

Politisk orientering den 1. juni 2015: Kandidat Tom Gillesberg: Valget i Danmark og USA; nyt om den Nye Silkevej

Med formand Tom Gillesberg, kandidat i Københavns Storkreds
uden for partierne

video:

lyd:

RADIO SCHILLER den 26. maj 2015: Finansboble og euro systemet på vej ned; BRICS systemet på vej op

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21. maj 2015: Den nye strategiske BRIKS-baserede verdensorden, video og audio

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

RADIO SCHILLER den 18 maj 2015 – BRIKS alliancen konsolideres og udbygges

RADIO SCHILLER den 12. maj 2015: 70-års sejrparade i Moskva viser den nye verdensorden

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 7. maj 2015:

Diskussion:

RADIO SCHILLER den 4. maj 2015: 70 år efter befrielsen

Med Tom Gillesberg

**SI-seminar i København den
27. april 2015: Kinas politik
for "Et Bælte, En Vej"
SI Copenhagen seminar, April
27, 2015: China's One Belt,**

One Road Policy

Titelbillede: Dr. Liu Chunrong og Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Schiller Instituttets seminar fandt sted på Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute under Copenhagen Business School.

The Schiller Institute seminar was held at the Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, Copenhagen Business School.



Hr. Li Xiaoguang, kinesisk meddirektør for Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, holdt en velkomsttale.

Mr. Li Xiaoguang, the Chinese co-director of the Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, welcomed the participants to the Institute.



H.E. Ambassador Liu Biwei (right)

HE hr. Liu Biwei, Den kinesiske Folkerepubliks ambassadør til Kongeriget Danmark holdt åbningstalen.

His Excellency Mr. Liu Biwei, Ambassador of the People's Republic of China to the Kingdom of Denmark delivered opening greetings to the seminar.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter og formand for det Internationale Schiller Institut, holdt en tale om 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen, med introduktion v/**Tom Gillesberg**, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and president of the international Schiller Institute spoke about The New Silk Road becomes The World Land-bridge. Introduced by **Tom Gillesberg**, chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark:

Video af Zepp-LaRouches tale, med dia-billeder; en dansk oversættelse følger lige under videoen.

(Video of Zepp-LaRouches speech, with the slides included. An english transcript can be found further down the page)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Audio:

Hr. Liu Chunrong, PhD., associeret professor, School of International Public Affairs, Fundan Universitetet; eksekutiv vicedirektør for Fundan-European Centre for China Studies, Københavns Universitet, præsenterede Kinas "En Bælte, En Vej" politik.

Dr. Liu Chunrong, PhD, Associate Professor, School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, and Executive Vice Director Fudan-European Centre for China Studies, NIAS, University of Copenhagen, presented China's One Belt, One Road policy.

Video:

Audio:

Discussion period:

Video:

Audio:

(See English report below.)

Stor succes for Københavner-seminar om Kinas politik for »Et Bælte, En Vej«

København, 27. april 2015 – Omkring 80 mennesker deltog i dag i et seminar, som blev holdt på Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute under Copenhagen Business School.

Følgende personer var talere på seminaret:

Velkomsttale: **Hr. Li Xiaoguang**, kinesisk meddirektør for Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute.

HE hr. Liu Biwei, Den kinesiske Folkerepubliks ambassadør til Kongeriget Danmark – åbningstale.

Fr. Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af og international præsident for Schiller Instituttet og en betydningsfuld medforfatter af »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«; mangeårig leder i LaRouche-bevægelsen og gift med den amerikanske statsmand, økonom og filosof Lyndon LaRouche; forkvinde for det tyske politiske parti Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität (Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet), BüSo. Introduktion v/**Tom Gillesberg**, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark.

Hr. Liu Chunrong, PhD., associeret professor, School of International Public Affairs, Fundan Universitetet; eksekutiv vicedirektør for Fundan-European Centre for China Studies, Københavns Universitet.

De ca. 80 deltagere inkluderede fem ambassadører samt diplomater fra seks andre ambassader, mange medlemmer og kontakter af Schiller Instituttet, og andre interesserede som har specielle tilknytning til Kina.

Denne konference er den tredje i rækken af 'Manhattan-projekt'-konferencer i København siden januar, som Schiller Instituttet har arrangeret. En mere udførlig rapport vil følge, inkl. links til video- og audiooptagelser.

English:

Very Successful Copenhagen Seminar on “China’s ‘One Belt, One Road’ Policy”

The Schiller Institute in Denmark held a very successful seminar about China’s “One Belt, One Road” policy, at the Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, attended by approximately 80 people. Video and audio recordings can be found at: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=6387>

Li Xiaoguang, the Chinese co-director of the Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, welcomed the speakers and attendees.

The seminar participants had the honor to have opening remarks by **His Excellency Mr. Liu Biwei**, Ambassador of the People’s Republic of China to the Kingdom of Denmark.

The next speaker was **Helga Zepp-LaRouche**, founder and president of The Schiller Institute, and a major author of the EIR Report “The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge.” She was introduced by **Tom Gillesberg**, chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche presented the world land-bridge policy and the new BRICS paradigm, as the alternative to the danger of economic and financial collapse, and nuclear war. One area of special emphasis was the growing crisis of fresh water scarcity, counterposing the lack of action in the U.S., with the great infrastructure project approach in China.

The Chinese point of view of the “One Belt, One Road” policy was presented by **Dr. Liu Chunrong**, PhD, Associate Professor, School of International Relations and Public Affairs, Fudan University, and Executive Vice Director Fudan-European Centre for China Studies, NIAS, University of Copenhagen.

Among the audience were: five ambassadors, plus diplomats from another six other embassies; people who have a special connection to China representing a Danish think tank, academia and businesses; plus many Schiller Institute members and contacts.

This seminar was the third in a series of Manhattan project-style Schiller Institute conferences held in Copenhagen since January.

English transcript of Helga Zepp-LaRouche's speech, and Tom Gillesberg's introduction:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE ADDRESSES "CHINA'S 'ONE BELT, ONE ROAD' POLICY' SEMINAR IN COPENHAGEN, April 27, 2015

Here is the transcript of Helga Zepp-LaRouche's address to the Schiller Institute seminar in Copenhagen, which was held Copenhagen Business Confucius Institute, Copenhagen Business School. Click her for the audio and video from Helga Zepp-LaRouche's speech and the other speeches from the seminar.

TOM GILLESBERG: I have the great honor of introducing Helga Zepp-LaRouche, who has come here from a rather busy schedule both in Germany and the United States, but also the whole world she's intervening to. Just as a short introduction, Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche has been since 1977 the wife and very close collaborator of Lyndon LaRouche in the United States, the economist, philosopher, statesman who is giving leadership in the U.S., for the U.S. to return to the intentions of its founders, to be a promoter of sovereign nations that can collaborate on an equal footing to secure the benefits for all nations and peoples.

And Helga has a very, I think, close connection to China. As a young journalist she traveled to China in 1971, in the height of the Cultural Revolution as one of the first Western journalists and actually saw on the spot what was going on. She

then became politically active with the LaRouche movement and embarked on a life-long battle for a new just world economic order, for the possibilities of development for all nations and peoples.

She then founded, among many other things, the Schiller Institute, in 1984. She is presently the chairwoman of the German political party, the BÜSo – the Bürgerrechtsbewegung Solidarität, or Civil Rights Soliarity Movement. She was vry active after the Fall of the Berlin Wall and one of the authors

of the Schiller Institute program for the development of the world after the Iron Curtain had fallen of the program the Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle, a Locomotive for the World Economy. And when that did not materialize, she was very active in extending that program to the program for the Eurasian

Land-Bridge, going from China and Asia to Europe and having a development of the whole region. And as part of that, she then became a visitor many times to China to speak on the need for a

New Silk Road and actually earned her nickname in China as the “Silk Road Lady,” for her efforts to have China embark on this policy.

And since then, she has been also the driving force in holding many scores of conferences in Europe and the United States on the need for creating a paradigm shift, to get the Western world out of its long-term economic, strategic, and cultural crisis. And, over the last couple of years, she has been one of the architects of this report, “The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge.” She has also been leading the campaign to stop the present geopolitical games that threaten

to
detonate thermonuclear war and instead get the United States
and
Europe to accept the offer of the BRICS countries to join
forces
in an inclusive world order, where all nations of the world,
on
an equal footing, collaborate to secure the peace and
development
of all nations.

So I think it's very appropriate that you are here to
directly lay what's going on, so please, welcome. [applause]

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Thank you, Tom, for these kind words of
introduction.

Well I have a certain dilemma, because I want to present to
you the potential, which lies in this program, and given the
fact
that the Western media have reported very little about it, I
have
a dilemma, that I need to tell you, that this is {the} most
important political initiative on the planet right now. The
dilemma comes from the fact that, by introducing this idea,
have
to tell you immediately why this is the case, and that is the
reality, that the world is much more close to a new global
war,
than most people have an inkling of. And this New Silk Road
initiative, which comes from China, but which in the meantime
has
been joined by many countries, is the only available
war-avoidance policy.

