course, they're not always going to be so clearly delineated.

What's important is that the United States and Russia are taking co-responsibility for the monitoring of this process.

Now you've seen a number of fairly dramatic announcements over the last several weeks. You had the announcement a week ago today where the terms of this detailed ceasefire agreement were worked out. Earlier in the month, on Feb. 11, on the sidelines of the Munich Security Conference, there was a meeting of the International Syria Support Group, again chaired by the U.S. and Russia, and that's where they announced the original earlier framework for the ceasefire. Needless to say, when Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov sit down, they're not starting out simply with an empty clean piece of paper. There's an enormous amount of back-channel secret diplomacy that's been taking place between Russian and American officials leading to the point where these breakthroughs are at least potentially in sight within a matter of hours. And so you've had extensive U.S.-Russian military to military coordination. In fact, the advances being made against the Islamic State heartland, hardcore area of control, by the group known as the Syrian Democratic Front, largely the Kurdish YPG and certain Sunni tribes that make up that Syrian Democratic Front, they've been getting active support for their advances both from Russia and the United States. So, there are things that are going on that you will not read about in the mainstream American media, but which have all contributed to this process.

Now there is strong opposition to this entire arrangement, coming from elements within the Obama administration. President Obama himself has been caught in a kind of a trap, because on the one hand, a success by Secretary of State Kerry, who's clearly the point man on behalf of the Administration for this effort, looks good on Obama's report card, makes his legacy appear to be better than it actually should be. So, he's got a certain tendency to want to see this thing succeed.

But there's a deeper underlying hatred of Russia, and after all, he is a tool under the orders, under the thumb, of the British Empire faction. And I'll get to that aspect of the situation in just a moment.

To go at the heart of the question that's been posed, to make this work, you've got to have a solid economic foundation, and fortunately, in the Eurasian part of the world – say, the area from Russia extending all the way out to the Pacific Coast – you've got coordination among major states, particularly Russia, China, and India, and the Chinese policy of One Belt, One Road – which involves both the New Silk Road, the overland, high-speed development corridor transportation corridors, and the Maritime Silk Road, are all ultimately programs that are the basis for a stabilizing and full development of the Middle East Region.

I should say that quite a number of years ago, Lyndon LaRouche was invited to the Zayed Center in the United Arab Emirates, to deliver a paper on the economic future prospects of the Persian Gulf, and he identified this region as the crossroads for where Eurasia and Africa come together under one great big development design that he's been working on, that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been working on, literally for decades and decades.

So, we have a living experience from not that long ago, when under the impetus of President Bill Clinton, the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, head of the PLO, chairman of that organization, and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel, where you had back in 1993, a breakthrough secretly negotiated in Oslo, and then finally signed and commemorated with the Oslo Accords which were signed at the White House. And I remember vividly that Prime Minister Rabin called this the "peace of the brave," because peace is only realized when you are willing to come up with a common plan with your worst avowed enemies, for the betterment of all.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said at that time by way of a warning, because of his clear understanding of the overarching power of the British Empire system, the dominant political-economic system in the trans-Atlantic region: he said the only way that Oslo would work is if there were shovels, crane, building material brought in immediately. Start building up the West Bank, building up the Gaza Strip. Tap into the tremendous scientific and technological capabilities of Israel. Create a new fundamentally different reality on the ground, a reality of optimism, born of genuine economic progress.

That did not happen. The World Bank interceded. The British, through their radical elements inside Israel, assassinated Prime Minister Rabin. In all likelihood, Chairman Arafat was also assassinated through poisoning. And so that whole process basically disintegrated, and leaves us now with a worse cancer in Israel-Palestinian relations than probably we ever had.

So, it's a powerful lesson to be learned, and it's the same exact neighborhood. So, unless you've got a perspective of a genuine Marshall Plan, that is anchored in the Chinese policy of One Belt, One Road – because that's where the momentum is in the world today for real development. Unless you do that, then this will not succeed. Yes, Kerry is doing a heroic job, working in partnership with Lavrov. Putin is playing a key role. He's holding his nose and engaging in an open dialogue to keep President Obama boxed in, and prevent him from wrecking this whole thing. But really, the key is going to be fully integrating the One Belt, One Road policy, the New Silk Road, with the Middle East, as precisely the kind of crossroads that Lyndon LaRouche talked about quite a number of years back in that lecture that he delivered at the Zayed Center in the UAE.

Now, to fully answer the question, and to step back further and really face the cold hard reality: You've got to start from the fact that so long as President Obama remains in office, there is an imminent danger that the British Empire

will pull the plug not just on the Syria situation, but will pull the plug on the whole planet, and draw us into a devastating war that will likely be a war of thermonuclear extinction.

At the very same time that Secretary Kerry was working on this Syria situation, in full partnership with the Russians, you've had the spectacle this week on Capitol Hill of General Breedlove, the head of NATO, Defense Secretary Ash Carter, making their pitch for a major defense budget, and in so doing, demonizing Russia. You've got all kinds of demands for added defense spending in order to put NATO forces on the borders with Russia, in addition to their various minions around Europe and the United States. And so when you're coming under that kind of pressure, that kind of psychological tension, the tendency is going to be to look for some avenue of relief. And the avenue of relief that they're looking at is war against Russia, and secondarily, war against China.

They know perfectly well that the world from Russia, extending eastward all the way to the Pacific Coast, is an area of relative economic recovery. Russia to be sure has major economic problems, major economic policy problems. But Russia has taken a critical leading role in taking up the Syria flank in a way that has completely overturned the apple cart in terms of how the British and how Obama were steering that Middle East situation, in partnership with Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Russia seized the initiative because Putin understood the strategic principle of the flank.

China is the center of scientific and technological growth on this planet. India is aligning with that combination. So you have an area defining where two-thirds of the population now live and work, that is relatively doing well, particularly when you compare it to anything going on in the trans-Atlantic region. So you've got a situation where the British Empire is bankrupt, is desperate, and will continue by impulse to drive for war, so long as they continue to exist.

So therefore, ultimately, if you want the Syrian peace agreement to succeed, in addition to the urgent need for a Marshall Plan, Land-Bridge cornerstone to make sure that that peace is durable, you've got to remove Obama. And you've got to bring down the British Empire system.

You've got options for replacement, but those replacements will only come about when Obama has been removed for cause, for good Constitutional cause, and at the point that the British Empire has been put through an orderly funeral.

ROSS: Thank you, Jeff. On the other direction, in terms of what is possibly outside of the dying, collapsing current trajectory of the trans-Atlantic, Lyndon LaRouche has been very emphatic over the recent period on the role of space as a driver for a uniquely human mission of discovery and of economic development, pointing in particular to the role here in the United States of Kesha Rogers, for example. I'd like to ask Ben to deliver some prepared remarks that he has on space, economics, and where we need to go.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. I want to take a few minutes just to lay out some conceptions about how to think about approaching this perspective for a new space program that Mr. LaRouche has been re-emphasizing recently.

And I think, to start, the most fundamental point is this is an issue of understanding the nature of mankind: getting a deeper understanding of what is mankind and mankind's mission as a uniquely creative species in what Mr. LaRouche has defined in his work, as a creative universe. That we cannot separate the ostensible space program, maybe the way a lot of people tend to think about it, in terms of spaceships and rockets and spacesuits – those are all elements of it – but this is a necessary expression of the true scientific principle of mankind's existence, as not just another animal species on this planet, but a species that has a fundamentally unique creative capability. And we must always continue to

exercise that creative capability in new domains, new frontiers, new deeper principles of the universe, and that's our destiny. That's what we have to do, and that's why we look to space. That's why space is necessary at this point in the development of mankind. And as we juxtapose the horrid direction under Obama and the trans-Atlantic and the British, this is – as Jason just said – the alternative, the reality that we should be pursuing if we return to an issue of principle.

This really defines what some people discuss as, to some degree in the highest sense, the common aims of mankind. This is the common unifying objective of the human species as a single species: the pursuit of our true nature as this creative force, into the Solar System in the near term, and looking out farther into the galaxy and the galactic perspective as the frontiers we want to push towards.

And the point is, this is what is happening in the Asian sector of the world. This is what China is doing. This is what Russia is doing, what Russia would like to do. This is what China's lunar program is vectored towards. And this is what China and Russia and their allies are openly asking the United States to come join. This is the offer being presented to the United States. China's explicit policy of "win-win" cooperation. And I want to just reference that that was a very beautiful concluding remark given by the Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi at a press conference he had with Secretary of State Kerry, just this past Tuesday, where he said, again reiterating China's conception of this "win-win" policy, he said, "Our two countries, China and the United States, we should work to make the pie of our common interests bigger. We should enlarge the pie of our common interests. We should look through telescopes to visualize the future, rather than a microscope to magnify our differences." So again, you're just continually getting this from China; this perspective of if we cooperate in true, fundamental scientific economic progress,

we expand the pie. We create more wealth; we create more resources available to the human species as a whole. So, let's just get rid of this crazy imperial perspective, and get on board with the development of the future in this very real sense.

As Jason emphasized, one of the most important things I think about what Kesha Rogers has done, is she has shown that the American people want this; that they're ready for this. What she demonstrated in her campaign is, that if there is real leadership out there, the American people will respond; they want this. They want this perspective; they're sick of what's going on. If we can provide real leadership and remove this terrible fake leadership running our country right now, there's the potential, the inherent desire in the American people to move in this direction. And she showed that very clearly in her leadership in her multiple Congressional campaigns; where with orders of magnitude less financial support than her adversaries, no support from the Democratic Party establishment – the certified hacks of the Democratic Party over there – despite all this seeming lack of resources, she showed a couple of resounding victories. Which shows you that if you have real qualified leadership out there, this is what the American people want; this potential is there.

So, this is where we have to go. Now from this standpoint, to break this down a little bit and to just kind of put some of this on the table, I think we ought to look at the space program perspective from the standpoint of two dimensions; two dimensions of what we mean about the space program. We have first, what I think is really the primary issue; and I think this is something that Mr. LaRouche is rather uniquely focussed on, and very focussed on; and I think this is something that he has uniquely and emphatically brought to the forefront of this discussion. Which is the primacy of the role of fundamental scientific discovery in this whole process. If we want to talk about space and the Solar System, in a certain

very real sense, you're talking about pursuing the fundamental potential created by the scientific revolutions and discoveries of Kepler through Einstein, for example. That it's that quality of fundamental scientific discovery which is what ultimately in the most basic sense, enables mankind to rise to a fundamentally different relationship to the universe as a whole. That our ability to not just be a species on Earth interacting with the universe from the standpoint of Earth-based processes; and to actually fundamentally change our relationship to the very substance, the nature of organization of the universe. That comes in the most primary sense from the unique quality of creative discovery per se; typified by Kepler, typified by Einstein. And I think if you draw an arc between Kepler's initial discoveries of the organization of the Solar System, the development of Kepler's work all the way up through Einstein is kind of defining another bounding condition on our understanding of the organization of the Solar System. You get a very clear picture of the kind of fundamental, uniquely human, discovery process which is the substance, the real root, of our ability to progress and transform the nature of our species, of our organization. So, that's one dimension; that's in a sense the more fundamental issue that we need to put up front and center when we talk about the "space program".

I would say the second dimension is, you could say in a sense, the realization of the potential created with those types of revolutions. Stuff we might discuss more as the infrastructure, or the physical economic development, or maybe physical economic platform which enables mankind to realize his potential to develop the Solar System. And Mr. LaRouche has been putting a lot of emphasis on the work of the German space pioneer, Krafft Ehrlicke, as a critical person defining many of the key elements of mankind's development of the Solar System. He was one of the original German space pioneers, the visionaries who really worked through in really significant on a very real sense. And anytime we bring up the work of Krafft

Ehrlicke, who was also very much a collaborator of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the 1970s and 1980s; and there was a very clear resonance with the perspective that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche were defining at the time, and Krafft Ehrlicke's own work in terms of bringing mankind into this next stage.

But anytime we talk about Krafft Ehrlicke's work, I think it's worth emphasizing what we have on the first slide here [Fig. 1], his three laws of astronautics; which I think define very beautifully the scientific principle that he worked from when developing his whole perspective for the space program. So, I just want to read this; I'm sure many people have heard these, but I think it's worth continuing to re-emphasize his insight into this. His first law states: "Nobody and nothing under the natural laws of the universe impose any limitations on man, except man himself." And his second law: "Not only the Earth, but the entire Solar System and as much of the universe as he can reach under the laws of Nature, are man's rightful field of activity." And his third law: "By expanding through the universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of reason, and the wisdom of the moral law within himself."

So, this was Krafft's own insight into the nature of mankind, the destiny of mankind, and defining a space program from that standpoint, from that perspective. More work is being done on reviving and continuing Krafft Ehrlicke's approach, but he defined and elaborated in great detail much of the fundamentals of the development of space from this proper scientific perspective.

Now, going from Krafft Ehrlicke's work, the work of LaRouche in the 1980s with his own space program proposal, I think it's useful just to fill out a little bit this idea of what I would call a physical economic platform for the development of the Solar System. I think there are three categories of activity which we should take a serious look at and focus on, if we want to enable a great expansion of mankind's capability to be

an active force in the development of the Solar System.

If we really want to fulfill the potential created by Kepler and Einstein in that sense, and fulfill Krafft Ehrlicke's vision and bring mankind to a level of really mastering and developing and interacting with the Solar System as a whole; I think there are three key categories that we want to look at. That we need fundamental breakthroughs in. So, one, first, is the issue of getting into space; space launch. The issue of getting from the surface of the Earth up into Earth orbit. And it's been said that getting from the Earth's surface into even low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System; that's very true in a certain sense.

We can see this in the next graphic [Fig. 2]; this is illustrated rather clearly if we look at the case of the Saturn V rocket. The rocket that took the Apollo astronauts to the Moon. Some people might be familiar with this; some people may be not, but most of that entire rocket was not the elements that actually landed on the Moon and brought people back. Most of that was just to get up off the Earth. 92% of the mass, the weight of the entire Saturn V rocket, was all fuel; most of that fuel was used just to get into orbit. So, in the pie chart, you can see the breakdown; just the total amount of weight that's fuel – 92% – the dry weight of the rockets and the systems to utilize that fuel is another 6.5%, and around 2% of the weight of the entire thing is the actual people and the stuff you're trying to get on the Moon, and the stuff you're trying to get back. So, you can get a clear sense of how much effort it takes just to get into space; this is also illustrated in the bar chart next to it. If people are familiar with the way the Saturn V worked, you had a series of stages; so you had the first main rocket fires, it gets up off the ground, and starts taking you up through the atmosphere, through the sky. And once that first rocket burns up all its fuel, it's jettisoned, it's released, and a significantly smaller part of the total rocket then continues as a new stage

fires, a new rocket fires. So, you had three stages to the Saturn V rocket; the entire first stage, the entire second stage, and part of the third stage was all needed just to get into orbit. And then from there, the third stage carried the astronauts to the Moon; it landed and came back, and then that third stage carried them back to Earth.