Now there was just on the April 18- 19 in Moscow the Fourth
Moscow International Security Conference, and the main subject
of
this conference was the danger of nuclear war. And this is a
reaction to the fact that NATO has been expanding eastward, up

to
the borders of Russia. You have a whole bunch of strategic doctrines which Russia regards as a threat to their security interests, and naturally you have the horrendous situation in Ukraine, which contrary to what the Western media have been reporting on – or not reporting actually – is it's really something which the West must make up. I just participated in the
last two days, or Friday and Saturday in a conference in Baden-Baden in Germany, the German-Russian Cultural Days. It's an
annual conference, and there was a large gathering of German industrialists and Russian speakers and Russian people. And we had the fortune to have a videoconference connected to this conference, which brought in a live program from the former Prime
Minister of Ukraine, Mr. [Mykola] Azarov. And he gave an absolutely hair-raising report about the conditions in Ukraine,
the fact that the country is being torn apart. Political leaders
are either forced to go into exile or are threatened to be assassinated; journalists are being killed openly in the street;
trenches are being built; and, as you know, American soldiers are
now training the National Guard, which has a lot of Nazi components in it. And for the Russians this is extremely severe,
because we are shortly before the 70th anniversary of the end of
Nazism and the end of the Second World War, and the mood of the
people were really horrified to see this endorsement of Nazis
70
years after the Second World War.
Now, I don't want to go into this in depth, we can do that

in the discussion if people have questions about it, but I think this crisis, in Ukraine in particular, I could also point to the Middle East, which is in a similar horrible condition, makes very, very clear, that if we as humanity cannot move away from geopolitics – geopolitics was the reason for two world wars in the 20th century, and right now the continuation of geopolitics is threatening a new global war. I just want to mention an article in {New York Times} from 19th April, where two generals, Gen. James Cartwright, who is former head of the U.S. Strategic Command, and Gen. Vladimir Dvorkin, who is the chief of intelligence of the Russian Strategic Nuclear Forces, they penned together an article, In which they said that the world has never been so close to the danger of nuclear war globally, and therefore extinction, as right now. And the reason is obviously that even the normal code of behavior among nations, which existed in the Cold War, that you had a red telephone between Kennedy and Khrushchev, this no longer exists; and you have the two nuclear forces, from NATO and the West and Russia, all the time on launch on warning. And launch on warning means there are only a few minutes time, if one side perceives a launch, either by intention or by accident, they have a few minutes, actually it's estimated three minutes' time, to respond or be eliminated. So that shows you how extremely close we are to the danger of a global extinction of civilization. Because if this would happen, we would not exist as humanity. And I'm saying it with

that gravity, to say that this calls all the more urgently, for a different approach. And the different approach must be to move away from geopolitics and move in the direction of the common aims of mankind.

And it just happens to be, that the policies which are proposed by President Xi Jinping, which he calls a “win-win” policy, is exactly that. It’s the idea, that with the New Silk Road, you have a policy where every country which participates in it, will have a benefit for it. The New Silk Road, Maritime Silk

Road policy by China is {not} a new imperial policy replacing the Anglo-American imperial policy, but it is a completely new model

of the nations among nations, where the enormous example of the Chinese economic miracle, which China was able to develop in the

last 30 years – you know, where China in {30 years}, developed as much as most industrial nations needed 100 or 200 years to develop – and China is now offering to export that model and have other countries benefit in a similar way from that kind of economic miracle, which China did.

Can you move to the first slide?

So the world has changed since July last year, the summit of the BRICS countries in Fortaleza in Brazil. And this is a picture which was made at this occasion, showing the leaders of

Russia, India, Brazil, China and South Africa. And they basically

concluded a new strategic alliance – economic alliance, which Prime Minister Modi characterized in the following way: He said,

“This is the first alliance of nations, which are not defined

by their current capacity, but by their future potential of development.” And at another occasion, Modi said that the biggest potential of India is, that 60% of its people are below 30 years of age, and therefore, if they are well-educated and developed, they can come to the help of other nations, which has demographic problems, like Germany, for example.

What these countries did, is they concluded an enormous amount of economic treaties, of economic cooperation, including peaceful development of inherently safe nuclear energy, the development of fusion energy, joint space projects, space travel, and numerous other high-tech cooperation areas.

Then, the next day, they met with the leaders of South America, the organizations of CELAC [Community of Latin American and Caribbean States] and Unasur [Union of South American Nations]. Then a little bit later they also had meetings with countries of ASEAN [Association of Southeast Asian Nations] and

actually you have now a completely parallel system of economics, which is really going to be the infrastructure development of the world.

Now this here is an official picture of the New Silk Road and the Maritime Silk Road, which shows you the old Silk Road from Xi'an, actually it goes even farther to the west, Lianyungang, where the end of that Silk Road is on the China Sea, all the way through Urumqi, then Central Asia into Europe; and then Maritime Silk Road is actually connecting even Africa and

much of the Pacific also into Europe. And this is modelled on the famous Maritime Silk Road of the 15th century, which connected the nations of the world already at that time. Now, I want to very quickly say that this made us very happy, when Xi Jinping announced the New Silk Road in Kazakhstan in 2013, we jumped that high – you know, in the Schiller Institute – because we had promoted this idea. This was our proposal when the Berlin Wall came down, in '89, and the wall no longer was there. So we said let's connect Paris with Berlin and Vienna, which is a triangular area of the size of Japan, and has the highest concentration of industrial capacity in the world; and let's make corridors to Warsaw, to Kiev, to the Balkans. And it would have been a perfect way to intervene. Unfortunately at that time, despite the fact there was a very good resonance, you had Bush Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, and they had completely different ideas: They wanted to reduce Russia from a superpower to at Third World, raw materials-exporting country, and therefore they introduced the shock-therapy, instead, which dismantled the Russian industrial potential between '91-'94, to only 30% left. But then, when in '91, the Soviet Union collapsed, we connected this triangle, Paris-Berlin-Vienna, and we said: OK, now the Iron Curtain is gone, now we can have development corridors connecting the population and industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through corridors. And then we looked at the best geographical conditions. I should say, we were inspired very much by the railway program of Sun Yat-sen, the founder of modern China, who had developed a whole network of

Chinese railways, and that went into this program. So, at that time we said let's look at the best geographical preconditions, and we found, not so accidentally, that the old Trans-Siberian Railroad and the old Silk Road, the ancient Silk Road, had the best geographical conditions to build such infrastructure. So at that point the shock therapy started to destroy Russia's economy, but we kept holding seminars – we had hundreds of seminars, in Europe, in United States, and then, eventually, in Warsaw, in Budapest, in Moscow. And in '96 even in Beijing, where the Chinese government had responded to our proposal to all the governments, to hold a big conference promoting the regions along the Silk Road. And I was there as a speaker, but then came the Asia Crisis in '97, and China, at that conference said, that this will be the long-term strategy for China until 2010. But then the Asia crisis brought chaos and then the Russian GK0 crisis [in '98]. So in the mean time we kept working on this initial proposal which grew. And the latest of this, is this report: It's a 370-page study which is really the idea of connecting the world through infrastructure corridors. Now, here you see some of these projects, which are already being built, by the BRICS, by some of the other countries – for example China is now building a transcontinental railroad from Brazil to Peru, this is letter A [on the map]. This has already started – you know, Latin America does not have an infrastructure network! It is still in the colonial condition, where you have little railroads from the iron ore mountain to

the

coast, but if you want to travel from Peru to Brazil, you have to

go via Miami. So this is the idea, to develop a continental railroad system.

Then number 1 there is the canal built in Nicaragua, it will be the second Panama Canal, which obviously is an extremely important project, which will mean that Nicaragua has a very good

chance to become an industrial country, with improving living standards of its population. Naturally the Greens are going crazy and they say there are two fishermen who have to be resettled. But, first of all, these people will be compensated,

and secondly without infrastructure, there is {no} industrial development; without infrastructure there is not even agriculture, because without infrastructure you cannot transport

and process food.

So then, naturally you have the Bering Strait, this number 2. This has been recently announced by Vladimir Yakunin, who is

the head of Russian Railways. And he proposed (I don't think I have that slide), a fast train connection from London all the way

through the Bering Strait to New York. A couple of years ago, Mr.

LaRouche and I participated in a conference in Moscow where the

fathers of the Bering Strait Project were present. These were all

older men over 80, and they said: "Oh, in 20 years, we can go with a maglev train from Acapulco through the Bering Strait to Mumbai, and this will be much faster than you can go by ship today," and they had a very pioneering spirit.

So this is very important because this connection not only would connect the transport lines of North America with those

of

Eurasia, but it would be absolutely crucial to open up the Arctic

Region. In the Far East of Russia you have all the raw materials

which are in the periodic table of Mendeleev, and they represent

for the next 100 years a very important raw-material potential which will be important not only for Russia, but for Europe, for

the United States, for China, for Japan, for Korea. So this will

be the way to develop it, because these raw-material are in permafrost conditions, and you have to build, you have to build

cities, which have a dome, because people have to live – you cannot live in permafrost conditions like that, you have to have

a special way of developing it.

Now, I could go into many other projects – the Seikan tunnel between the Japanese islands does already exist, it connects the two important islands in Japan. Then the Bohai Tunnel will connect two Chinese cities and shorten the transport.