So, as we saw with the case of the Apollo, it's a nice, clear case study illustration of how much energy and expense it takes right now, currently, just to get into orbit. If we want to get a little bit more technical, this could also be expressed in terms of what's discussed as changes in velocity, changes in speed. This is a way to look at travel around the Solar System. Now, to get into Earth orbit, you don't just go up into space; if you just went straight up into space and then stopped firing your rockets, you'd just fall straight back down. Orbit is not just getting into space. You have to get up to a certain speed, where you're orbiting the Earth; and you're talking about thousands of miles per hour. You're talking about miles per second; so you have to get up to very high speed to actually get into orbit. And if you want to change orbits, once you're in low Earth orbit, and you want to get into a different orbit, you again have to change your speed, you have to again expend energy to change your speed. So, one way people discuss and analyze space travel, is what is referred to as changes in speed. So, here is just an illustration of the amount of change in velocity, sometimes called "delta V" is the technical terms sometimes used. The amount of change in velocity, the amount of change in kilometers per second needed to get to different destinations. And as you can see on the graph, each of those bars is to a different destination; the first one is to low Earth orbit, the second one is to geo-stationary orbit, the next one is to lunar orbit, and then we have each of our planets there. Venus, Mars, Jupiter, etc. So, in all of those cases, you can see that they all have that grayish-blue chunk at the very bottom; which in most of those cases, is well over half of the

total change in velocity requirements is just to get into low Earth orbit.

So again, when you say that getting from the Earth's surface to low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System, that's very true. So this is a major impediment, a major challenge and expense factor for space travel, for developing the Moon, for sending out more satellites, for everything we want to do. To the degree we have to bring stuff from Earth, this is a huge part of the cost. Now, there's been various designs proposed for ways to dramatically reduce this cost. One thing I want to – this is by no means the only method used, but this is something I think is worth putting on the table for greater consideration and examination, is what's been designed as vacuum tube, maglev space launch systems. So, a magnetic levitation system, so you can propel a rocket, a spacecraft with magnetic levitation; if you put it inside a vacuum tube, you can actually get to much higher speeds. Because even with maglev technology, the main impediment to getting the higher speeds very quickly becomes wind resistance. So, if you put this in a vacuum tube, you can get to very, very high speeds. Remember, we need to get to high speeds to be into orbit. And then if you can elevate that track up above much of the atmosphere, you can actually use a maglev vacuum tube launch system to get into space.

And what's depicted here [Fig. 3] is a NASA illustration of one design done by a former senior scientist at Brookhaven National Lab, Dr. James Powell, who actually has some of the original patents on maglev technology; he was one of the first designers of maglev technology back in the 1950s and 1960s. He developed this proposal for a vacuum tube maglev space launch system in collaboration with Dr. George Maise; and this particular design they called the "startram". So, just to give a sense, through the analysis they did, this would lower the cost of launching things into space from the current range of something around \$10,000-\$20,000 per kilogram to something

more on the order of \$40 per kilogram; just to put it in monetary terms. So, you're talking about a 100-, 200-, 400-fold drop in the cost of putting stuff into orbit. And this particular design was actually examined by an independent group in the Sandia National Labs, who had a so-called "murder board", which is a term for a group of people set up to see if they could find any fundamental technical flaws in a design like this. And so they examined it, and they gave it a clean analysis; they couldn't find any fundamental technical flaws in this general idea of this design.

So, you have these types of proposals out there, for dramatically lowering the cost and expense of getting stuff into orbit. And this general idea is being pursued in China. No surprise; China is where we see interest in actually pursuing these frontiers, and people are actually thinking about these things, are looking at these frontier technologies which can greatly give us a new capability to do these things. Specifically, at Southwest Jiaotong University in China, you have a group there looking at maglev technology, looking at vacuum tube maglev technology; they actually even have a test vacuum tube track actively working, where they're testing vacuum tubes for maglev. And the head of that project has openly discussed, he said this could also have great application for space launches; so, this is being looked at in China. So, this is one category of activity we want to get a fundamental breakthrough if we want to dramatically expand mankind's capabilities to develop the Solar System. And there are other variations, this isn't the only design out there that can address this. But this is just one that is worth highlighting to look at.

Second issue; second category of activity if we want to expand our ability to develop the Solar System – actually travelling in space, moving around in space. Once we're in Earth orbit, how do we get to the Moon, to Mars, to Jupiter, to Pluto, as we did recently? Well, to get to Pluto, it took us nine years;

and after travelling for nine years, scientists hoping everything goes right, hoping they can turn the spacecraft back on because they had it in hibernation. They spent more years before that designing the mission. Finally, they're reaching Pluto, they finally get there; the space craft turns on, starts taking all kinds of pictures, readings. We're totally surprised by what we see; Pluto is actually a much more active planet than we thought. It's got all kinds of diversity in its geographical, geological features; evidence for a lot of recent activity. Stuff we didn't expect at all; just totally surprised, shocked the scientific community. And then the space craft just passed by and kept going; didn't stop, didn't enter orbit. If it had entered orbit, we could be finding all kinds of more stuff; it could be getting awesome pictures of the entire thing, doing active studies to see if we can see changes taking place currently. But it didn't do that; it just kept going. Why did it keep going? Because we're still dealing with chemical propulsion for space travel. If New Horizons, the mission Pluto, wanted to stop and enter an orbit around Pluto, they would have had to carry the fuel needed to slow down enough to enter orbit; and also the rockets needed to use that fuel. And if they had carried that fuel with them, the launch would have had to have been much bigger, because you would have to lift all that fuel off the ground in the first place. So, this is just one illustration of how difficult it is to have any serious development and travel and moving around the Solar System

travel in space. We still don't want to take everything with us everywhere we go; we want to develop the resources of various environments in the Solar System. In the technical community, they talk about "in situ resource utilization"; I guess they want to make something exciting sound boring or something, so they call it "in situ resource utilization".

But developing the resources of the Moon, for example. What people in China again have talked about – mining the Moon for

Helium-3, an excellent, perhaps the most advanced fusion fuel available to us. Which doesn't really exist in any significance at all on Earth, but it relatively abundant on the Moon. We could be mining the Moon for Helium-3; we could be getting oxygen from the Moon, water from the Moon. Being able to use the material of the Moon to build buildings and shelters, whatever; actually having the ability to use and develop all the resources available to us on the Moon, or on Mars or wherever else. So, again, the third category – maybe the third leg – of areas we need to make qualitative leaps and breakthroughs in to enable mankind to be a real controlling presence in the Solar System. And again, China is looking at this; they're looking at the Moon, they're looking at the far side of the Moon in particular. Their next mission is going to be a lander on the far side of the Moon, which will be the first time that's ever happened in the history of mankind in space; they'll be landing something on the far side of the Moon to further prepare themselves to pursue these goals.