The brown line there, this is the actual Silk Road [Silk Road Economic Belt], which is now being promoted by China; this larger

gray line is the [21st-Century] Maritime Silk Road; but as you can see, it stretches all the way to Europe and into Africa.

Prime Minister Li Keqiang was several times last year in Africa,

and he proposed to connect all African capitals through a fast train system. And I know from many Africans, leaders and leading

politicians, they are very happy about that, because Africa right

now urgently needs development. And I think, if you look at

the
horrendous refugee crisis, the people drowning by the
thousands
in the Mediterranean, it makes it {so} clear that to bring
development to Africa is the only way how you can overcome
this
unbelievable tragedy. And if Europe would have a right mind,
they
would join! You know, rather than sending the Triton boats to
chase the refugees back, which is a complete moral bankruptcy
of
Europe.

Now this is very interesting, because the big question
always comes, "who should finance all of this?" As you know,
already at the Brazil Fortaleza summit, the BRICS countries
agreed, together with some of the other countries, to create
new

financial institutions: the New Development Bank of the BRICS,
the AIIB [Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank] was already
founded in last October, but also a whole set of other banks.
And it came from the idea, that when the Asia crisis happened
in

'97, in which speculators like George Soros speculated against
the currencies of countries like Korea, Philippines, Thailand,
in

one week up to 60-80% downward, and these countries had no
defense; so they concluded, "OK, we have to protect
ourselves,"

so they created the Contingency Reserve Arrangement [CRA],
which

is a pool of currencies of a \$100 billion, which will defend
all

of the participating countries against speculative attacks.

Now, the AIIB, the New Development Bank, the New Silk Road
Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the bank of the Shanghai
Cooperation Organization [SCO Development Bank], and the SAARC
[South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation] Development

Fund, are all new banks which follow a completely different principle than Wall Street and the City of London, or Frankfurt, for that matter. They say, we do not participate in speculation, but we will use these funds only for investment in the real economy, into these projects. And this is urgently needed, because as you know, despite all of the quantitative easing of the Federal Reserve, and now [ECB President] Mr. Draghi, who are printing money as if there would be no tomorrow, the money does not arrive at the industries! Because the banks, the speculators prefer to keep the casino going, and this is actually reaching a point where at the IMF annual spring meeting which just took place in Washington, the IMF itself put out a report saying that we are facing a collapse {bigger} than 2008 with the collapse of Lehman Brothers. And several economists from J.P. Morgan and other banks warned that you could have a simultaneous stock and bond crisis, causing a meltdown of the system; or, if the Federal Reserve would increase the interest rate only by a tiny, tiny amount it could blow up the whole derivatives bubble of \$2 trillion. And if the Troika and the ECB are pushing Greece out of the Eurozone, that could also trigger a collapse, because it would not so much hurt Greece, but it would blow up the European banks.

So therefore, the existence of these banks are de facto a lifeboat in the face of the immediate danger of a collapse. Now, as you probably have noticed, when the question came,

who would be a founding member of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, which was already constituted last October, but the date until which countries could join as founding members was end of March [2015]. And the United States put a lot of pressure on the allies, not to join; they didn't want Korea to join; naturally, they didn't want Europe to join, and they put maximum pressure on Asian countries not to join. But then, it just so happened, that the best ally of the United States, Great Britain, was the first European country to join, and that caused a kind of a dam break, and then Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, and all the Scandinavian countries joined. And the actual founding members included 57 countries. And they basically participate in different degrees in this new bank, which obviously people realize that what China is offering with the economic cooperation in these projects, is much, much more attractive than to participate in more speculative bubbles which eventually will pop. So, this was from the founding meeting in October, already, but in the meantime, it become many more states.

Now, this is also very interesting, because this is a proposal which my husband made in 1975. It was called the International Development Bank, and it was basically the same idea as the AIIB, today, saying that the IMF and the World Bank

do not provide enough credit for Third World development. This was a proposal he made in '75, and it went into the final resolution of the Non-Aligned Movement in 1976 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and it had the same idea as the AIIB.

The World Bank only spends per year \$24 billion for

projects. But the actual requirement of the developing countries, is about \$8 trillion in the next years! So there is no way the World Bank can manage that, and this bank, on the other side, the AIIB, and the other banks will grow and will become more productive.

Now, this is very important because what the AIIB and the New Development Bank and this new economic system which is emerging represent, is something completely different than monetarism. Monetarism is the idea that you have to have maximum

profit, the real economy doesn't count; as a matter of fact, you

all know, that if you have an industrial firm which lays off 10,000, the stock goes up! It doesn't make any sense. In the realm of monetarism, this is explained by the idea that the firm

becomes "more productive" because fewer workers work more, and therefore the profit is greater; but from the standpoint of the

real economy this makes no sense at all.

And it is exactly that philosophy which has caused the Troika to destroy Greece. What they managed to do is to reduce the Greek economy by one-third, to increase the youth unemployment to 65%, and people are extremely unhappy, not only

in Greece, but also in Italy, in Spain, Portugal and so forth.

What we propose, both the IDB and these new banks, is really going back to a completely different model. It's based on the idea of this man, whom you all recognize, I'm sure – he is Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. And he created, actually, the United States, by creating the National Bank and the credit system, because, what

he did, was after the War of Independence, the different states

in the United States were totally indebted. So he unified the United States by taking over the debt obligations of these

states, and basically saying, it's no longer your business, we'll take these debts as a Federal state, as a national state, and we will transform that into a credit mechanism, only aimed at areal production.

And that was really the actual founding of the United States. And this idea of a credit system which is not monetarism, but it is the idea that credit can only be given for future production in the real economy, not for speculation, that model was what made the United States a great industrial power.

Because, despite the fact that some following Presidents then tried to dismantle it, the United States went back to it, again

and again. It was the policies of John Quincy Adams; it was the policy of Abraham Lincoln with the greenbacks; it was the policy

of Franklin D. Roosevelt. This is how Roosevelt brought the United States out of the Depression of the '30s by building the

Reconstruction Finance Corp. which financed the New Deal, and that's how America got out of the Depression. And, also, it was

the basis for the German Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, the state bank, which help to finance the reconstruction and the economic miracle of Germany in the postwar period – which was modeled on the Reconstruction Finance Corp.

So this is therefore, not something new. It's a tested model, it has always been the basis when there was progress in the real economy, as compared to the financial markets. I'm not

talking about the financial markets, I'm talking about real

production for the livelihood and the common good of the people.

So the first step there, we have called for – Tom mentioned it – that we think it is an absolute matter, actually of war and peace, if we succeed to get the European nations {and} America to join with this “win-win,” all-inclusive, non-geopolitical system. And, as I said, the financial system of Wall Street and the City of London {is} about to blow up, bigger than 2008, and the only way how that can be avoided from leading to a chaotic collapse, is by going back to the Glass-Steagall legislation which was introduced by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933, which was his answer to the collapse of '29-'33 period. And he separated the banks, by making the commercial banks separate from the investment banks, so that the investment bank could not have access to assets of the commercial banks. And this exist from 1933 until 1999 in the United States, and in Europe you had practically the same thing, because you had a very regulated banking sector. But the Wall Street forces did not like it, because naturally it reduced their profit, so they worked very hard to eliminate it, which they were able to do in 1999, and the whole super-expansion of the speculative area only occurred after this law was eliminated. And the good news, is that there is a right now a Presidential candidate in the United States, who has said that his first act if he would move into the

White House, would be to reintroduce this Glass-Steagall law:
And
that is the former Maryland Gov. Martin O'Malley, about whom
many
papers are writing that he has a very good chance to take the
Democratic nomination, because many people think Hillary
Clinton
has made too many compromises with bad policies, when she was
Secretary of State. But, O'Malley is not alone, but you have a
whole bunch of people around him, who say the United States
must
go back to being a Republic; it must go back to putting the
common good above the interests of Wall Street. And that is
really the "to be or not to be" question of the whole world.
Now, if this reorganization would take place, then, the
United States could easily join with the BRICS countries in
such
efforts as the AIIB and other such things. And, as you know,
the
Greek government has also demanded that there is no way how
they
can pay their debt, because as you know, of all the rescue
packages which went to Greece, only 3% of that money remained
in
Greece, while all the rest really went to the European banks.
And therefore, to demand that Greece should pay back these
debts,
it's just impossible! And the Greek government has made the
point that they want to have a European Debt Conference, like
Germany in 1953, without which the German economic miracle
would
never have taken place. So if this all happens, and that could
happen in the short term, Europe could easily participate in
that.
Now, I just want to say, the ancient Silk Road was not only
an exchange of silk, and porcelain, and paper, printing,
gunpowder, and many, many other goods, but much more important

than that, it was an exchange of ideas and technologies: Silk making is more important than silk; how to print books is more important than the book. So the ancient Silk Road was an extremely important exchange of goods and culture, and ideas, and

understanding among people – and so will be the New Silk Road, just with modern means.

Now, if you go back to the picture, this is why we have said, “The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge” where we

have the camels, sort of symbolizing the old Silk Road, and here

you see a maglev train, and here you see a rover on the Moon, to

give you an idea that the exchange of technologies and goods in

the modern world will be the most advanced technologies to the benefit of all of mankind.

So going back to the problem here, is, obviously, if you look at that map, you see, these are the deserts of the world:

A very broad desert band which goes from the Atlantic coast of Africa, through the Sahara-Sahel zone, the Arab Peninsula, the Middle East, all the way to China. And that desert is growing. It's expanding. And then you have the desert in the West of the

United States, which is right now ruined by a big drought in California, in Texas, in all the states west of the Mississippi;

and naturally, Brazil has a drought.

In the United States this is very severe. Here you have a global water scarcity map; here you have the water stress indicator. In the United States, just to mention that, Governor

Brown of California has just announced that the water consumption

will be cut by 25% up to 36%! Now that is the death to

Californian agriculture; in the south of California, for example, in the Central Valley, in this region, 40% of the entire agriculture of the United States is produced, and this is now being completely destroyed. Here you see, this is a former reservoir, which is almost dried up. This is the snowpack: in 2013, it was relatively, a lot of snow, and last year, no snow, so the drought is expanding, and obviously, to cut consumption means you kill people. I mean, you cannot cut water – where should these people go? There are already cities and towns where people are – it's not just not watering their lawn – it's taking public showers, of getting water rations, and then eventually people have to move away, because if there is no water there is no life. There were already herds being transformed, of hundreds of thousands of head of cattle, and the idea to just accept that, and as Governor Brown said, "California historically has only a carrying potential of 400,000 people," is ridiculous, because there are presently 39 million people living in California! And the idea to say there's only room for 400,000 is completely ahistorical about what is the role of human beings, who differentiate themselves from animals by being able to increase the living capability for more people by improving productivity, by transforming the industry, the infrastructure, and in that way, developing the planet. So obviously, China has taken a completely different approach. Here you see, China is actually the only country which has taken a very big water diversification: There is on the one

side, the Three Gorges Dam, which is now producing, I think 22 gigawatts of electricity per year, and it has eliminated flooding

which killed many thousands of people in the past; and even more

important, is the water diversification project from the southern

area of the Yangtze River through a Northern Route into the Yellow River and the desert area of China; and the Middle Route

to the region around Beijing.

So this is actually a model which is now being followed by Narendra Modi for India, who just agreed to make gigantic water

projects to tame the water coming down from the Himalayas, and also making canals out of 101 Indian rivers.

Now, what most people don't consider is, that water is not a natural resource like iron ore, or gold, or whatever: You can't

use up, because water is organized in global cycles, where 90% of

the precipitation rains down over the ocean, only 10% rains down

over the land. And that water, the Sun causes evaporation, this

leads to cloud formation, and then the water rains down, and it

is human activity, which can make these cycles more efficient.

It's not just, that it rains down over land and then flows back

into the ocean. You can use it in agriculture, you can use it in

industrial production, you can use it in other urban activities,

and it is actually the ability of man to make that more efficient.

Here you see a very interesting comparison – you see here

the water diversion of the United States. Even though the water diversion of China has started much more recently, it's almost double, which shows you the completely different philosophy. This is a very important project, which is part of the approach to fight the desert, and this is the Lake Chad Transaqua project, which is the idea, that you could eliminate a lot of the drought in the Sahel zone and around Lake Chad by bringing some of the surplus water from the headwaters region of the Congo on the one side, through rivers and canals into Lake Chad, which has been reduced to less than 10% right now; and also through a second canal along the Nile to increase the agricultural land in Africa tremendously. And also now to bring real development to these countries, without which you will have more people running away from Boko Haram, which is now at Lake Chad and Nigeria. And without a real development perspective, there is no way how you can contain these projects. Human beings are the only species, which can improve the conditions of mankind again and again and again, and the last 10,000 years, or 20,000 years since the last Ice Age, just think, what an enormous development mankind has made. We have increased the population potential of the Earth from about 5 million at most, to presently around 7 billion. This is due to the fact that man, unlike animals, can make new discoveries, discovers the universal principles of our physical universe, and think

things,

which have never been thought before.

Therefore, the attack on the water crisis is not just a question of using the aquifers, because the aquifers can – they

replenish, but this goes much too slowly. It's not only re-diverting the rivers, dams, but it's especially influencing the global cyclical process of water. There is a relationship between what happens in our Solar System and the rain. Because the Sun, which shines on the oceans, causes evaporation, but the

Sun is not the only solar impact on the weather; it's also the cosmic radiation, which comes from our galaxy, which leads to cloud formation, ionization of moisture, and therefore to rain.

That is not just something where we have to wait passively until

it happens, but we can study, for example, what is happening in

our galaxy, which influences the weather, and then understand better, how we can create more water.

Here, you see our Solar System in a 32 million year cycle, moving along the Milky Way. The Milky Way is basically a flat plateau, in which our Solar System is moving up and down in cycles, and you have a complete change in the weather patterns,

which comes from the position of our Solar System in our galaxy.

I'm not saying, that we know everything about that yet. We know, that there is a lot of connection between the Solar System,

the galaxy and the weather patterns on our Earth, and I can assure you, that if you look at the long-term changes in our weather patterns, then {these} things are a lot more important,

than whatever you use in your little car as CO2 production.

Because these are forces, which are of a completely different

magnitude, and naturally, the climate is changing, but galactic processes are really what is the cause of it. Anyway, the idea of using cosmic rays and ionization of moisture is already successfully being done by Israel and by some of the Gulf States; Russia is doing a lot of research on this, and this is, what we have to do. The reason, why I'm saying this, is, the Silk Road is not just building railways from Dunhuang to Lisbon or wherever; it's not just building roads, it's not just building canals. The modern Silk Road, the New Silk Road is, exactly as the old Silk Road was, {an exchange of ideas, of technology, for the common good of all.} Obviously, today the big challenges are world poverty, are the danger of war, are the danger of water scarcity, which could become the reason for new wars. So the New Silk Road – and this is what we understand with it, and I'm sure that our Chinese friend will show his perspective – but that is the philosophy, which we have taken as a basis in our approach, that the New Silk Road is {a vision}, of how humanity can move away from geopolitics and the stupid idea that we have to fight over scarce resources, that we have to create wars because we don't like another system, that we have to eventually self-destruct, but that we have to make the evolutionary jump to the idea of the common aims of mankind and to define the next phase of evolution in the interest of all. If you look at this, the Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin of Russia just two days ago, pointed to the fact, that the BRICS countries are all space travelling nations. China is

the leader in space travel. When China in December 2013 landed the Yutu rover on the Moon, with was the idea, that in a few missions later, I think it was in 2017, this Yutu – “Jade Rabbit” – that they will bring back helium-3. Helium-3 is an isotope, which is actually a fuel for fusion power. It’s much more efficient than deuterium or tritium, because with this heavy deuterium and tritium in the fusion process, you are still using turbines, and you use turbines to create electricity in the old way. But with helium-3 you can directly gain electricity from the physical process of fusion power, and therefore, naturally, the energy efficiency is much, much higher. And once we have fusion power, for example, this will create for the first time energy and raw materials security for the Earth. Energy security, because on the Moon, you have several tons of helium-3, which will be sufficient for many tens of thousands of years of energy security on the Earth; and raw materials security, because with the high heat of the plasma torch, you can take any waste, including nuclear waste, including waste in your household, and turn it back into isotopes, which you then can reconstruct and make new raw materials.

So this is the vanguard of where mankind must go, and China has made that its national pride. And China, contrary to Germany, which is very stupid with respect to energy – you know, this stupid exit from nuclear energy without having an alternative, is completely crazy – but China has basically created a situation,

where they are in the right position to solve this problem, and Rogozin, the Deputy Prime Minister of Russia, has said, that the BRICS countries will cooperate in space to solve these problems. So this is extremely important, because if mankind makes that jump to not have war as a conflict resolution, which in a time of nuclear energy, it should be obvious that we must move to a different regime, that we must define the common aims of mankind, that which is, – if you have seen these pictures with astronauts and cosmonauts and taikonauts, they all report the same: When they are in space and look at our little planet, this blue planet, they realize that there are no borders. They also realize that our planet is extremely small in a very big Solar System, in an even bigger galaxy, and there are {billions} of galaxies. So, there are dangers from space, like cosmic radiation, like asteroids; there are all kinds of dangers, which we don't manage right now. But if we don't want to have the same fate as the dinosaurs, who became eliminated 65 million years ago, because probably a meteorite hit the Earth and created so much cloud cover, that all the vegetation stopped, and then the dinosaurs, and 96% of all other species were eliminated; if we as a creative species, {are} really the creative species, we should put our efforts together and defend against common dangers to our planet, common dangers to our civilization, and unite. And there is no better image for that than space collaboration. This whole question also has a philosophical dimension. Because people think, China is just doing an imperial expansion,

they want to have their interests. Well, I have the deepest conviction that what is working in China right now, especially with President Xi Jinping, {is} the 2,500-year-old Confucian tradition in China. And I go even so far to say the Chinese people have Confucius in their genes. Confucius was a philosopher, who reacted to a historical period in China, which

was characterized by war, by great unrest, by turmoil. And he developed the Confucian philosophy, which is beautiful. I can only advise you, in case you are not doing it, study Confucius.