I think if you take these together – addressing the issue of getting from the Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, addressing the issue of travelling around the Solar System, and addressing the issue of utilizing and developing the resources of the Solar System – if we had leaps in all of those areas, the point here is not to detail exactly what those leaps will be. They can have various aspects to them; some of these breakthroughs are probably not even thought of yet, but those the three categorical areas where we need fundamental jumps in our capabilities there. With breakthroughs in these areas, we really have a new platform, a new physical economic platform; the kind of integrated infrastructure system that will enable mankind to be an active presence throughout the Solar System as a whole. And that defines a very useful set of boundary conditions that we have to focus upon if we want to pursue this type of perspective. And again, this is something that Krafft Ehrlicke spent a lot of time on and elaborated in great detail some of these

aspects. The development of the resources of the Moon; he had extensive investigations into that himself already. Nuclear fission and fusion propulsion systems. So these are not new concepts I'm presenting to you; these are things that have been thought through by Krafft Ehrlicke and others. But together, they define the needed platform that we must develop now if we really want to be an active force, an active presence in the Solar System in a serious way.

But I think that just brings us back around to the more fundamental point, because what we want to do is bring mankind into a higher role as a creative force and active presence in the Solar System. But then that becoming the platform to create the potential for the next higher leap. And one thing that immediately comes to mind, is Mr. LaRouche's work on this back in the 1980s; where he had designed his own proposal for a Moon-Mars colonization program. And in some of his presentations of this, and a particular paper he wrote on the subject, he organized the entire perspective from the standpoint of the most important being enabling mankind to make new fundamental scientific revolutionary breakthroughs. How do you want to do that? We need some really big and excellent and advanced space telescopes; things that cover the entire orbit of Mars with an interferometer system. From an integrated series of telescopes, you can integrate to operate as a single system. So, why don't we build something like that? What do we need to do that? Well, we need to be able to get into space. We need to develop the Moon; we need to develop Mars. We need mankind to be an active force throughout the Solar System to do that. But that whole perspective was unified around a mission of giving mankind the new capabilities to provide the human mind new generations of scientists with the new clues, the new anomalies that will lead to new fundamental discoveries. And this takes us to things like the galaxy; understanding the higher order principles organizing our galaxy and other galactic systems. Or, even higher than that, what organizes multiple systems of

galaxies.

So, as Kepler through Einstein had defined, in a certain sense, an arc of fundamental creative discovery that brought mankind to the level of the Solar System in true scientific fundamental potential; as they did that, so too, must we today look to the development of the Solar System. Expanding mankind in the Solar System, from the standpoint of giving new generations of scientists the capability to have the opportunity and the indications and the evidence needed to make new, completely fundamental breakthroughs in basic science; basic physics. The discovery of new physical principles; the types of things associated with our galaxy, other galactic systems, areas of science which are completely outside of our knowledge currently.

So, I think when we talk about the space program, people get excited about the rockets and the space suits and bouncing around in space – and those might be elements of it to some degree; to some degree not maybe. But the most fundamental thing is this issue of mankind; and this is really defining the necessary future common aims of mankind as pursuing the developments and the realization of our existence as a creative force in the universe. And that is something that unifies all of our nations; and it's something that we need to pursue today. So that is, I think, the positive perspective that we have to look forward to, and which will give us the inspiration to defeat these very ugly figures like Obama and his controllers. Because they're holding us back from that; and we shouldn't waste any more time.

ROSS: Thank you very much. That will be the conclusion for our webcast for tonight. I do want to let people know that there will be a live-streamed event on this website tomorrow, February 27, from Texas; where Kesha Rogers will be hosting an event on there being no limits to mankind's growth, and about the potential we have in space. I'd like to ask you to "like" this video, to subscribe to our Youtube channel; and if you

have questions about things that were presented, or for future shows, leave them as a comment. Thanks for joining us.

Spørgsmål og Svar Special den 25. februar 2016 om LaRouches fysiske økonomi

P.g.a. en fejl blev programmet desværre ikke optaget, men her er kildematerialet. Michelle Rasmussens indlægsnotater på dansk vil blive udlagt senere.

Vi diskuterede nøglepunkterne i kapitler 1 og 2 af Lyndon LaRouches lærebog "So, you wish to learn all about economics?":

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Her er LaRouches video om emnet, som var lavet i forbindelse med bogen:

Silkevejen kan få den syriske

våbenhvile til at lykkes

24. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Da Israel og den Palæstinensiske Befrielsesorganisation (PLO) underskrev en aftale i 1993 om at afslutte drabene og oprette et selvstyre for palæstinenserne, sagde Lyndon LaRouche omgående, at traktorerne måtte køre, med det samme, hvis planen skulle lykkes. Den gensidige gavn, baseret på israelsk industrikapacitet og palæstinensisk faglært arbejdskraft, måtte lanceres uden tøven, insisterede han. Det skete ikke, eftersom IMF og Verdensbanken skulle lede processen. Treogtyve år senere ...

Den dramatiske våbenhvile, som Ruslands og USA's udenrigsministre, Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry, hhv., aftalte den 22. februar i München, og som bekræftedes via en telefonsamtale fra præsident Vladimir Putin til præsident Barack Obama, har et umiddelbart potentiale til at transformere ikke alene Syrien, og ikke alene Mellemøsten, men hele verden. Den fremragende, strategiske intervention fra Putins side i Syrien sidste år i september demonstrerede, at terrorister kan nedkæmpes, men også, at USA under præsident Obama i realiteten havde allieret sig med terrorister for at opnå »regimeskift«, rettet mod ikke-samarbejdsvillige regeringer. Denne æra, med amerikansk underdanighed over for britisk imperietyranni, kan afsluttes – hvis våbenhvilen holder.

Ligesom med Oslo-aftalen vil våbenhvilen kun holde, hvis genopbygningen og udviklingen af Syrien (og regionen) omgående kommer i gang. Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde den 23. feb., at den Silkevejsproces, som Xi Jinping har lanceret, kan og må bringes ind i regionen nu – ikke i næste måned, eller til næste år. Det udviklingsprogram for Sydvestasien, som *EIR*-rapporten 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen' fremlægger, leverer fundamentet. Xi Jinping initierede projektet under sit besøg til Saudi Arabien, Iran og Egypten i

januar. Der er ingen tid at spille.

Titelfoto: USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry i rådslagning med sin russiske modpart Sergei Lavrov og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin. (en.kremlin.ru)

Putin går frem med fredsinitiativ for Syrien; Det haster med at få Obama og briterne smidt ud

24. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin går frem i denne uge med det nye initiativ for en våbenhvile i Syrien, med dens fulde implikationer for at standse krigsmagerne. Elementer i denne proces i perioden 22.-23. feb. tøjrer Obama og hans London-kontrollers med flere og flere begrænsninger. Det geopolitiske slæng finder det stadig vanskeligere at gennemføre deres sædvanlige, beskidte tricks. Dette skaber en ny mulighed for os til at handle for at få Obama væk, og virkelig bryde med det britiske imperieparadigme, der er den oprindelig ansvarlige for ødelæggelsen i Mellemøsten/Nordafrika og Europa. De aktuelle omstændigheder udgør de perfekte betingelser for fornuftige kræfter i hele USA – og i hele verden – for at komme frem og præstere dette.

»Der er ingen mulighed«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag og understregede det som en presserende hastesag. »Med mindre der gøres noget særligt for at få Obama smidt ud af embedet«, er

der ingen chance for succes. Det er vigtigt, sagde han, at »bryde det britiske overtag. Det er menneskehedens eneste chance. Obama må fjernes, på den ene eller anden måde. Det er den eneste mulighed.«

Den 22. feb. nåede de fælles formænd for ISSG (Den Internationale Støttegruppe for Syrien) – Rusland og USA – frem til en formel aftale om »Betingelser for Ophør af Fjendtligheder i Syrien«, efter en telefonsamtale mellem Putin og Obama, efter anmodning fra Kreml. Dernæst udstedte Putin en fuld og officiel »Særlig Erklæring«
<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/51376>

om den nye aftales betydning, der omfatter en gentagelse af principperne og en specifikation af deres gennemførelse. Med hensyn til overholdelse af kravene siger Putins erklæring: »For at opnå dette mål vil vi etablere en kommunikations-hotline og, om nødvendigt, en arbejdsgruppe til udveksling af relevant information ... «

Putin understregede yderligere, at der må skabes betingelser »for lancering af en politisk proces på lang sigt gennem en bred, inter-syrisk dialog i Geneve, under FN's regi«.

Moskva annoncerede dernæst, inden for 24 timer, mere implementering. Generalmajor Igor Konashenkov, talsmand for Forsvarsministeriet, udstedte i dag en erklæring, der sagde, at Rusland har forberedt logistikken for den 'varme linje' mellem USA og Rusland og overgivet det til USA til at blive igangsat. For det andet har Rusland etableret et »koordinationscenter til forsoning« af de krigsførende parter, på Kheimin-flybasen nær Latakia idet vestlige Syrien. Dets funktioner vil være at »yde maksimum assistance« til alle, der beder om det. Der vil blive oprettet hotlines for at overvåge våbenstilstanden. Centeret vil assistere indsatser for humanitær hjælp.

I modsætning hertil fulgte Obama op på telefonsamtalen og

aftalen med Putin ved ikke at komme med en erklæring og blot frigive et udskrift på to afsnit, der blev udlagt på Det Hvide Hus' nyhedsside. Første afsnit bekræftede blot telefonsamtalen og aftalen; alt imens det andet afsnit rapporterede, at Obama revsede Putin for forseelser i Ukraine. Den britiske udenrigsminister Philip Hammond fulgte trop ved at rave om, at den nye aftale »kun vil holde, hvis der finder et betydeligt sindelagsskift sted i det syriske regimes og dets støtters opførsel. Især må Rusland honorere denne aftale ved at afslutte sine angreb på syriske civile ... « osv.

I realiteten udgør Putins fredsinitiativer i Syrien rammerne for den Silkevej/Marshallplan, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Schiller Instituttets mobilisering har foreslået, og som er indbefattet i præsident Xis nylige besøg til regionen. Dette er midlet til at afslutte striden og genoprette en fremtid i hele regionen.

Det, der blokerer for dette, er, at amerikanere stadig finder sig i, at Obama sidder i embedet, og i den britiske imperiebesættelse. Tiden til at komme af med dette er for længst overskredet.

Foto: Vladimir Putins tale efter Ruslands og USA's vedtagelse af en fælles erklæring om Syrien. (en.kremlin.ru)

7000 argentinske forskere

advarer: Neoliberalisme og sand videnskab kan ikke eksistere side om side

22. februar 2016 – Syv tusinde argentinske videnskabsfolk, der repræsenterer flere forskellige institutioner, har underskrevet et dokument, der skarpt angriber præsident Mauricio Macri og advarer om, at, som det i fortiden er blevet demonstreret, så er monetarisme skadelig for sand videnskabelig udvikling og kreativitet, rapporterede *Página 12* den 21. februar. Argentina er nu, lyder erklæringen, i en »konservativ genrejsnings« kvælergreb.

Neoliberalisme og videnskab »er en modsigelse«, sagde Dora Barrancos, chef for Det Nationale Råd for Videnskabelig og Teknologisk Forskning (Conicet). »Vi har én gang før gennemlevet dette med [José] Martínez de Hoz«, sagde hun med reference til City of London-agenten, der tjente som Argentinas finansminister i militærdiktaturet 1976-83, og som forsøgte at virkeliggøre den britiske imperiedrøm om et Argentina, der snarere var en »landlig idyl« end et industrialiseret land. Dengang blev industri og videnskab lagt på huggeblokken, og der er uro i videnskabelige kredse over, at Macri vil standse finansiering af videnskabelig forskning, sagde Barrancos.

Dr. Eduardo Dvorkin, leder af det Nationale Akademi for Eksakte Fysiske og Naturlige Videnskaber, sagde til *Página 12*, at videnskabsfolk er bekymrede, »fordi en politik, der er imod national udvikling, og som sætter individuelle rettigheder på spil, er blevet påtvunget landet ... På kun to måneder er landet gået fra at være en model på autonom udvikling, med universiteter, forskningscentre og små og mellemstore

selskaber som basis for vækst, til at være et land, der er baseret på multinationale selskaber, der, i stedet for at udvikle landet, importerer alting, fyrer arbejdere, og som har modtaget en enorm overførsel af finansielle ressourcer.«

En anden underskriver, Daniel Filmus, understregede, at »vi videnskabsfolk lever ikke i en anden verden – der er en forbindelse mellem en udviklingsmodel og videnskabelig aktivitet. Hvis der ikke er nogen interesse for at udvikle industri og suverænitet, er der ingen plads til videnskabelig udvikling.«

Foto: Dora Barrancos

DET SKER I VERDEN – Infrastruktur, Videnskab & Teknologi – nr. 7

Korte artikler fra hele verden. Indeholder bl.a.:

- Der er også en fremtid for Tyskland – med fusionsenergi!
–
- Kinas Beidou satellit-system skal bidrage med en vigtig egenskab til "Rumsilkevejen" –
- Der er helium-3 på Månen, men meget mere på Uranus –
- O.m.a.

Titelfoto: En kunstners gengivelse af NASA-ISRO NISAR satellitten, der skal opsendes i 2020, og som skal overvåge naturkatastrofer og miljø.

Tyskland: 'Fysik for flygtninge' – At vække forskningens ånd og give håb for skabelsen af fremtiden

22. februar 2016 – Sidste december stod det Tyske Selskab for Fysik (DPG) og Georg-August Universitet i Göttingen i spidsen for et projekt, »Fysik for Flygtninge«, der var henvendt til børn og unge i henved 20 flygtningelokaliteter i hele Tyskland. Hver uge udførte 500 frivillige et fysikeksperiment, der blev gentaget af de unge, på disse steder. De opfandt også en internet-baseret »kalender for kommende fysik«, hvor eksperimenter præsenteredes via YouTube uden at give svaret. Med hjælp fra frivillige blev disse eksperimenter gentaget og løsningerne indsendt.