Because Confucius has this idea that there must be harmony in the

world, on the planet. And that, for example, the best way to have harmony is, there is one key notion, which is {li}, which is

the idea, that each person, each nation, should take its proper

place, and develop in the best possible way, and then you have harmony. Because if everybody develops their creative potential

and their best maximum capacity, and takes the development of the

other as their own interest, and vice versa, then you have peace.

And that should also be based on the other notion of {ren}.

{Ren} basically means the same thing as love, or {agapē}, or the

Christian idea of charity.

And it happens to be that these ideas are also in the European best tradition. There is a very important philosopher of

the 15th century, called Nicolaus of Cusa, who was the founder of

modern science, the founder of the modern nation-state, and he was very important: He broke through the barrier from the Middle

Ages to modern times. Because he was actually the person, who brought the Council of Florence into being by first finding handwritings in Byzantium, which were then the basis for the unification of the Orthodox Church with the Roman Church; but when he brought the Orthodox delegation in 1453 to the Council of Florence, he had a stroke of genius: He said, now, I am thinking something, which no human being has ever thought before. He then wrote his {De Docta Ignorantia}, and he developed this notion of the coincidence of opposites, the {coincidentia oppositorum}, which was the idea, that the One has a higher quality than the Many, and that the human mind is capable of synthesizing some hypothesis, which gives you a deeper insight into the laws of the universe, into Classical art – in other words, it's the creativity of the human mind, which is the driving force in the development of the universe. And that's for example, what the Russian philosopher Vladimir Vernadsky called, that the creativity of man is a geophysical force in the universe. Now, what he did basically, is to say – he didn't say it in this way, but the effect of it was – that in order to move away from the Middle Ages, from the Scholasticism, from the Neo-Peripatetics and the Aristotelean ideas, you had to basically break with the axioms of the Middle Ages thinking, and that you had to create something basically completely new, a new method of thinking. And I'm saying, that with the New Silk Road, we have to do exactly that: We have to break away from money, greed, monetarism, all of these things, which really are a decaying culture. If you look at the European, American, Western culture, it {is} a decaying culture. Just look at the youth culture.

Look

at what our young people watch in terms of pop music, video games, the violence, just the popular entertainment has become really degenerate. And we have to break with that, and we have to

combine the New Silk Road economic model – which I did not go into so much today, because I already spoke about it two months

ago here in Copenhagen – but we have to break with the whole axiomatic of globalization and basically go for a New Renaissance, a new cultural renaissance of thinking, which will

build on the best traditions of each country: on Confucianism, on Vedic tradition of India, on Avicenna [Ibn Sina], and other thinkers, Al-Farabi, Abu Al-Kindi in the Arab world; in Europe,

the great Classical music tradition, the Italian Renaissance, the

German Classical music. We just have to take the high points of

all civilizations, and study that, and start to love the culture

of the other countries, and then we will create out of this a completely New Renaissance, which will bring mankind into a completely new phase of evolution.

Because I do not believe, that the present condition of mankind is, what we are here for! We are not here to kill each other; we are not here to eat caviar, until we have it coming out

of our ears. We are here to be creative! We are here to discover

the laws of the universe, to write beautiful poems, to write beautiful music, to celebrate the creativity of civilization.

And

I think, that the idea of man in space, man going into the next

phase of the evolution of man, is really what will get us out

of
this crisis. So that is, what the New Silk Road is all about.
[ovation]

Slides from the presentation (click to enlarge):



**Politisk orientering den 23.
april 2015:
Derfor stiller Schiller
Instituttets Venner op
til folketingsvalg med BRIKS**

på plakaten

med formand Tom Gillesberg

RADIO SCHILLER 20. april 2015: Flytningekatastrofen er vores ansvar

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 11. april 2015: Verden efter Danmark gik med i Asiatisk Infrastruktur- Investeringsbank

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER den 7. april
2015:
Iran-aftalen må ikke
saboteres**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Politisk orientering den 30.
marts 2015:
Danmark bliver medlem af
AIIB,
Asiatisk Infrastruktur-
Investeringsbank!
Video og lydfil**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video udlægges senere i dag, mandag.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 23. marts
2015:**

**Danmark skal gå med i
Asiatisk Infrastruktur-
Investeringsbank**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER den 16. marts
2015:**

**Tysk udenrigsminister
Steinmeier og Helmut Schmidt
siger fra over for krig med
Rusland // Glass-Steagall i
USA**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER den 9. marts
2015:
Grækenland bygger en bro til
BRIKS
/Schweiz, Danmark og
finansverdenen**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 5.
marts 2015
v/ formand Tom Gillesberg:
Gå ikke ned med den vestlige
Titanic!**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Politisk Orientering v/formand Tom

Gillesberg, 5. mrs. 2015:

Gå ikke ned med den vestlige Titanic!

Der er nu ved at blive skrevet et nyt kapitel i historien om menneskets storhed og fald, eller i hvert fald snublen, inden vi forhåbentlig får menneskets genrejsning og storhed i en snarlig fremtid. Vi befinder os på et afgørende punkt, hvor det, som vi længe har talt om, er nødvendigt med et paradigmeskifte. Den autopilot, som den vestlige verden bliver styret efter, både finansielt og strategisk, fører på begge områder til en total katastrofe selv på den relativt korte bane. Det bliver mere og mere åbenlyst dag for dag, og det er derfor spørgsmålet, om det kan få nok personer i ledende og ansvarlige positioner til at erkende den forestående katastrofe og i tide være med til at få kursen lagt om.

Det er lang tid siden, at det vestlige finanssystem i lighed med Titanic sejlede på et isbjerg. Der har været mange ulykkelige kollisioner gennem tiderne, men i 2007-2008 ramte man i hvert fald et kæmpe isbjerg, men i stedet for at gøre redningsbådene klar til at blive sat i søen og forberede sig på at redde, hvad reddes kan, så har man hugget redningsbådene op for at kunne fyre ekstra op i kedlerne. Når vandet fosser ind på underdækket, så kan det jo godt sænke tempoet, Titanic sejler med, men i stedet for at løse problemerne, så ville man bare have mere fart på skibet, koste hvad det vil.

Når så andre skibe har nærmet sig den synkende, vestlige skude og tilbudt deres hjælp, så har vesten i stedet klargjort store kanoner på dækket, der kan sænke de skibe, som f.eks. BRIKS-samarbejdet, der forsøger at tilbyde vesten en hjælpende hånd, men som svar får krig og vestlige forsøg på regimeskifte, der kan lede til en underkastelse ind for den vestlige overhøjhed. Man accepterer intet alternativ til den politik, der bliver

udstukket på Titanic. Som en fransk konge engang udtrykte det: "Après moi, le déluge". Hvis vi ikke har magten, kan det hele være ligegyldigt. Så kan verden, og menneskeheden, lige så godt gå under.

Natten mellem den 27. og 28. februar blev Boris Nemtsov myrdet i Moskva. De fleste kunne nok ikke nævne navnet, hvis ikke det var, fordi mordet på ham har været forsidestof i de vestlige medier i mange dage, hvor man kaldte ham lederen af den liberale opposition i Rusland og en trussel imod Putins regime. Hans betydning er nok blevet overdrevet en del, for en opbakning fra 40-50.000 mennesker ud af en befolkning på over 140 millioner er ikke specielt imponerende, og udgjorde da heller ikke, på trods af, hvad visse medier siger, nogen form for trussel imod Putin.

Meningsmålinger siger, at omkring 87 % af russerne støtter Putin som præsident, 2 % ved ikke, hvad de mener, og 11 % støtter ikke Putin, fordi de mener, at han er alt for blødsøden over for Vesten.

Det første, som alle, der ved, hvad der foregår i Rusland, konkluderede, var, at det i hvert fald ikke var Putin, der stod bag mordet. Ikke desto mindre udtalte USA's præsident i en officiel udtalelse i forbindelse med mordet på Boris Nemtsov, at "Putin er ansvarlig for at forværre borgerrettighedsklimaet i Rusland". I lighed med de fleste vestlige medier, så fremstillede Obama det, som om Putin var ansvarlig for mordet uden dog at sige det direkte, og uden på nogen måde at føre bevis for sin påstand eller forsøge at sandsynliggøre den. På samme måde, som man konstant giver indtryk af, at konflikten i Ukraine udelukkende skyldes en utidig indblanding fra Putins side.

Dette er en alvorlig sag, for det sker på baggrund af, at vi har haft en proces, hvor Tyskland og Frankrig i samarbejde med Rusland har forsøgt at deeskalere situationen i Ukraine og forhindre, at kampene mellem de ukraineske styrker under

kontrol fra Kiev og de pro-russiske rebeller i Østukraine, der ønsker øget selvstyre, eskalerer yderligere gennem vestlig militær hjælp fra USA til Kiev, og en fremtidig direkte konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland på ukrainsk jord.

Mens der har været våbenhvile og en fredsproces i gang i et samarbejde mellem Merkel, Hollande, Putin og Ukraines præsident Poroshenko, så har Storbritannien og USA gjort alt, hvad de kunne, for at underminere og smadre muligheden for fred og i stedet presset på for en eskalation af krigen. Deriblandt diskussionen om at sende våben fra USA til Ukraine.