Projektet har fået støtte fra regeringen og vil fortsætte i en anden form i 2016. Hovedformålet er at give børn mulighed for at koncentrere sig om noget andet end den umiddelbare virkelighed i flygtningecentrene, at vise dem, at de er meget velkomne, og at opmuntre dem til at blive involveret i at udføre fysikeksperimenter på en legende måde. Deres webside siger: »Fysiske fænomener er universelle og globale. For at udføre eksperimenter behøver man ikke et bestemt sprog, en bestemt religion eller et bestemt sted. Det samme gælder for alle mennesker på Jorden, uanset, hvor man er, hvilket sprog,

man taler, eller hvilken religion, man tilhører. Fysik er spændende, sjovt og lærerigt – og at udføre eksperimenter skaber selvtillid. Fysik er sjovt – og det er overalt!«
<https://www.dpg-physik.de/pff/index.html>



DPG forpligter gennem sin forfatning sig selv og sine medlemmer »til at stå for frihed, tolerance, sandfærdighed og værdighed og at være sig bevidst, at de personer, der er aktive inden for fysik, i en meget speciel, høj grad er ansvarlige for dannelsen af menneskeligt liv som helhed. Vi besluttede derfor, i denne aktuelle, akutte situation, at tilbyde Fysik for Flygtninge for at engagere særligt børn og unge efter deres lange flugt, gennem at kombinere lærerig og spændende underholdning.«

Frivillige rapporterer, hvordan udførelse af eksperimenter »vækker forskningens ånd«, og at sprogbarrierer meget let overvindes. Projektets særlige virkning er »læringseffekten – på begge sider!«

Foto: Flygtningebørn i Friedland oplever 'Physik im Advent' med frivillige hjælpere.

70 prominente tyskere støtter Merkels flygtningepolitik

22. februar 2016 – I et forsøg på at stemme op for tidevandet i anti-flygtningedebatten og dækningen i medierne, har flere

end 70 prominente tyskere fra den kulturelle verden (især filmverdenen) og fra den politiske verden skrevet et åbent brev, der blev offentliggjort i avisen *Die Welt*, til støtte for kansler Angela Merkels flygtningepolitik. Brevet udtaler, at Tysklands modtagelse af over 1 million flygtninge i høj grad har hævet Tysklands internationale omdømme, og at Merkels strategi med at forhandle en løsning på flygtningespørgsmålet må opmuntres.

Underskriverne inkluderer Daniel Barenboim (musiker, dirigent), Nico Hoffmann, Jürgen Flimm, Katharina von Garnier (filminstruktør), Herta Müller (forfatter), Lea Rosh (udgiver), Margot Friedländer (overlevende fra Holocaust), Andre Schmidt (tidligere kultursenator, Berlin).

RADIO SCHILLER den 22. februar 2016: Knæk Det britiske Imperium med en tysk-russisk udviklingskorridor og et kinesisk-koreansk- russisk hurtigtog

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

Kerry og Lavrov når frem til 'Midlertidig principaftale om Syrien'

21. februar 2016 – De amerikanske og russiske udenrigsministre, hhv. John Kerry og Sergei Lavrov, nåede i dag frem til det, Kerry kaldte »en midlertidig principaftale om betingelserne for en standsning af fjendtlighederne [i Syrien], der kunne komme i gang i de nærmest kommende dage«.

Under en nyhedskonference i Amman sammen med den jordaniske udenrigsminister Nasser Judeh sagde Kerry: »Betingelserne for en standsning af fjendtligheder er nu ved at blive fuldført. Vi er faktisk i dag tættere på en våbenhvile, end vi har været.« Kerry tilføjede, at han forventede, at præsident Obama og den russiske præsident Putin i de kommende dage ville forhandle, for at fuldstændiggøre den midlertidige principaftale.

Irans PressTV og Reuters rapporterede, at det Russiske Udenrigsministerium bekræftede, at Lavrov og Kerry havde talt i telefon sammen søndag, om betingelserne for en våbenhvile. Rapporten sagde, at diskussionerne gik omkring betingelserne for en våbenhvile, der ville ekskludere operationer imod organisationer, »som af FN's Sikkerhedsråd var anerkendt som terrorister«. Dette inkluderer ISIS og Nusra Front.

Hvad den midlertidige principaftale vil føre til er ikke klart. Under pressekonferencen gentog Kerry Obamas holdning, at den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad må gå. »Med Assad der, kan, og vil, denne krig ikke ende«, sagde han. Assad sagde i går, at han ville gå med til en våbenhvile på

betingelse af, at terrorister ikke udnytter en standsning af kamphandlingerne til deres fordel, og at lande, der støttede oprørere, ophørte med deres støtte. Elementer af den syriske opposition havde tidligere indvilliget i »muligheden« for en midlertidig våbenstilstand på betingelse af, at der blev givet garantier for, at den syriske regerings allierede, inklusive Rusland, ville stoppe deres luftangreb, at belejringer blev ophævet og at nødhjælp ville få adgang over hele landet. Og Rusland har sagt, iflg. Associated Press, at de ville fortsætte luftangrebene i Syrien mod dem, de anser for at være terrorister, selv under en våbenhvile. Disse divergerende holdninger gør en holdbar våbenhvile til en monumental udfordring.

»Jeg tror ikke på«, sagde Kerry, »at, i løbet af de næste par dage, hvor vi forsøger at få dette effektueret, der skulle opstå et 'magisk vendepunkt' med hensyn til det, der foregår på jorden ... Oppositionen har gjort det klart, at de er fast besluttet på at kæmpe tilbage«.

Hverken Kerry eller det Russiske Udenrigsministerium ville frigive detaljer om den midlertidige principaftale.

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry taler under en fælles pressekonference med Jordans udenrigsminister Nasser Judeh i Udenrigsministeriet i Amman, Jordan.

Gør Det britiske Imperium

forbi, og sats på den eurasiske løsning

21. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Lyndon LaRouche gav søndag, den 21. februar en strategisk vurdering, der sagde, at verden nu har nået et øjeblik med et vendepunkt, hvor enten, det onde Britiske Imperium, med sit system for monetaristisk udplyndring, bliver knust, eller verden vil snart styrte ned i en atomkrigs rædsler. Alt imens der er legitim fokus på de sindssyge provokationer, som kommer fra Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien, der forsøger at gøre alt, hvad de kan, for at starte Tredje Verdenskrig på den syrisk-tyrkiske grænse, så er virkeligheden den, at det virkelige magtsæde bag disse manøvrer er den britiske krone.

Det transatlantiske, britiske system er totalt bankerot, og det virkelige centrum for global magt og stabilitet er skiftet over til Asien, hvor samarbejde mellem Kina, Rusland og Indien har skabt en relativ stabilitet, efter transatlantiske standarder. Der er trusler i Asien, men disse trusler kan overvindes gennem den form for politik for fysisk, økonomisk udvikling, som Kina har fremmet gennem initiativet med 'Et bælte, én vej'. Asien er blevet centrum for menneskehedens fremtid, fordi briterne har ødelagt næsten hver eneste hvid af kreativitet i USA, Storbritannien og det meste af kontinental-Europa. Der er muligheder, men de begynder alle med udslettelsen af Det britiske Imperiums magt.

For kontinental-Europa er den eneste, produktive løsning, at Tyskland, den sidste, tilbageværende økonomiske magt i Europa, allierer sig med Rusland omkring en plan for fysisk, økonomisk udvikling, tværs over hele korridoren mellem Tyskland og Rusland. En russisk-tysk koalition for en genoplivning af de produktive kræfter ville være den form for forandring, væk fra

Det britiske Imperiums monetarisme, som der er et presserende behov for. Glem Det britiske Imperiums bankerotte pengesystem. Det er fuldstændig færdigt, og kan aldrig genoplives. En tysk alliance med Rusland om opbygning af de produktive forbindelser hen over Eurasien, i partnerskab med Kina og Indien, er skriften på væggen for en dødsdom over de imperiekræfter, der gør fremstød for krig ved hjælp af skakbrikker som Erdogan, Obama og Mohammed bin Salman.

Samme fremgangsmåde er presserende nødvendig i Nordøstasien, hvor Koreakrisen kun kan løses gennem en genoplivning af Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbaneforbindelserne, der rent historisk har eksisteret, og som kan og må genoplives i dag. uden en fysisk-økonomisk dimension findes der ingen måde, hvorpå de britiske, geopolitiske svindelnumre kan overvindes. Afdøde general Douglas MacArthur forstod dette princip for asiatisk udvikling og stabilitet, som det ses af hans program for en genopbygning af Japan ved afslutningen af Anden Verdenskrig, og af hans fremragende lederskab i Korea. Genoplivningen af Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbanekorridoren er afgørende for stabiliteten i Asien, og dette bliver forstået af det kinesiske lederskab som et nøgleelement i hele »win-win«-udviklingsstrategien i Eurasien.

Der er ingen levedygtige alternativer til denne totale sejr/totale fremgangsmåde med krig, til at overvinde briterne. En tysk-russisk alliance for en genoplivning af Eurasien fra den europæiske side, som det tidligere blev forudset af den franske præsident, general Charles de Gaulle, den sidste franske leder, der besad en vision om Eurasien, er den eneste, tilbageværende mulighed for Europa og hele det transatlantiske område. I USA betyder dette at dumpe Obama, der ikke er andet end en britisk brik, og at udslette Wall Street. I Asien er Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbanekorridoren afgørende for en meningsfuld løsning til Det britiske Imperiums eskalerende krigsprovokationer, der i overvejende grad køres gennem Barack Obamas mund, og som er rettet, ikke mod Nordkorea, men mod

Kina. Indien er en naturlig partner i denne asiatiske udviklingsbestræbelse, og er allerede med om bord og forlænger de eurasiske udviklingskorridorer ind i Det indiske Ocean.

Den russiske præsident Putin har gjort det godt med den russiske, strategiske intervention i Syrien, der har trukket tåberne i Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien ind i en fælde, de selv har skylden for. Denne fælde har taget det britiske imperie-slæng på sengen, og øjeblikket til at knuse dem fuldstændigt er nu inde.

Dette er den presserende, globale politik, der må tages i betragtning, og vedtages. Tiden er ikke til endeløse debatter, og til at trække tiden ud. Denne politik må vedtages nu, og gennemføres i praksis. Det er den faktiske gennemførelse, der er underkastet seriøs planlægning blandt seriøse verdensledere, af hvilke flertallet er i Eurasien, som et resultat af generationers britiske brutalisering af befolkningerne i USA og kontinental-Europa.

Hvis du fanger dig selv i at tænke, »Ja, men det her er altså ikke praktisk«, er du allerede dømt til undergang.

**Bliver Ankara et nyt
Sarajevo?
Verden har brug for en**

fredsplan!

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Løsningen er enkel: Kasinoøkonomien må afsluttes gennem realiseringen af Glass/Steagall-loven; en international gældskonference må afskrive bankernes giftige værdipapirer, og et nyt kreditsystem må finansiere investeringer i den Nye Silkevejs projekter. Og hertil har vi ikke brug for et oppumpet, overnationalt bureaukrati i Bruxelles, men derimod en alliance af suveræne stater, som er forpligtet over for den fælles mission for udvikling af de områder i verden, der har et presserende behov for vores hjælp.

Kun, hvis Europa finder tilbage til sin humanistiske tradition, vil vi kunne bestå.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Kinesisk regeringsperson: USA har planer om krig med Kina med sin oprustning i Korea

20. februar 2016 – »Beijing må fuldt ud forberede sig militært og diplomatisk til krig på den Koreanske Halvø. Vi bør tilpasse vores militære deployering langs den nordøstlige grænse og vore maritime sikkerhedsstrategier så snart som muligt«, skriver Wang Haiyun, den tidligere kinesiske militærattaché ved ambassaden i Rusland, og nuværende ekspert

ved Kinas Internationale Institut for Strategisk Samfund.

Wang kritiserer skarpt Nordkorea for sin atomprøvesprængning og lancering af en rumraket og fremfører, at »For mellemstore og små lande vil ethvert forsøg på at udvikle atomvåben og strategiske bomber for at sikre den nationale sikkerhed ikke medføre andet end ulykke«.

Vi må imidlertid, siger han, »også få Seoul til at forstå, at introduktionen af udefrakommende styrker for at øge regionale spændinger vil være destruktiv ... Sydkoreanerne må huske på, at deres land vil bære den fulde effekt af kaos på den Koreanske Halvø, hvis der udbryder krig«.

Men USA's mål, siger han, er Kina. Kina må »mønstre de relevante modforholdsregler imod de amerikanske og japanske flåder, der omgiver vore vande, og Washingtons deployering af missilforsvarssystemet i Sydkorea« og tilføjer, at »USA og dets to, asiatiske allierede er i færd med at forstærke deres militære deployering i Nordøstasien under påskud af, at de håndterer truslen fra Nordkorea«.

Rettet mod Obama skriver han: »Washingtons plan om at inddæmme Beijing ved at øge den militære deployering og skabe vanskeligheder på halvøen vil blot lemlæste dets egen militærmagt, der gradvist er blevet svagt.«

Foto: THAAD missilforsvarssystemet, som USA vil deployere til Sydkorea.

Den Nye Silkevej bliver den »Største økonomiske udviklingsplan på Jordens overflade«

20. februar 2016 – En artikel i *Money Morning* fra i går sammenligner størrelsen og den potentielle indvirkning på økonomien og verdenshandelen af de Nye Silkevejs-projekter med tidligere mega-infrastrukturprojekter, såsom Panamakanalen og USA's Interstate Highway system. At se på, hvordan den Nye Silkevej »måler sig med tre af de mest mindeværdige, økonomiske megaprojekter i historien ... sætter virkelig dens blotte størrelse i perspektiv«. Artiklen skønner, at, når man inkluderer de mindre, lokale regerings projekter, der vil blive udviklet for at forbinde deres provinser med den Nye Silkevej, vil det Nye Silkevejs-projekt befinde sig i størrelsesordenen 600 mia. dollar, hvilket får alle andre mega-infrastrukturprojekter til at blegne i sammenligning.

Marshallplanen, der omfattede en hel befolkning, siger artiklen, på over 3 mia. mennesker, kostede USA omkring 130 mia. dollar, i nutidens penge. Panamakanalen kostede omkring 6 mia. dollar. Selvom artiklen ikke kvantificerer de tidligere programmers økonomiske indvirkning, beskriver den, hvordan kanalen revolutionerede shipping, hvordan Interstate Highway indvirkede på USA's transport over land, og hvordan Marshallplanen genrejste Europas økonomier.