Hver gang presset for en konfrontation med Rusland er ved at miste momentum, og folk i Europa spørger sig, hvorfor man skal have ødelæggende og selvdestruktive sanktioner imod Rusland, så sker der noget dramatisk, der lige kan bevise, at vi må stå fast og komme efter ham Putin. EU kunne ikke være blevet enige om sanktionerne imod Rusland, hvis det ikke var, fordi et Malaysisk passagerfly meget belejligt blev skudt ned over det østlige Ukraine. I de vestlige medier kunne man læse, at det selvfølgelig var rebellerne, der stod bag, og at det i virkeligheden var Putin og hans våben, der var ansvarlige. Anklagerne førte til, at man fik sanktionerne imod Rusland vedtaget, men efterfølgende forsvandt sagen, og der er stadig ikke blevet fremlagt nogen form for beviser for, hvem der stod bag nedskydningen. De mange indicer på, at det i virkeligheden var Ukraine, der skød flyet ned, er ikke noget, man har lyst til at beskæftige sig med.

På samme måde forsøger man nu at bruge Boris Nemtsovs blodige skjorte til at forsøge at destabilisere Rusland og komme efter Putin. En række efterretningseksperter er derfor kommet ud i offentligheden og har påpeget, at det ikke blot er en absurd tanke, at Putin skulle have stået bag mordet, men at likvideringen af Boris Nemtsov blev iscenesat og udført på en bestemt måde, der havde til formål at ramme Putin. Så kunne man veksle en upopulær og utroværdig russisk oppositionsleder, der ingen trussel var imod Putin, til en blodig skjorte, man

kan hænge om halsen på ham.

Den franske økonom og Ruslandsekspert Jacques Sapir kom på sin meget læste internetblog www.russeurope.hypotheses.org med en detaljeret analyse af sagen den 3. marts med titlen: "Hvem fabrikerede beviserne imod Vladimir Putin?". I analysen slår Sapir fast at drabet på Nemtsov var en decideret likvidering, hvor han blev skudt ned bagfra med minimum 8 skud. Men likvideringen forbrød sig imod en lang række ting, der normalt kendetegner en sådan likvidering. For det første er nedskydning bagfra en meget usikker metode, da man jo så ikke kan være helt sikker på ofrets identitet, med mindre Nemtsovs ukrainske veninde, der var ved hans side og slap uskadt fra begivenhederne, blev brugt til at bekræfte Nemtsovs identitet.

Sapir fortæller, at den klassiske likvidering foregår ved ofrets bopæl, når han kommer eller går, ikke på et meget offentligt sted midt i Kreml. Den anden oplagte mulighed var, da Nemtsov lidt tidligere havde forladt en restaurant. Der havde man et klart blik på Nemtsov og en gylden mulighed for et direkte og dræbende skud. Sapir konkluderer derfor, at morderen tog en meget stor risiko ved at skyde Nemtsov ned bagfra, hvor det kræver stor øvelse at påføre ofret et dræbende skud, men til gengæld opnåede en maksimal, propagandistisk effekt ved at begå mordet på gaden midt i Kreml. Når man så bringer billeder af gerningsstedet, så ser man Moskvas symboler på billederne, og man kan let hævde, at det må være Putin, der står bag.

Han pointerer også, at man skal bide mærke i, at Nemtsovs ukrainske veninde kunne forlade drabsstedet helt uskadt. Man kunne jo tænke sig, at hun også ville blive likvideret, så hun ikke kunne udpege potentielle gerningsmænd. Hun skyndte sig efter mordet at tage hjem til Ukraine, og det er uklart, hvilken rolle hun egentlig spiller i historien, og om der eventuelt er en ukrainsk involvering i hele sagen. Nemtsov var tidligere involveret i en række russiske regeringer i 90'ernes katastrofale russiske politik og har siden 2004 været rådgiver

til regeringerne, der blev bragt til magten i Ukraine ved den Orange Revolution. Der var mange, der havde et ondt øje på Nemtsov, inklusive ekstremistiske elementer, der direkte havde truet ham på livet.

Men at man så tydeligt forsøger at gøre Putin ansvarlig for mordet, og det faktum, at den amerikanske præsident personligt deltager i tilsmudsningen af Putin, er en alvorlig affære. Den amerikanske statsmand Lyndon LaRouche sagde i en officiel udtalelse, at dette må være dråben, der får bægeret til at flyde over. Man må få afsat Obama som præsident, inden tingene eskalerer yderligere og verden befinder sig i en altødelæggende atomkrig, for hele sagen afslører en tydelig intensjon fra Obamas side om, at han og USA under hans ledelse er ude efter Putin og Rusland, uanset prisen. Det tyder også på, at USA har tænkt sig at fortsætte med at være direkte involveret i Ukraine, sandsynligvis med leverancer af våben, for hele den nuværende krise i Ukraine begyndte jo som bekendt, da man i februar sidste år gennemførte et statskup imod den siddende folkevalgte præsident i Ukraine. Statskuppet var iscenesat af Victoria Nuland, USA's viceminister for europæiske anliggender, som den dag i dag er en afgørende faktor i at sikre fortsat krig i Østukraine, og at man kan bruge Ukraine som en rambuk imod Rusland, og alt tyder på, at Nuland opererer på direkte ordre fra Det Hvide Hus.

Mordet på Nemtsov er en del af et mønster. Den 19. januar blev statsanklager Alberto Nisman fundet død i sin lejlighed i Buenos Aires. Nisman havde uden held gennem lang tid forsøgt at skade den argentinske præsident Cristina Kirchner gennem at anklage hende for at have forhindret, at man kunne afsløre, at det måske var Iran, der stod bag et terrorangreb på et jødisk kulturcenter i Buenos Aires i 1994. Nisman havde i lighed med Nemtsov mistet sin nytteværdi i levende live, for han stod frem for at skulle fremlægge sine "beviser" for sine påstande, og der var ingen substans i dem. Gennem, at han i stedet begik selvmord under suspekterede omstændigheder, så kunne man bruge

hans død til at køre en massiv kampagne imod Kirchner gennem at spekulere i, at hun stod bag mordet, og måske få startet en farvet revolution i Argentina, der kunne sikre det regimeskifte, som finansverdenen, Storbritannien og USA ønsker der. Det har i hvert fald ikke skortet på medieskriverier om sagen, og penge og støtte udefra til at fjerne præsident Kirchner.

Kirchner har udtalt, at hun selv stiller spørgsmålstegn ved, om Nisman begik selvmord, for han var for visse efterretningskredse mere værd død end levende. Nismans store dossier er efterfølgende blevet gennemset af en dommer, der hovedrystede måtte meddele, at der ingen substans er i det, bortset fra mudderkastning mod præsidenten.

Problemet med at lave nye, farvede revolutioner som dem, man så fremgangsrigt iscenesatte med vestlig støtte gennem et hav af NGO'ere i Ukraine, Georgien og andre steder, er, at de lande, man anvender dem imod, nu er blevet opmærksom på, hvordan det foregår.

Det gælder også Brasilien, hvor man har forsøgt at bruge undersøgelser af korrupsion i det statslige brasilianske olieselskab Petrobras til at igangsætte en kampagne for at få afsat præsident Dilma Rousseff, der netop blev genvalgt for et par måneder siden. Hun er netop blevet rensset for anklager om at have været involveret, men ikke desto mindre vil man fra vestlig side forsøge at bruge sagen til at skaffe sig af med hende, eller i det mindste svække hende.

I England er det ikke mere end to uger siden at Malcolm Rifkind, der tidligere var både britisk forsvars- og udenrigsminister, blev tvunget til at træde tilbage som formand for det britiske parlaments efterretnings- og sikkerhedsudvalg. Rifkind var i stigende grad bekymret over den vestlige konfrontationspolitik over for Rusland og var en af få røster, der efterlyste et skifte i politikken. I stedet kom der et skifte i hans personlige situation, da han blev

narret i en fælde af britiske journalister, der udgav sig for at være kinesiske forretningsfolk. De ville gerne betale Rifkind for, at han skulle hjælpe dem i kontakt med britiske ambassadører, og det ville Rifkind gerne. Belønningen var dog i stedet store forsideartikler med Rifkinds tilbagetræden som konsekvens.

Med i sådanne iscenesatte begivenheder, f.eks. mord og blodige skjorter, som man kan hænge om halsen på sine modstandere, forme offentlighedens billeder af, hvad der foregår, og efterfølgende bruge til at skabe et politisk skifte, bør også regnes de blodige begivenheder på Maidanpladsen i Kiev.

Viceformanden for det ukrainske parlament, Andriy Parubiy, der netop har været på en uges besøg til Washington for at propagandere for, at USA skal sende våben til Ukraine og lægge nye intriger sammen med Victoria Nuland, og alle steder blev modtaget som en værdig repræsentant for en tæt allieret til USA i kampen imod Rusland, var sidste år leder for en lignende begivenhed, der var afgørende for statskuppet i Ukraine.

I sin rolle som "Kommandanten", der ledte selvforsvarsstyrkerne på Maidan-pladsen, var han samtidig arkitekten bag den famøse massakre på pladsen, hvor såvel aktivister, der demonstrerede imod regeringen, som politifolk fra specialstyrkerne blev skudt. Senere undersøgelser viste, at kuglerne, man fandt i ofrene, var ens, og at de var blevet affyret fra højtbeliggende bygninger, der var under kontrol af Parubiys væbnede styrker. Der har tilmed været interviews af enkeltpersoner, der fortalte, at de havde fået ordre til at skyde fra bygninger. Det var med disse mange blodige skjorter, at man retfærdiggjorde det efterfølgende statskup i Ukraine, hvor man afsatte den folkevalgte præsident.