Overskriften på et medfølgende kort over de foreslåede ruter for det Nye Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte og det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej – også kaldet 'Ét bælte, én vej' – samt olie- og gasledninger, lyder: »Det største megaprojekt, der nogen sinde er forsøgt«

**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 to 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 feel 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

racess, 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.

Det Romerske Imperiums fald – du står midt i det!

Som Lyndon LaRouche omhyggeligt har påpeget, så var en side af denne britisk anførte fordærvelse og ødelæggelse af det 20. og 21. århundredes USA, det diktatur over videnskab, og dernæst som en konsekvens over tænkning generelt, som blev udøvet af

Storbritanniens Lord Bertrand Russell. Russell dekretede, at al fysisk videnskab måtte reduceres til blot og bar matematik, og han forfulgte aggressivt Albert Einstein som det geni, der erklærede sig uenig og aldrig ville acceptere dette diktat. Russell havde held med sig – et besøg til et hvilket som helst såkaldt »videnskabeligt« klasseværelse burde overbevise dig om det. Som Russell forstod, at den ville, har denne afskrælning af videnskab fremtvunget en fordømmelse af al tænkning. Amerikanere er blevet gennemgribende bedøvede netop sådan, som vores tidligere store geni Edgar Allan Poe havde forudset disse virkninger. Dette er grunden til, at han kæmpede til sit sidste åndedrag imod det, han fordømte som matematisk tankegang, og imod hele den imperiekultur, der udstrålede fra London.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Jacques Attali foreslår international fredskonference for at standse krigens trommehvirvler

Paris, 18. februar 2016 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – Vi har ikke meget tilfælles med François Mitterands tidligere 'grå eminence' Jacques Attali, men ligesom mange af den ældre generations elite, kan han genkende lugten af atomkrig, når han møder den. I sin ugentlige blog fra 15. feb. i avisen l'Express, med titlen »Lyden af Krigstrommer«, gennemgår han de hårrejsende taler ved den nyligt afholdte Sikkerhedskonference i München. De følgende, oversatte (til

engelsk, -red.) uddrag er taget fra hans egne, engelske oversættelser af hans blog, »Samtale med Jacques Attali«.

»Ved konferencen skændtes Vestens og Ruslands topledere med hidtil uset voldsomhed om et bredt udvalg af spørgsmål: Frem til et punkt, hvor den russiske premierminister [Medvedev] vovede at sige, at der var mulighed for en ny verdenskrig, og at Rusland stadig var 'verdens stærkeste atommagt'; at USA's udenrigsminister [Kerry], der havde ansvaret for diplomati, truede med massivt at forstærke NATO's aktiver i Europa; at den russiske premierminister svarede ved at spørge, om amerikanerne stadig troede, de befandt sig i 1962 med Cubakrisen; at den polske premierminister [Szydło] sammenlignede Ruslands militære tilstedeværelse i Ukraine med de russiske flys bombardementer i Syrien; at lederne af de baltiske stater forklarede, at russerne bør modgås i Centraleuropa på samme måde som i Mellemøsten; og sluttelig, at George Soros forsøgte at demonstrere, at den russiske præsident var begyndt at destabilisere den Europæiske Union på en brutal måde med det formål at ødelægge den, før faldende oliepriser tvinger hans eget land i knæ.«

»München-konferencen er ikke en café, hvor ord er uden betydning: det har været den mest betydningsfulde lokalitet i verden mht. strategisk debat i over 50 år. Der er ingen, der taler overfladisk her. Og i sidste uge hørtes skræmmende trommehvirvler, der, hvis de følges op af handlinger, i de kommende måneder kunne føre verden frem til det værst tænkelige scenario.

Og dog konfronteres verden med ekstremt alvorlige risici, der er langt mere reelle end disse verbale forvrængninger ... Hvorfor tilføje til alt dette en dum og ikke retfærdiggjort tilbagevenden til en konflikt mellem Øst og Vest? ...

I alle tilfælde er det presserende nødvendigt at standse situationens tragiske, nedadgående spiral. For, siden München-konferencen, er det værste nu muligt, imod befolkningens

ønsker, og når vi i stedet kunne gøre så meget sammen, hvor alle har interesse i de andres succes.

Til dette formål er det nødvendigt, med henblik på at sikre, at alle europæere – dem fra Vest og dem fra Øst – som en hasteforanstaltning mødes ved en storstilet konference for fremtiden, og væk fra München-konferencen, med det formål at udvikle fælles strategier og projekter, roligt og uden hastværk, imod deres fælles fjender.

Hvorfor ikke i Paris? Hvorfor ikke om en måned? Hvem vil tage initiativet? Vil vi gå glip af denne chance for at komme tilbage til fornuft?«

<http://blogs.lexpress.fr/attali/2016/02/15/beating-the-drums/>

Tysk industri kræver en afslutning på sanktioner; Rusland må være en del af løsningen af krisen i Mellemosten

Wiesbaden, 18. februar 2016 – Handels- og Industri kamrene (IHK) i Sachsen, Tyskland, kræver nu højlydt, at sanktionerne mod Rusland må afsluttes i år. I et dokument med deres politiske anbefaling, og som blev offentliggjort den 15. feb. i Dresden, understregede de også: »Det er klart indlysende, at

vi har brug for Rusland som en vigtig økonomisk og strategisk partner til løsning af globale udfordringer. Konfliktsituationen i Mellemøsten, for blot at nævne et eksempel, kan ikke løses uden Rusland. En ny Kold Krig tjener hverken en løsning af aktuelle konflikter, ej heller frihandel og Saxens økonomi. Rusland er og forbliver en integreret del af det europæiske økonomiske rum og den europæiske sikkerhedsarkitektur.«

Med en understregning af den potentielle skade på Saxens produktionsfaciliteter for maskinværktøj, i betragtning af *Mittelstands* mangeårige bånd til Rusland, kræver IHK-chefer fra Leipzig, Dresden og Chemnitz, at Saxens delstatsregering omgående indleder et initiativ for at afslutte sanktionerne i Bundesrat, parlamentets overhus, der er sammensat af alle delstatsregeringerne. Saxens eksport til Rusland, der for en stor dels vedkommende er maskinværktøj, er kollapsede med 25 %.

I hele Tyskland kræver industrien en afslutning på sanktionerne, ikke kun pga. indlysende erhvervsinteresser, men også for at etablere strategisk samarbejde med Rusland. Efter at finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble den 21. januar i Davos, Schweiz, havde krævet investeringer i Mellemøsten og Afrika på Marshallplan-skala, gav han et interview få dage senere, hvor han krævede tættere samarbejde med Rusland.

Ligeledes den 15. februar talte Mario Ohoven, chef for Tysk Sammenslutning af Små og Mellemstore Erhvervsvirksomheder (BVMW), for 3.000 gæster i Berlin ved BVMW's nytårsreception, hvor han kaldte sanktionerne mod Rusland for »en komplet fejltagelse«. Gerd Müller, minister for økonomisk samarbejde og udvikling, der står i spidsen for Marshallplan-initiativet, talte også ved dette arrangement.

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 Cypren-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.