Hvem er denne Andriy Parubiy, der nu er vestens bedste ven? Han grundlagde i 1991 det Social-nationale Parti i Ukraine (der senere blev omdøbt til Svoboda). Navnet spiller direkte på det tyske forbillede Nationalsocialismen, for blandt disse

ukrainere, så var Hitler ikke en fjende, men derimod ukrainernes ven, der hjalp dem i kampen imod russerne. Deres store forbillede Stepan Bandera, og hans bevægelse OUN var energisk medkæmper for SS under krigen, organiserede frivillige til at kæmpe på den tyske side imod russerne og stod i spidsen for en række massakrer på jøder og polakker i Ukraine.

I tiden 1998-2004 var Parubiy leder af den paramilitære organisation Ukrainisk Patriot, som han så officielt droppede for at være en af lederne for den "fredelige" Orange Revolution i 2004. Han forsøgte på et tidspunkt at få EU til at ophøre med sin modstand imod en forherligelse af nazisten og morderen Bandera. Parubiy mente, at EU, i stedet for at betragte Bandera som nazist, i stedet skulle se ham som en stolt anti-kommunist og en anti-russisk, ukrainsk og europæisk frihedshelt.

Fra december 2013-februar 2014 var han så "Kommandanten", der organiserede de paramilitære enheder i selvforsvarsstyrkerne på Maidan-pladsen, og efter at have iscenesat myrderierne på pladsen, som man brugte til gennemførelsen af det efterfølgende statskup, blev han leder af Ukraines Nationale Sikkerhedsråd. Han har senere forladt den post, men spiller en nøglerolle i rekrutteringen og organiseringen af den nye Nationalgarde og andre grupperinger, hvor man samler frivillige til den militære kamp imod rebellerne i Østukraine og andetsteds.

Den ukrainske hær har ikke været særlig entusiastisk i kampen imod sine ukrainske brødre i Østukraine, så Parubiy har været en af arkitekterne til at samle frivillige fra hele verden, der ingen hævninger har, når det drejer sig om at kæmpe imod befolkningen i Østukraine, fordi de blot ser russere, der skal fordrives eller slås ihjel. Nu er han som sagt også parlamentsmedlem og viceformand for det ukrainske parlament.

Parubiy fik den store tur i Washington af Victoria Nuland,

hvor han på utallige møder skulle overbevise amerikanske folkevalgte om, at USA skal bistå Ukraine med alle midler, deriblandt amerikanske våben, i Ukraines kamp imod Rusland.

Men hvad så med Minsk-aftalen? Blev der ikke netop indgået en våbenhvile, der skridt for skridt skal få til en varig fred i Ukraine? Der var til at begynde med problemer med våbenhvilen, fordi det var uklart, hvilken status Debaltseve skulle have, men efter at rebellerne vandt det slag, så er våbenhvilen faldet på plads, og rebellerne har netop annonceret, at de nu har trukket alle deres tunge våben tilbage inden for den tidsfrist, der blev angivet i aftalen. Det ser ud til, at freds-aftalen virker. Hvorfor forbereder man så nu at eskalere krigen?

De, der udvirkede denne freds-aftale – Tyskland, Frankrig, Rusland og Ukraines præsident under tysk og fransk pres – gjorde det netop, fordi de så faren for, at USA ville begynde at levere våben direkte til Ukraine, og dermed risikere en direkte konfrontation mellem USA og Rusland i Ukraine, men de interessenter, der ikke deltog i forhandlingerne, ukrainske nationalistiske, Storbritannien og USA, er fortsat opsat på, at krigen skal fortsætte, og at man skal bruge Ukraine som en rambuk imod Rusland. De ønsker at sabotere Minsk-aftalen og med amerikansk og vestlig hjælp at fordrive eller dræbe alle dissidenter i Østukraine og andre steder, for derefter at erobre Krim-halvøen tilbage fra Rusland.

Samtidig med at der er dette pres for at komme videre til næste fase i Ukraine-krigen, så er Israels statsminister Benjamin Netanyahu nu på besøg i Washington med samme krigsdagsorden.

Netanyahu holdt netop en meget kontroversiel tale til den samlede Kongres i Repræsentanternes Hus i USA, på trods af, at præsident Obama og hans rådgivere havde bedt ham om ikke at gøre det. Ved hjælp af formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus, republikaneren John Boehner, kunne han alligevel holde talen,

på trods af protesterne fra Udenrigsministeriet og Det Hvide Hus, og det havde to formål: For det første at sabotere og forhindre en aftale med Iran om Irans atomprogram, som ville betyde, at Iran kunne forlade skammekrogen og sanktionerne imod landet kunne ophæves, imod udenlandsk kontrol med, at den fredelige brug af kernekraft i landet ikke vil føre til bygningen af atomvåben.

Disse P5+1-forhandlinger har stået på i lang tid, og man er grundlæggende set enige, men der er en stor mobilisering blandt republikanske beslutningstagere imod det, og Netanyahu leverede så sit bidrag gennem en forudsigelig og propagandistisk tale, hvor han hævdede, at Iran om kort tid ville få atomvåben og forsøge at udrydde Israel med dem, hvis man lavede en aftale med dem. En vurdering, som åbent modsiges af både tidligere og nuværende ledende medlemmer af den israelske efterretningstjeneste. Briterne og Netanyahu ønsker ikke blot at forhindre en aftale, men at få verden samlet i kamp mod Iran, gerne gennem en direkte krig mellem sunni- og shia-muslimerne.

Officielt er Vesten i krig med ISIS og Islamisk Stat, men de, der gør den største indsats, er Iran og Syrien. Samtidig lader Vesten vore gode venner i Saudi-Arabien og Qatar finansiere ISIS, Islamisk Stat og ekstremistiske fundamentalister verden rundt, der ønsker at smadre civilisationen, hvad enten det er historiske monumenter i Afghanistan, Libyen eller Syrien, eller det er med terroranslag i Paris eller København. Der går samtidig rygter om, at der er lavet en underhåndsftale mellem Saudi-Arabien og Israel om, at israelske fly kan få lov til at overflyve Saudi-Arabien, hvis de ønsker at bombe mål i Iran.

Netanyahus tale havde til formål at forhindre, at Iran kom ud af skammekrogen og muliggørelsen af en samarbejds- og fredsproces i Mellemøsten, hvor Iran ville være en vigtig del af et samarbejde om at bekæmpe ISIS og Islamisk Stat. Samtidig var talen en del af Netanyahus valgkamp frem imod det israelske parlamentsvalg den 17. marts. Netanyahu forsøger at

sælge historien om, at han er den store leder, der kan forsvare Israel mod truslen fra Iran, men det er uklart, om den israelske befolkning køber den fortælling. Der er delte meninger om, hvorvidt Netanyahus besøg har styrket eller svækket hans chancer for at generobre magten. Der er mange, der siger, at Netanyahu har risikeret forholdet til USA, landets vigtigste allierede, og at det viser, at manden må afsættes hurtigst muligt.

Det er uklart, hvad der vil komme ud af disse begivenheder, men det, der allerede er kommet ud af dem, er et øget spændingsniveau i Rusland og Kina, hvor man konkluderer, at faren for krig – og faren for en kommende atomkrig – er kraftigt stigende. Den 1. marts kom generalmajor Andrej Burbin, der er leder af den centrale del af De Strategiske Missilstyrker i Rusland, dvs. de folk, der skal sørge for, at de russiske atomvåben er klar til at bringe deres dødelige last verden rundt i tilfælde af et angreb på Rusland, med en meget klar udmelding, der fik stor dækning i de russiske medier. Både i militære tidsskrifter, regeringsorganer, men også de russiske medier, som Sputnik News og Russia Today, der har den største spredning både inden for og uden for Rusland.

Burbin fortalte, at Rusland er bekymret over den voksende vestlige trussel, f.eks. Prompt Global Strike (Umiddelbar Globalt Angreb), hvor fantaster i Vesten tror, at man kan lave et lammende angreb på Rusland, der ville forhindre Rusland i at være i stand til at slå tilbage. Derfor har Rusland reorganiseret sine atomstyrker, så man altid vil være i stand til at modstå et angreb og svare tilbage. Man har arbejdet på at forny og forbedre de russiske atomvåben, og i 2020 vil 98 % af de russiske missiler være helt nye. Burbin fremhævede, at Rusland er en troværdig atommagt, og at man altid vil være i stand til at udradere dem, der måtte angribe Rusland.

Hvad er så Prompt Global Strike? Det blev fremlagt i forbindelse med USA Posture Review i 2002, der markerede et skifte i USA's strategiske tankegang. Siden har man arbejdet

med muligheden for, at USA ville være i stand til at lamme sine modstandere med et konventionelt/taktisk atomvåbenangreb, der ville sætte fjenden ude af stand til at slå tilbage. Man vil altså sige farvel til MAD-doktrinen, doktrinen om Gensidig Garanteret Ødelæggelse, og går ud fra, at omfattende, men stadig begrænsede krige, mellem atommagterne kan finde sted. Dette vil muliggøre, at USA kan tvinge de andre atommagter til at underkaste sig amerikansk overhøjhed.

Man er som en del af denne proces begyndt at fjerne den klare adskillelse mellem konventionelle våben og atomvåben. Tidligere var der en forståelse af, at atomvåben var på en hylde for sig selv og ikke kunne komme i spil, med mindre man selv blev udsat for et angreb med atomvåben. Det har ændret sig. USA har moderniseret de taktiske atomvåben, man har i Vesteuropa og Tyrkiet, så de i realiteten er blevet forandret fra taktiske atomvåben, der skal bruges lokalt, til at blive mellemdistance-atomvåben, der f.eks. kunne affyres mod Rusland imod de russiske atomstyrker.

Samtidig har man udviklet en ny generation af atombomber, B61-12 atombomber, der er mere præcise og har længere rækkevidde. Det er nu meningen, at de atomvåben, man har i Belgien, Tyskland, Holland, Italien og Tyrkiet, skal erstattes med disse, noget, som visse eksperter allerede har kaldt et brud med Traktaten om ikke-spredning af atomvåben. Samtidig har USA set stort på ønsket fra de lande, deriblandt Tyskland, der ønsker, at atomvåbnene fjernes fra deres territorium.

På lignende vis har USA skiftet sin doktrin over for Kina til den såkaldte Air Sea Battle (Kamp i luften og til havs), hvor man forsøger at være i stand til at rette et lammende konventionelt angreb på Kinas styrker, så deres atomvåben aldrig kommer i spil. Det er også i lyset af dette, at man skal se den store modvilje imod den amerikanske opbygning af et ABM-system (anti-ballistisk-missilsystem) i Europa, og USA's pres på Sydkorea for at få lov til at opsætte et ABM-

system der.

Der er netop nu en ledende, politisk gruppering i Vesten, der tilsyneladende styrer Barack Obama, som mener, at de kan vinde den store krig. De mener, at MAD-doktrinen er fortid, og at man nu har så smarte våben, at man kan neutralisere det modangreb, der vil komme i tilfælde af et angreb på Rusland eller Kina. Derfor tror de, at man kan vinde en krig, og hvis man tror det, så er det jo næsten en forbrydelse ikke at forsøge.

En anden version af samme galskab er, at man tror, at man kan have en krig imod Rusland på det eurasiske kontinent, uden at Storbritannien eller USA vil blive direkte ramt. Så kan de europæiske og asiatiske lande ødelægge hinanden (som Rusland, Tyskland og Frankrig gjorde det i første verdenskrig), mens Storbritannien og USA kan have det godt og regere verden. En idé Lyndon LaRouche har advaret imod som en fantasi, der aldrig vil kunne lade sig gøre. Kommer krigen, så vil den sprede sig til alle dele af verden og gøre brug af alle typer våben. Det er en tankegang, der vil føre til atomkrig.

Grunden til, at krigstruslen er blevet så akut, skal findes i det igangværende sammenbrud af det vestlige finanssystem. Finanssystemet kan ikke overleve i sin nuværende form, og der er derfor en berettiget diskussion rundt omkring i verden, om det ikke ville være en god idé at erstatte det bankerotte system med noget, der er langt bedre.

Vi har Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika, der er gået sammen i BRIKS og direkte fremlagt et alternativ i form af BRIKS' Ny Udviklingsbank og etableringen af CRA, en fond til at imødegå spekulation imod landenes valutaer, og en lang række tiltag, der skal finansiere projekter, som kan sikre en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden og muligheden for udvikling og forbedrede levevilkår for alle lande og alle dele af befolkningen.

Kina er netop nu den største udenlandske investor i Sydamerika, og investerede flere penge i infrastrukturprojekter der, end resten af omverdenen tilsammen. De er i gang med det samme i Asien, og det er formålet med etableringen af AIIB, Den Asiatiske Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank. I Afrika er Kina allerede i gang med mange projekter, men mange, mange flere er på tegnebrættet.

Der er stor interesse fra europæiske firmaer for at være med i denne udvikling og alle de forskellige projekter. Samtidig er der jo også et utal af infrastrukturprojekter i Europa, der bare venter på at blive sat i gang, men hvor der ikke har været den nødvendige finansiering. Det er derfor indlysende, at vi burde samarbejde med BRIKS.

Men på samme måde, som man har fravalgt at samarbejde med Rusland og Kina om at løse de strategiske udfordringer vi har, deeskalere krisen i Ukraine og finde en løsning, der kan holde på lang sigt, løse problemerne i Mellemøsten, så det ikke kan være en fortsat kilde til krig og destabiliseringer, så ser man ikke BRIKS som en mulig samarbejdspartner, men som en trussel imod den vestlige magtposition i verden, der skal smadres hurtigst muligt.

Det samme ser vi på den økonomiske front, hvor man betragter BRIKS som en trussel. USA forsøger at etablere frihandelsaftaler, hvor man vil holde Kina ude.

På lignende vis har man i EU insisteret på at holde fast i en økonomisk politik, som helt tydeligt ikke fungerer. Behandlingen af Grækenland er det tydeligste eksempel på det. Man har insisteret på, at Grækenland for at vedblive en del af eurosamarbejdet skulle fortsætte med at underkaste sig såkaldte reformer og nedskæringsprogrammer, der i stedet for at hjælpe Grækenland har ført til, at pensionerne, lønningerne og levestandarden er faldet dramatisk, mens arbejdsløsheden er eksploderet. Samtidig er den græske statsgæld vokset til nye

højder og er blevet langt mere ubetalelig.

Den græske befolkning har så valgt en ny regering bestående af Syriza og Uafhængige Grækere, som har fået mandat til at skifte politikken grundlæggende. Ikke flere underskrifter på utopiske aftaler og at lade som om, at det går fremad, mens det i virkeligheden bare bliver værre og værre. Der skal iværksættes programmer, der faktisk kan forandre tingene til det bedre. I stedet for nedskæringer skal der bruges penge på sociale programmer for den fattige del af befolkningen, og der skal investeres fra det offentliges side for at sætte gang i økonomien. Langt hen ad vejen skal man gøre det modsatte af det, man har gjort under ordre fra Bruxelles, bortset fra, at man kan øge skatteindtægterne ved at sætte stop for, at den rige del af befolkningen snyder for at betale deres del af skatterne.

EU har stået stejlt på, at den nye regering ikke har lov til at forandre politikken. Kun en forsættelse af den tidligere politik accepteres, selv om den helt klart ikke har fungeret. Der er så blevet indgået en midlertidig våbenhvile mellem Grækenland og EU, hvor Grækenland accepterer at fortsat modtage penge de næste 4 måneder, men ikke vil fortsætte nedskæringerne. Til gengæld lader Grækenland være med at erklære, at de ikke vil betale gælden tilbage, så man kan opretholde illusionen om, at gælden stadig har værdi. Men denne våbenhvile vil sandsynligvis ikke holde 4 måneder, og så er man tilbage til det opgør, der næsten kun kan ende med, at euroen sprænges.

Kostas Lavitsas, der er et nyvalgt medlem af Syriza, men også gennem mange år har været økonom ved Londonskolens Universitet for Orientaliske og Afrikanske Studier, havde den 2. marts en artikel i den britiske avis *The Guardian*, hvor han skriver, at den nye græske regering har haft fire ugers diskussioner, hvor man intet har opnået ud over at købe lidt tid.

Lyt selv til resten af orienteringen efter de første 40:00

minutter

på

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2015/03/politisk-orientering-den-5-marts-2015-video-og-audio-med-formand-tom-gillesberg/>

RADIO SCHILLER den 2. marts 2015:

**Ruslands atomstyrker er klar
/ Grækenlands strategiske
betydning / SAS strejken**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**EIR's spørgsmål til Irans
viceudenrigsminister
Majid Takht-Ravanchi i
København
om Silkevejen og finansiering**

af terrorisme

EIR's spørgsmål om Silkevejen kommer 25 min. 32 sec. inde i optagelsen; og finansiering af terrorisme 50 min. 35 sec.

video playlist (i 3 del):

RADIO SCHILLER den 23. februar: Ukraine/Grækenland/den kriminelle finansverden

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

PARADIGMESKIFT I DANMARK: Lydfiler fra Tom Gillesbergs møder i Aarhus og Kolding lørdag

den 21. februar

- Konflikten i Ukraine og situationen i Grækenland –
- Økonomisk nedsmeltning, gældskonference og bankopdeling –
- Danmarks fremtid i samarbejde med BRIKS

Mødet i Aarhus:

Mødet i Kolding:

RADIO SCHILLER 16. feb. 2015: Terror i Danmark og våbenhvile i Ukraine

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

RADIO SCHILLER 12. feb. 2015:

Ukraine//Grækenland

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER 9. feb. 2015:
Voksende splid USA-Europa//
Gældskonference Grækenland//
USA '28 sider'**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER 3. februar
2015:
Helga Zepp-LaRouches møder i
KBH//Krig imod
Rusland//eurokrise når
Danmark**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg