

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 28. april 2016

**Dit valg: konfrontation eller
samarbejde med Rusland og
Kina?**

Video: 2. del:

Lyd:

RADIO SCHILLER den 25. april 2016:

**Barack Obama er en britisk
agent**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

RADIO SCHILLER den 21. april

2016:

Den britiske hånd bag Saudi-Arabiens støtte til terrorisme

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Video og lyd: Seminar på Frederiksberg:
Forlæng Den Nye Silkevej ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika
mandag den 18. april
med bl.a. Helga Zepp-LaRouche
og Hussein Askary**

Schiller Instituttet og Executive Intelligence Review holdt et seminar mandag den 18. april 2016 på Frederiksberg på engelsk.

Inkl. en diskussion om EIR's specialrapport Den Nye Silkevej Bliver til Verdenslandbroen

Introduktion: Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Musik:

Fischerweise af Schubert
Ritorna Vincitor! fra Aida af Verdi
Leena Malkki, soprano fra Sverige
Dominik Wijzan, pianist fra Poland

Teksterne på originalsprogene med engelsk oversættelse

Video: Introduktion og musik

Talere: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Instituttets internationale præsident, kendt som "Silkevejsdamen" (via Skype video)

Video: Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Audio: Introduktion, musik og Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Afskrift: [Et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden: Afskrift af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale](#)

Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika: Hussein Askary, EIR's Mellemøstredaktør, som lige har oversat den arabiske version af rapporten.

Den Nye Silkevej og den iranske rolle; Hr. Abbas Rasouli, først sekretær på Irans ambassade i Danmark.

Video: Hussein Askary og Hr. Abbas Rasouli.

Audio: Hussein Askary og Hr. Abbas Rasouli

Afskrift: Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind i Sydvestasien og Afrika: Afskrift af Hussein Askarys tale

Afskrift: Den Nye Silkevej og Irans rolle: Afskrift af Hr. Abbas Rasoulis tale

Mere om Den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen på dansk:

Specialrapport: Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Den Nye Silkevej fører til menneskehedens fremtid! Oktober 2014

Den kommende fusionsøkonomi baseret på helium-3. En introduktion til en kommende EIR-rapport om Verdenslandbroen.

Nyhedsorientering december 2014: Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen; Introduktion v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche

BYG VERDENSLANDBROEN FOR VERDENSFRED

Helga Zepp-LaRouche var taler ved et seminar for diplomater, der blev afholdt i Det russiske Kulturcenter i København den 30. januar 2015, med titlen: »Økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde mellem nationer, eller økonomisk kollaps, krig og terror? Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. Nyhedsorientering febr. 2015.

Nyhedsorientering maj 2015 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Tale ved seminar i København: Den Nye Silkevej Kan Forhindre Krig

Tema: Den Islamiske Renæssance var en Dialog mellem Civilisationer, af Hussein Askary

Genopbygningsplan for Syrien: Projekt Fønix: Diskussionspunkter om Syriens genopbygning

Link: Homepage about the EIR report The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge

The English, Arabic and Chinese versions of EIR's report are available from EIR and The Schiller Institute in Denmark.

Prices for the 400-page report:

English: printed 500 kr.; pdf. 300 kr.; Arabic: printed 500 kr.; Chinese: pdf. 300 kr.

Please contact tel. 53 57 00 51 or 35 43 00 33, or si@schillerinstitut.dk

Invitation:

Terror in Europe, and elsewhere. Waves of refugees leaving countries racked by war and economic ruin, from Afghanistan to Africa. Threats of financial crash in the trans-Atlantic region. Dangers of escalating confrontation and war against Russia and China. Is there any hope for the future?

The Schiller Institute and Executive Intelligence Review, led by the ideas and efforts of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, have been working for decades to create a paradigm shift, away from "geopolitics," to a new era of cooperation between sovereign nations, based on an ambitious infrastructure-driven economic development strategy – a plan for lasting peace through economic development.

In 2013, this New Silk Road and Eurasian Land-Bridge strategy was adopted by Chinese President Xi Jinping, who called it the "One Belt, One Road" policy, which now includes agreements with 60 countries. In addition, the economic development alliance among the BRICS countries, and the establishment of new credit institutions, constitute an alternative in the making.

In December 2014, EIR published a ground-breaking special report in English, *The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge*, the sequel to its 1996 report, which elaborates the new set of economic principles needed for world economic development. The Chinese version was issued in 2015.

Now, if there is to be a solution to the heart-wrenching suffering of the people of the Middle East and Africa, and the effects of the crisis in Europe, the New Silk Road must be extended to those regions, on its way to becoming the World Land-Bridge. The recent negotiations led by U.S. Secretary of State Kerry (despite opposition from other factions in the Obama administration), and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, regarding Iran and Syria, have also helped to create the political preconditions for such a new "Marshall Plan" to immediately come into effect.

There are already moves in that direction. An example of "win-win" cooperation was demonstrated during Chinese President Xi Jinping's recent visit to Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Iran, where he confirmed China's support for real economic development in the region, backed up by \$55 billion in loans and investments.

And on March 17, the Arabic version of EIR's report was presented in Cairo by Egyptian Transportation Minister Dr. Saad El Geyoushi, and EIR Arabic desk chief Hussein Askary, who translated the report, at a well-attended launching at the Ministry. An expanded chapter on proposals to rebuild Southwest Asia is included.

The Copenhagen seminar will present the vision of a new paradigm, instead of geopolitics, terror, war and economic collapse. Mustering the creative efforts of populations collaborating to rebuild their nations, is the only way forward.

We hope that you will be able to attend this important seminar, and join in the discussion about how this alternative can be brought about.

Links:

Introduction to the arabic-version of EIR's report by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (in English, Arabic and Danish)

Here are links to information about EIR's March 24, 2016 Frankfurt seminar, co-sponsored by the Ethiopian consulate, including the speeches of Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Hussein Askary.

Report about the Frankfurt seminar

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's speech

Hussein Askary's speech

Homepages:

Danish: www.schillerinstitut.dk

English: www.newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com

www.schillerinstitute.org

www.larouchepub.com/eiw

Arabic: www.arabic.larouchepub.com/

Other languages: [Click here](#)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 11. april
2016:**

**Vil et britisk nej til EU
smadre EU og euroen?
Baner G7 i Hiroshima vejen
for atomkrig?**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER den 4. april
2016:**

**Obama truer Kina og Rusland,
trods topmøde om
atomsikkerhed**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Händels Messias (2. og 3. del) med Schiller Instituttets “Manhattan Projekt” kor

Download (PDF, Unknown)

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 31. marts 2016:

Det britiske Imperium og Obama forsøger at knuse BRIKS – Tjekkiet inviterer Kina indenfor –

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

2. del (5 min)

Lydfil:

RADIO SCHILLER den 29. marts 2016: Efter terrorangrebet i Brussel

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

RADIO SCHILLER den 21. marts 2016: Den arabiske udgave af Den Nye Silkevejsrapport lanceret i Transportministeriet i Kairo

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

Lydfilen er fra mandag den 21. marts, ikke den 25. marts, som
der blev sagt.

»Vi kan skabe et mirakel«

Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Jeg mener, at det nye paradigme allerede er synligt; jeg mener, at samarbejde om menneskehedens fælles mål om at overvinde sult og ophøre med ideen om krig som et middel til løsning af konflikter i en atomvåbenalder, er et 'must', hvis man ønsker at eksistere. Der er andre områder, f.eks. samarbejde om udviklingen af fusionskraft, som ville give menneskeheden energisikkerhed, ressourcesikkerhed; det fælles arbejde i rummet; jeg mener, der er så mange fantastiske områder, inden for hvilke vi kan blive virkeligt menneskelige, så jeg tror, vi må vække befolkningerne til at se hen til disse løsninger.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Det frydefulde ved at skabe overraskelser!

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast 18. marts 2016

Engelsk udskrift: I denne uge får vi en opdatering fra Kesha Rogers i Texas, som anfører en politik for en genoplivelse af

det amerikanske NASA-rumprogram; Jason Ross fortsætter sagaen om Gottfried Leibniz; og Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches analyse af betydningen for fredsprocessen i Syrien af de seneste udviklinger, med den russiske militære tilbagetrækning.

– DELIGHT IN CREATING SURPRISES! –

International Webcast March 18, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's March 18th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to thank you for joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, on larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and Jason Ross,

from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined via video by

Kesha Rogers, multiple-time candidate for Federal office from the

state of Texas, and leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

All of us had a chance to meet with Mr. LaRouche, both in person and via telephone connection (in the case of Kesha), earlier this morning. Mr. LaRouche had some very definite and specific ideas which he wished for us to convey. Mr. LaRouche was

{emphatic} when we met with him earlier today, that the global agenda right now is being set by Russia and by China, and their

allies. He said that the initiative in creating the future and shaping present global policy, lies with those two countries, strategically – in the case of Russia, as is very clear with what is occurring in Syria right now; and economically and scientifically – in the case of China.

You can see very clearly that the outdated and archaic methods of the trans-Atlantic system are proving to be impotent,

both in the case of resolving the current grave crises which are facing mankind as a planetary species right now, but also impotent in setting the agenda and fulfilling and laying out the vision for the future of mankind. The mission which has been undertaken by China, in terms of their objective to explore the far side of the Moon – something which is going to be unfolding over the coming two years – exemplifies the necessary identity which mankind must have in order to affirm and to fulfill our true nature as a creative species.

Mr. LaRouche stated that something that we should develop, in dialogue with him and with each other, is to think about the open questions, the unanswered questions about how is mankind, a species, reflective of a much larger, and as yet not fully understood, creative characteristic of the galactic system as a whole. This is a relationship which Johannes Kepler drew out in very unique detail in terms of his discoveries about our {Solar} System, but we have many, many large and unanswered questions of what is the role of the human species in our relationship to the galactic system as a whole, and then the complex of galactic systems as a much, much larger whole.

Mr. LaRouche said that this mission to explore the "dark side" of the Moon, so-called, is a pathway in order to begin to understand even the opening of the questions along these lines.

The dark side of the Moon, his hypothesis was, is where you

can

find some of the shadows of this much larger system, have insight

into it, and also to begin to understand mankind's role as reflective of these broader creative processes which are involved

in these great astronomical systems.

This is the spirit of the United States at our best. Our republic was founded on these kinds of unique ideas, as we've discussed here in previous weeks. The role of the great philosopher and scientist Gottfried Leibniz is a major contributor, a "founding father", or "founding grand-father" of

our republic. This is something which I know Jason Ross has presented multiple times and is in the process of having a series

of developing classes on that subject; and I'm sure we'll be part

of his discussion later today.

But also, this is what you can see in a great statesman, such as Abraham Lincoln – very, very much so. Franklin Roosevelt; and John F. Kennedy. Tragically, that spirit in the United States has deteriorated drastically. We see now that the

leadership does indeed lie with China and with Russia; and this

is something which Kesha Rogers, who is joining us here today, wrote about in an editorial which is appearing in this week's edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine.

Kesha's

editorial is titled, "To Save the United States Economy, Revive

the Space Program."

Kesha and I had a brief conversation earlier this afternoon.

I know she has some broader ideas to develop on this subject, so,

without further ado, I would like to hand over the podium to

Kesha Rogers.

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matt. I think I'd like to start, first of all, by continuing to develop what has and must be the focal point by which we come to understand the necessity for the revival and the defense of, not just the American and U.S. space program, which I have continued to be a leader in championing the development and the necessity of our space program and what it truly represents for the progress of all mankind. But just on the editorial that I wrote, I think, to understand it, it's not just from the standpoint of looking at the economic conditions of the United States and some practical applications to economics that the space program will provide; but we also have to look at it from the standpoint of is, the space program as a true conception of real economic value. This is what's actually missing from our thinking and what has been attacked by the current Wall Street/British imperial system, is that economic value is based, from {that} standpoint, on monetary value and not on the creative powers and progress of the human mind. The real question at hand right now, is to bring about – as we're seeing and will be developed further in these discussions today – a new conception of what is the identity and what is the purpose of mankind. I have continued to use the example and

the

works of the great pioneer of space flight, space pioneer
Krafft

Ehrlicke; and looking at his conception of mankind as a
space-faring creature, as the understanding of mankind's
"extra-terrestrial imperative," as that which must be
identified
and understood.

If you look at the conditions of the space program and why
it's so important, you take the example, for instance, of what
China is doing now, as completely rejecting this monetarist
policy; that the space program is not how much money you're
going

to put into pet projects and specific projects. It is creating
something that's never been created before, to actually create
a

new conception and identity of mankind, from the standpoint of
the idea of acting on the future. That's what this idea and
what

is being developed, for instance with China in their
investigation of the far side of the Moon.

People may look at this, "Well what is this going to
benefit us? How is this going to improve the economic
conditions,

in terms of monetary value, or any of this?" But that is the
wrong way to look at it; because the problem right now is that
what you have seen is two different opposing conceptions of
the

view of mankind. One coming from the trans-Atlantic system,
coming from a collapsing imperial system that has been based
on

money and monetary value that is dying; and the other is
represented by what Russia and China are doing. And as Matt
emphasized and what I developed in my recent writing, was that
this was the mindset of the great leaders of our nation,
represented by the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, of Franklin
Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, [and] John F. Kennedy. It wasn't

just

on the creating of new projects per se, but on a whole new different conception of the identity of mankind.

And so, you take for instance, the example of what we accomplished in the United States, of landing a man on the Moon

– the idea that Kennedy put forward, that by the end of decade we would land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth.

What was the vision and intention behind that? Was it just the idea that we would go and plant our flag on the Moon? This would

be some short-term gratification and so forth? Or, was it a forward-thinking outlook, in terms of the direction of mankind in

recognizing what Krafft Ericke, the great pioneer of space flight, recognized, that mankind was not just a creature of the

planet Earth. We were not just a part of, as he called it, a "closed system," and so it was our responsibility to go out and

to do what no other animal had the capability of doing; of actually conquering and developing, coming to understand what is

the purpose of mankind and what is the development of mankind in

the universe as a creature of our solar system and of the galaxy

as a whole.

One thing that I thought was very insightful, is that Krafft Ericke wrote about the understanding of the Renaissance, the Classical Renaissance, as an achievement of human progress. And

also the Classical Renaissance is something that contributed to

the development of what became our space program and what was the

intention that guided the direction of space travel and the space program.

I'll just read a quick quote from what he expressed on this idea. He says, "The development of the idea of space travel was

always the most logical and most noble consequence of the Renaissance ideal, which again places man in an organic and active relationship with his surrounding universe and which, perceived in the synthesis of knowledge and capabilities, its highest ideals."

So you look at this from the standpoint of Krafft Ericke understanding that the Renaissance that was guided by the scientific breakthroughs which I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from my colleague Jason there, of Brunelleschi, or the breakthroughs that came about from the works of Kepler. That the

idea of mankind, is to create something fundamentally new, something that had never been created before, and increasing the relationship of mankind to the Universe.

Now that's economic value! That is not what is being discussed when you look at these debates going back and forth from the standpoint of these Congress Members to the space community, and what budgets are being cut and should not be cut.

But the reality is, as I stated before, we have to have, in the

defense of the space program, a new conception of the direction

of mankind. That means we're removing all limitations to progress, all limitations that are put on mankind's ability to continue to understand how to make new discoveries in the principles scientifically of what's out there. Why should we actually investigate the Solar System? What is our mission in doing so? And it's not about a money-making short-term gratification. And so, I think this emphasis that Krafft

Ehricke

put on the renaissance as an ideal of looking at why we have,
as

a human species, an extraterrestrial imperative, is really a
continued expression of what you're seeing coming from China;
not

just in their space program, but in the development of the
win-win strategy of cooperation for all mankind, for every
nation

to come to join together. And to further the progress of
addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition
of

the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not
lie

right here on planet Earth.

So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across;
and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue
this

fight to identify what is the real mission of the space
program,

and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current
dead

system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we
should

be.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Kesha; and I can recommend that
people read what you've written in the current edition of
{Executive Intelligence Review}. I also know that you're
planning

on making a video statement – which will be posted on the
LaRouche PAC website and available for people – developing
some

of these ideas a little bit more in detail.

So, if people have been watching this website, you know that
Jason Ross has also been working very closely with Kesha to
develop some of these ideas with their implications from the

standpoint of a scientist, whom I hope you are becoming more familiar with by now – Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As we discussed last week on this webcast, I think if you begin to consider this question which Kesha just laid on the table for us,

about how do you create a future for mankind. How do you initiate

the creation of something which is completely new, as we move into the future? Now, this can never be done through the replication of the past; there's no precedent for a discovery.

A discovery is something which is always new, and is created {de novo} and is introduced, which changes the course of human history. Obviously, there is a lineage that goes back to Gottfried Leibniz, and many Leibnizians who have lived since him:

Karl Gauss; Bernhard Riemann; Albert Einstein; and I would even

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

So, without further ado, I'm going to ask Jason to elaborate a little bit more; picking up on what Kesha just left off on.

JASON ROSS: Thanks, Matt. Well, I think if you consider how to conceptualize the value of the kinds of programs that Kesha was discussing that we're promoting today, you reach a contradiction if you try to approach them from a monetarist standpoint. That is, the kind of economics that's generally taught today, the kind of economics practiced as a religion – well, I was going to say as a religion on Wall Street; the primary religion on Wall Street is stealing – but, in general, the basis of thinking is that economy is about money; we can measure things in terms of money. How much is somebody willing to

pay for something? That's how valuable it is. That isn't. Money

doesn't measure different qualities; money doesn't measure the future potential that something is able to create. And if you

base money on how much somebody's willing to pay for something,
you don't distinguish between things that are good and useful versus bad and vices. People are willing to pay for heroin; people are willing to pay for other opioids if they're addicted to it. Does that mean that those drugs, as used by those people, are valuable, or worth something because they're willing to pay for them? Quite the contrary. So, we need a different way of thinking about how we can measure economic value if we're going to be human economists, instead of Wall Street magicians or Satanists.

So, the reason we have economy is that we aren't animals; animals don't have economies. Animals don't change what they do from generation to generation; they don't improve, they don't develop. We do. We create a new kind of time for ourselves. In a very real way, humanity is a totally new and totally distinct force of nature from anything else. Over geological time, geologists describe to us how the Earth has changed, or how a planet has formed; this is over hundreds of millions of years. Over evolutionary time, perhaps tens of millions of years, we're able to see transformations in the kinds of life that exists on the planet. Over biological time, we have short-term periods of the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed.

During the Dark Ages, when not much happened, you might say that human time slowed down. And with the Renaissance, and

with

the ability to discover more about nature by having a more powerful way of thinking about it, and a more powerful conception

of us as human beings interacting with it; you could say that time sped up. We create a certain time in that we create new eras

of humanity; not in the way that geology or evolution does, but

willfully by developing new principles that if we were animals,

you would say this is a whole new type of life all together. Life

moving from the oceans onto land; that's a totally different quality of life. Life having developed photosynthesis and using

the Sun as a power source; that's a totally different kind of life. But we're still human beings after the discovery of the combustion engine, for example; the use of heat-powered machinery. We create in ourselves the change that's comparable only to large-scale evolutionary changes when we look at life in

general. So, we're distinct.

Now, how do we understand this? Both how do we understand that world around us that we act on and interact with; and how do

we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to progress

and use the practice of science itself? What sort of terrain is

it? What sort of world is it? The physical world and the mental world.

Well, here's where I'd like to take up some concepts that Mr. LaRouche has been bringing up recently about Bernhard Riemann

and about Gottfried Leibniz, and a bit about Einstein, too,

who

got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves announced

very near his birthday this year – which was on Monday. So, let's think about it. Is the terrain that we're operating on, one

which is steady and indifferent to our actions? Or, is it one where what we do and what we discover and how we interact with it, changes that world around us in a way that the world is not

fixed; either in ourselves or in our understanding of it? And, that is the case; we transform the world in changing our mental

understanding of it. The math that we use in understanding how do

we conceptualize that world; that changes our interaction with it, and we're a force of nature. We change the operation of the

forces of nature by improving our understanding of the world around us and of ourselves and our ability to discover such things. How can we possibly think about that quality of change?

As a couple of other examples, think about the difference between what you might say is a fixed object – let's say iron oxide. Iron oxide is basically rust; it's a mineral that's rust.

It's reddish brown, it's not terribly useful; but with the development of metallurgy, instead of being a deposit of some compound, it's now a resource. It's an ore from which we can create iron and steel. The substance itself, did it change chemically? It did in terms of the potential of what we could do

with it. And remember, we're a force of nature; we changed what

it was. It has to be thought of that way.

Or, what's the value of a technology? How does it change over time? In the 1400s, windmills were a great invention;

they
were somewhat new on the scene. They allowed pumping water,
they
allowed grinding grain. That's excellent; that's a
breakthrough.

Are windmills valuable today for making electricity? I don't
think so. Consider helium; helium is an interesting element.

It
was first discovered in the Sun, not on Earth. It was
discovered
in the Sun by the kind of light that came from the Sun when
that

light was broken up into a rainbow with a prism, and certain
bands of the absence or presence of color were the clue that
there was a new element out there named helium, after Helios,
the

Sun. That element, what's it used for? You might think of it's
being used to fill up balloons for children; you might think
of

it being used as a gas for cooling for physical purposes or
for

experiments. It's also, as Helium-3, an ideal fuel for fusion.
So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our
developing

understanding. How can we think about this?

Well, let's take the example of Bernhard Riemann. In 1854,
Bernhard Riemann delivered a presentation and a paper on the
subject of the hypotheses that underlie geometry. That might
sound like a dry title; it might sound like it has nothing to
do

with physical economy or anything that we'd want to be doing
right now. But this paper is very important in the view of
Lyndon

LaRouche for his own development and as a way of understanding
economics. So, let's say why. Very briefly, Riemann points out
that our conception of space itself and of the way things
operate

in space is taken for granted. The ideas that we use to understand it, they don't really come from experiments per se, or from physical theories; they come from our thoughts about space.

For example, the idea that space has no particular characteristics of its own; that was the view of Isaac Newton. Newton said space is uniform, it's out there; things occur within

space. Space is there first, it's just space; it has no characteristics in particular. Newton said the same thing about

time; that time flows on uniformly. That's what time is; it's really not much of a definition, or an understanding.

Geometric ideas that people had, for example, are the idea that if you add up the angles in a triangle, you get 180 degrees.

Now, if you're drawing triangles on flat paper, yes that's true;

if you draw them on a curved surface like a sphere, it's not true. Triangles on a sphere have more than 180 degrees in them.

If you then ask, "What if I draw a triangle in space?"; that's a

tough question. When we connect points in space, is the space between them flat, is it curved? How could we discover that, and

what would be the basis of it having a curvature if it wasn't flat?

What Riemann does, is he discusses through all the possible ways that this could come about. He discusses in general, curvature – both of surfaces and of space; how a space could be

curved. He works out in general how you could do that; but he can't answer the question. He says, to answer the question,

"What's the nature of the space, and which processes unfold?"; you have to leave the department of mathematics and you have

to

go to the physics department. You can't answer questions like that just by pure reasoning; you got to have a hypothesis – "What physically makes space?" And in this way, he's coming back

to the view of Gottfried Leibniz, who, just to say very briefly,

Leibniz and Newton totally disagreed on a number of subjects. People may have heard of the dispute over their invention of the

calculus; did Leibniz steal it from Newton, or vice versa? But there's a lot more there.

One of the major disputes they had was about space. Newton's view was that space and time were absolute; and Leibniz's view was that space was a way of understanding co-occurrences. The relationship of things that are here at the same time – that's space; and for Leibniz, time was the evolution of things, how things change. But time didn't have its own existence. Now, that's precisely what Einstein took up in his theories of relativity; he did what Riemann said had to be done. He didn't finish the job; but he did what Riemann said had to be done. Einstein overthrew, in a very specific way, the outlook of Newton; Einstein showed that space was not flat, that it was bent

in special relativity, that it was curved in general relativity.

And very importantly, the basis of its shape, the basis of how things interact over distances – that sense of space – was based not on what a mathematician might imagine, but on what a physicist hypothesizes. Einstein hypothesized an equivalence between different observers that the laws of nature shouldn't depend on whether you're moving; something that Leibniz also said

very explicitly. Einstein considered that light moved at the same

speed to any observer; something he had been pondering since he

was a pretty young man. And he hypothesized that gravitation would transform the shape of space; that straight lines wouldn't

be straight to the extent that gravity is affecting them. This is

what was seen with the experiments about the position of stars around the eclipse of the Sun, performed earlier during Einstein's life; and it's seen in the recent verification of gravity waves.

So, most people acknowledge that Einstein, OK, this is physically important; this is a scientist, he discovered things.

What does it have to do with this other point, though, about understanding humanity, and our role in economy, and our creation

in economy? Well, what Riemann did was, he made it possible to say that human discovery is a force of nature; it reshapes nature, it transforms our understanding about the objects around

us. And the basis of that world outside of us, can't be considered independently of our increasing knowledge about it. What we know about the world around us changes it, in that it changes our ability to interact with it.

So, if we're looking for a real idea of what economics is, throw away any sense of monetarism that says money made in a warehouse is just as valuable as money made in a steel plant; and instead say, "How do we foster scientific discovery? How do

we foster its social implementation through technologies that physically improve our power over nature and our ability to provide improving standards of living and promote the general welfare of human beings?" If this is our basis of economics, fostering that kind of outlook, then I think we can say that Gottfried Leibniz was the first physical economist in that sense.

I'll just reference to the show on Leibniz from earlier this week, and one of the documents I cited there; Leibniz's paper

on

the creation of a society for science and economy in Germany.
And

I think if you read that paper, you'll be astonished at how
Leibniz pulls together both promotion of discovery, how that
works, what kind of thoughts are needed, how people should
work

together, and how to implement those thoughts to improve
people's

lives to the betterment of mankind. And that really has to be
the

basis of our economics.

One simple rough measure, proposed by LaRouche to measure
this, is the potential population density. How many people can
be

supported in a given area? That's a measure that is fixed for
animals. For a certain kind of environment, the number of deer
that can live there; deer don't change that. Human beings do.
And

as a rough measure of economic progress, we could take that
value. What's the potential population that we're able to
support? The ability to use these thoughts is one that is not
being expressed in the trans-Atlantic at present. In our
discussion today, Mr. LaRouche talked about the positive
impact

that Riemann had had on Italian science. Riemann had
tuberculosis, and spent a good deal of time later in life – he
didn't live that long – but later in his short life in Italy;
where thoughts from Riemann influenced the development of
hydrodynamics, stretching all the way into the time of
airplanes

and the consideration of getting out into space.

Today, this overall outlook is best represented by Russia,
and especially at present, by China. So, this doesn't have to
be

a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that
we

can take up as a mission for ourselves to contribute to here in the United States and in the nations around the globe. And we've got very special and precious people in the past that we can look to for insights in how to make the next breakthroughs in developing our understanding of what it is to be human, the basis of human culture, and how best to advance human economy.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. Now, as Jason just mentioned, and as I said in the beginning, really right now you do see the initiative – the economic and the scientific initiative – being taken by China to lead mankind into the future; especially with the space program. You also see the initiative being taken by Russia; and this is very clearly illustrated this week with the actions that have been taken by Russia in Syria. The strategic initiative lies in Putin's actions there. As Mr. LaRouche emphasized, Putin is setting the agenda; he is constantly on the flank. You can see this going back to the chemical weapons, where Putin took the initiative to say fine, we will help Assad dismantle these chemical weapons. It can be seen with the decision to intervene, a few months back, by Putin into the situation in Syria; and then with the pull-out that happened earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the way, Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise; constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking

the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as Mr.

LaRouche always uses the example, of Douglas MacArthur's actions

in Inchon. You always, always act on the surprise.

Now, this was illustrated I think just anecdotally very well in an article that was published March 15th – Tuesday of this week – in the {New York Times}, with a very apropos headline which read "Putin's Syria Tactics Keep Him at the Fore, and Leave

Everyone Else Guessing". I just want to read the first paragraph

of that article, actually, because I think it just describes very

vividly what we mean by this:

"President Vladimir Putin's order to withdraw the bulk of Russian forces from Syria seemingly caught Washington, Damascus,

and everyone in between off guard; just the way the Russian leader likes it. By all accounts, Mr. Putin delights in creating

surprises."

So, this is the subject of our institutional question for this week; which Mr. LaRouche had some very specific words to say

in response to, which I'm going to let Jeff elaborate on for us.

But let me just read the text of this question to start off.

"Mr. LaRouche, as you know, earlier this week, at the start of the Geneva Peace Talks, Russian President Vladimir Putin announced that he ordered the withdrawal of some of the Russian

military forces in Syria. The withdrawal of Russian fighter planes began the next day and has continued. A residual force will remain at the naval base at Tartus and at the air base in Latakia. How do you view Putin's decision? How might it impact the Russian, American, and United Nations efforts to bring the

Syrian war to an end, now underway in Geneva?"

STEINBERG: Of course, we've taking up the bulk of this week's report with a discussion about man's extraterrestrial imperative; the need for man to get off of the planet Earth, because man was never an Earthbound creature. So, we're at a point right now where Mr. LaRouche was delighted in our discussion earlier today at the prospect of over the next two years, China going through the preparations for the launching of an orbiter that will be hopefully landing on the back side of the Moon. And will for the first time, give mankind a window into the Solar System and the Galaxy beyond. And this is something of enormous importance and enormous excitement, because it puts this nature of man as an extraterrestrial creature capable through creative discovery, of not remaining Earthbound, but of exploring the near Solar System and beyond. And it reminds me that virtually every astronaut and cosmonaut who has travelled in space, has remarked at one point or other, that having the vantage point of looking down on Earth, you become at one point overwhelmed with the fact that so much of what goes on, on the planet of Earth, is trivial relative to the challenges that are very obvious when you look at man from the standpoint of man's ability to explore the Universe and make these kinds of discoveries. And it was that approach that actually informed our discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that he has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy is

always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking; continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks were

beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the Russian

military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next morning

– Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the

Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground,

which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said,

if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a

matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the

infrastructure is in place for that to happen.

But Mr. LaRouche wanted to make a larger and much more fundamental point about what is going on here. What he emphasized

is that you can't lose sight of the fact that the war is still going on. We don't know how things are going to play out; what we

do know, is that there has been a change of conditions. In fact,

there was a major change of conditions beginning on September 30th of last year, when the major Russian military presence began. And when the situation systematically shifted from that point on, and yet at the same time, certain leading political figures around the world – the spokesman for the Jordanian government; Steffan de Mistura, the UN representative for Syria

– they all said, "We're not surprised by President Putin's announcement this past Monday." In the case of the Jordanians, the chief of staff of the Jordanian military, the chief of staff

of the Syrian military, were both in Moscow last October; and they met with Russian Defense Minister Shoigu, they met with President Putin. And they were told quite clearly that the Russian mission was not a permanent mission; but was a limited mission in both size and in time duration. And that when the circumstances reached the point where it was feasible to reach a

diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis, that the Russian forces

would begin to be withdrawn.

As Matt pointed out with the {New York Times} coverage, people in the West were scratching their heads, because they refused to take note of the fact that Putin is a strategic thinker. And very often, what he says – in most cases, in fact – is exactly what he intends to do; but he's not going to do it

in a predictable fashion. He's going to do it in a way that will

catch you by surprise. And the biggest surprise is that most political thinkers in the West, most officials in government in

the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices

prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a

strategic

fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria.

Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily

in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs.

Look

what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a

founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway

to destabilize the Zuma government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative.

So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to

happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in

Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed –

to a major confrontation between the United States and China. We

had a report earlier this week from David Ignatius in the {Washington Post}, who is very often a kind of reliable leak sheet for what's going on inside the administration. And the Obama administration is preparing for confrontation with China over the South China Sea; they're waiting for a ruling from the

World Court in the Hague on a complaint filed by the Philippines.

So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China in the eye, for carrying out new provocations against China. The sanctions that President Obama announced this week, ostensibly against North Korea, are in fact sanctions against China; they go way beyond what was agreed upon by China and the United States at the United Nations.

So, if you take all of these factors into account, and if you think of them as a process, not simply as a series of discrete events, then you get a very clear idea of what Mr. LaRouche means when he says that the planet, in general terms, is in a state of war. Now, ultimately what this state of warfare comes down to, is the fact that you have a new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered future. It's defined by the economic initiatives of China, by the One Belt-One Road policy, and most emphatically by China's systematic plan for collaborating with other nations on the kind of space exploration that once was a hallmark of American policy; but has not been abandoned. President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and Kesha is leading the fight to reverse that process.

Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney administration followed by the Obama administration, the United States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at the beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And as the result, the United States, really the entire trans-

Atlantic

region, is dead. Germany was once a great prospering economy; the

result of the "economic miracle" that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned for the post-World War II period; no replay of Versailles, but a completely different approach. Germany has now

been destroyed by the policies largely coming from the British Empire. All of continental Europe is hopelessly and irreversibly

bankrupt; and Mario Draghi's announcement of an expansion of quantitative easing and a zero interest rate policy is a reflection that certain people are desperate over the fact that

Europe is doomed, that the United States under present circumstances. We've talked in recent months on this broadcast about the death rate increase in the United States; the true rate

of unemployment; the epidemic of heroin addiction and heroin overdose deaths; the declining life expectancy in the United States. These are all measures of the fact that the trans-Atlantic region is dead; and will only begin to reverse that death if there is a revolutionary, fundamental change in policy. That alternative policy is being carried out in the Eurasian and Asia-Pacific region; led by China, led by Russia, reflected in the way that Russian President Putin has navigated

the strategic situation.

So, the great threat is coming from the fact that a dying British Empire – which is irreversibly doomed – is lashing out and is trying to preserve something that can no longer be preserved. There was a time when the British Empire could impose

petty tyrannies on countries around the world and achieve a certain limited degree of stability. That's over with. All of the

efforts within the framework of the mindset of the British

Empire, the mindset of the Obama administration, the mindset of virtually all European leaders – the French probably the worst of the bunch on the continent – is doomed; it doesn't work. Yet, there is an opportunity; and opportunity for all of mankind in what's going on in the Asia-Pacific region, led by China, by Russia. India is clearly stepping in to play a significant role in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for purposes that go beyond national interests, but address the interests of all of mankind. Egypt is fully established as orienting towards that new Asia-Pacific combination. So, this is the larger picture; this is the framework for judging the initiative taken by President Putin this week. And it must be judged from the standpoint of the global consequences; and not just simply the consequences for the immediate negotiations around Syria. Although his actions this week have certainly greatly improved the possibility of bringing that five-year tragedy to an end.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I would just add, the initiative being taken by these countries also very much has to do with the decades-long work Mr. Lyndon LaRouche and Mrs. Helga LaRouche have undertaken. The One Belt-One Road policy that China has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the 1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the 350-page Special Report that was issued by {Executive Intelligence Review} called "The New Silk Road Becomes the

World

Land-Bridge". One very exciting announcement, because you mentioned Egypt, just this week there was a very high-level event

which was sponsored by the Transportation Ministry in Cairo; featuring a LaRouche collaborator, Hussein Askary, to announce the formal publication of the Arabic language of this full, 350-page World Land-Bridge Special Report from {Executive Intelligence Review}.

So, you can see that at the very highest levels of government around the world, this is what is shaping the discussion; the initiatives that the LaRouche movement have taken

for decades. And one final note along those same lines, as we announced last Friday, Mrs. Helga LaRouche just got back from a

very important trip to India; at which she was one of the featured speakers in a very prominent, very high-level dialogue

– the Raisina Dialogue. And if people have not seen it yet, a wonderful half-hour interview that Jason Ross conducted with Mrs.

LaRouche was posted on the LaRouche PAC website earlier this week. So, if you haven't watched that yet, I would really encourage you to watch it; and to just think about everything that has been said here today. Think about these initiatives that

are being taken by some of the world's leading countries to create the future; and think about the role that the LaRouche movement has played over years and decades in shaping the possibility of these initiative being taken today.

So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would

like to thank Jeff and Jason here in the studio. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17.
marts:**

**Putin sætter den strategiske
dagsorden//**

**Kina forbereder finansstyring
og Tobinskat**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Lyd:

**EIR's interview med Irans
ambassadør i Danmark, H.E.
Hr. Morteza Moradian
om Irans relationer med
Rusland og Kina, og Irans
rolle i Den Nye Silkevej**

efter P5+1 aftalen med Iran (på engelsk og persisk)

Interviewet, som EIR's Tom Gillesberg lavede, fandt sted den 15. marts 2016 i København. Ambassadøren talte på persisk, som blev oversat til engelsk.

English:

Interview with Iran's ambassador to Denmark, H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian about Iran's relations with Russia and China, and Iran's role in the New Silk Road, after the P5+1 agreement with Iran. The interview was conducted on March 15, 2016 in Copenhagen, Denmark by EIR's Copenhagen Bureau Chief Tom Gillesberg. Ambassador Moradian spoke Farsi, and his statements were translated into English.

Audio:

Interview with H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian, the ambassador from the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Kingdom of Denmark, about Iran's relationship with Russia and China, and Iran's role in the New Silk Road, from a vantage point after the P5+1 agreement with Iran. The interview was conducted on March 15, 2016 in Copenhagen, Denmark by EIR's Copenhagen Bureau Chief Tom Gillesberg. Ambassador Moradian spoke in Farsi, and his statements were translated into English. Video and audio files are available at: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=12299>

EIR: Mr. Ambassador, thank you so much for agreeing to this interview, to give us an opportunity to hear what Iran's views are on some extremely important questions, not only for Iran, but, I think, for the whole Middle East region, and, also, for the world. When Chinese President Xi was in the Islamic Republic of Iran, there was a lot of discussion with President Hassan Rouhani, and others, and agreements signed, aimed at

reviving the ancient Silk Road, which the Chinese call the "One Belt, One Road." Greek Prime Minister Tsipras was also in Teheran, and spoke about Greece's role as a bridge between Europe and Iran.

After years of war and lack of economic development, many countries in Southwest Asia are completely destroyed. What is urgently needed is the extension of the OBOR/New Silk Road policy for the entire region, as well as the Mediterranean countries – a Marshall plan, but without the Cold War connotations.

Do you see a potential for that, and if so, what are your ideas about it?

H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian: In the name of God, the compassionate and merciful, I would also like to thank you for arranging this session for me to be able to air my views on the issues of the region, and others. Both Iran and China have high ambitions regarding transportation issues. I think that there is extreme potential for economic development, arising from the idea raised by the Chinese president. Iran is situated at a very important juncture from a transportation point of view. This has nothing to do with the issues of today or yesterday, but it is an historical issue. Iran, and the region around it, are located along a very, very important corridor.

If we look at the important corridors in the world, there are three important ones. We can see that the North-South corridor, and the East-West corridors, all pass through Iran. The important thing is that transportation corridors necessarily need lead to the growth of economic development, and also, when economic development takes place, what follows that is peace and stability. Our country, and all of the countries of western Asia, are trying to find and develop these transportation routes. In this regard, the idea raised by China can have important consequences for the region. Just to sum it up, this idea of reviving the old Silk Road, would have a very positive influence on development.

As far as Iran is concerned, Iran enjoys a very good position

in regard to all forms of transportation – air, sea and land. Iran has always followed up on the issue of reviving the old Silk Road, with China. We now see that the Chinese idea, and the Iranian idea, are now meeting at some point. I think that within the framework of two very important agreements, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), and, also, the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), we can have very, very good cooperation. I will give more explanations later about the importance of the SCO and ECO cooperation. These are both in our region, and they can have cooperation with each other.

EIR: You have personally been involved in your country's relations with, especially, Russia and China – two countries which are playing leading roles in today's world, with Russia taking leadership in the fight against Daesh/Islamic State, and China pursuing an inclusive, multi-national, economic development strategy, which is an alternative to the transatlantic monetarist policy leading to economic collapse. Now, starting a new chapter after the sanctions against Iran have been lifted, how do you foresee the future of Iranian relations with Russia, and China, and what benefits will that bring to Iran and the rest of the world?

Ambassador Moradian: As you pointed out, I think the conditions are now conducive for good cooperation and development. During the years of the sanctions, we had extensive relations with China. There is now about \$50 billion of trade between Iran and China. This has fluctuated some years, but it is between 50-52 billion dollars. China is the biggest importer of Iranian oil. We also had extensive relations with Russia during the years of the sanctions. It's natural, now that the sanctions have been removed, that the relationship between these three nations would develop further.

The important point that I would like to point out is that the three countries have common interests, and common threats

facing them. We are neighbors with the Russians. We have common interests with Russia regarding the Caspian Sea, transportation, energy, the environment, and peace in the world. So, we have quite a number of areas where our interests coincide. Other there areas where we have common interests are drug trafficking, and other forms of smuggling, combating extremism and terrorism, and, also, our views on major international issues converge.

We also have quite a number of common interests with China. They include energy, in the consumption market, reviving the Silk Road, combating terrorism, the transportation corridors, and, also, in the framework of the SCO -- quite a number of areas where we have common interests. China needs 9 million barrels of oil on a daily basis. As I said, our trade relations amount to about \$52 billion.

Iran enjoys some very important factors. First of all, it has enormous amounts of energy resources. Its coastline along the Persian Gulf runs up to 3000 kilometers. We are neighbors with 15 countries in the region. So these are very, very important points for Iran to be in the hub. I think that cooperation between these three powers, namely Russia, China, and Iran, can ultimately lead to stability and peace in the region. So the four areas – the combination of economics, trade, energy and transit – these are areas that can lead to the ideas that I mentioned. I think that effective cooperation between these three powers can lead to peace and stability, important in western Asia, and in the Middle East.

The revival of the old Silk Road, at this juncture of time, would be very meaningful. During the recent visit to Iran by the Chinese president, the two sides agreed to increase the volume of trade between the two countries, in the next 10 years, to \$600 billion.

Also, in the recent visit to Iran by President Putin, there was also agreement on Russian investment in Iran. It has to be said that our trade relations, economic relations, with Russia is not as much as it should be. But among the topics discussed when President Putin visited Iran, was to make sure that the

volume of economic cooperation increases between Iran and Russia.

Just to sum up our relations with Russia and China regarding economic cooperation, we think that with Russia, it is not enough, and we want to increase that. With China, it has been very good, but we still want to develop that further. Overall the situation is promising.

You are well aware that from the point of view of stability, Iran is unique in the region, and that actually prepares the ground for this cooperation to continue.

EIR: There is already progress on extending the New Silk Road from China to Iran. On February 15, 2016, the first freight train from Yiwu, China, arrived in Teheran. The 14-day-trip covered over 10,000 km. (about 6,500 miles), travelling through Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, saving 30 days compared to the former route. What are the plans to extend this line, and how will that improve economic relations along the New Silk Road? And what new agreements were just made between Iran and China to develop the New Silk Road?

Ambassador Moradian: President Rouhani has very clear views on the Silk Road. In fact, President Rouhani is a specialist in transportation routes and communication. He believes that the basis for development lies in the development of transportation infrastructure. He and the Chinese president have talked over the revival of the Silk Road on a number of occasions.

There was a discussion that deviated from the main subject of the Silk Road, being propagated during the past few years. That was the idea of the new Silk Road, or the American Silk Road, so to speak, and it was not based on an historical issue. Basically, they wanted to bypass Iran, and deviate the route to bypass Iran, in effect. No one can fight against economic and geographical realities on the ground. When the route through Iran is the shortest route, and the cost effective route, then nobody can go against that. And because the Chinese ideas were more realistic, then Iran and China

were able to come to some sort of understanding on the development and revival of the Silk Road.

There is also emphasis on the development of sea routes. We witnessed good investment by the Chinese in this regard, in the recent years. China has invested heavily in Pakistan, in the Gwarder port.

If I want to just come to the issue regarding Iran, then I can go through the following issues. The railroad between Khaf in Iran, and Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif in Afghanistan, is an important connection. The Khaf-Herat section has been completed, but the Herat-Mazar-i-Sharif section is still to be constructed. I think this is an important route that we believe, in my opinion, China would be advised to invest in. Also, within the framework of Danish development aid to Afghanistan, I think a portion of funds to the Herat-Mazar-i-Sharif railroad link would be an important factor.

If this route between Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif were to be completed, then from there, there are two routes – one leading to Uzbekistan, and the other leading to Tajikistan, and that can be an important connection. At the moment, China is making good investments in both Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, in order to establish the links. In fact, the link between China, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Iran, is one of the most important links of the Silk Road. And there is a missing link between Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif, as I said, and I hope that the countries concerned, especially China, can help establish that link. Over the past two years, the corridor between Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Iran has now borne fruit, and is now connected. In fact, the train that you mentioned, that arrived in Teheran, actually came through this route, and this corridor has extreme potential. I hear that quite a number of countries in the region are interested in joining this corridor. We have another corridor linking Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Oman, which is called the fourth corridor. And this has also come into operation over the past year-and-a-half.

We also have other corridors, which I call subsidiary

corridors. All of these subsidiary corridors can actually enhance and complement the main East-West Silk Road. One very important corridor, that you are aware of, is the North-South corridor, and a section along this corridor is now under construction – the connection between the city of Rasht, and Astara on the Caspian coast. In fact, we have reached agreement with Azerbaijan on the connection between the two cities of Astara in Iran, and Astara in Azerbaijan. This corridor also needs some investment, and we hope that countries like China can help us in developing this. Just to sum up regarding the corridors, there are two routes which need investment: Herat to Mazar-i-Sharif; and Rasht to the Asteras in Iran and Azerbaijan.

Regarding the third part of your question, about the agreements reached by Iran and China during the Chinese president's visit in Iran, 17 agreements were signed during the visit. The areas included energy, financial investment, communication, science, the environment, and know-how. Specifically, on the core of your question about the Silk Road, the two countries agreed to play a leading, and a key role, in the development and operation of this link. They agreed to have cooperation on infrastructure, both railroad and road. For example, electrification of the railroad link between Teheran and Mashhad, is part of this connection of the Silk Road that was agreed to. The other important thing is cooperation on the port of Chabahar in Iran. The two sides agreed to have cooperation in this, and the Chinese agreed to invest in Chabahar. Regarding industry and other production areas, they agreed that the Chinese would cooperate and invest in 20 areas. Regarding tourism and cultural cooperation, the two sides also agreed to develop cooperation in this regard, within the framework of the Silk Road. I think you can see that within the framework of the Silk Road, there are quite important agreements between the two countries.

EIR: Building great infrastructure projects is a driver for economic growth, and increasing cooperation among nations.

Now, after suffering under the sanctions, Iran has an opportunity to build up its infrastructure, as is going on, in cooperation with other countries, to help create the basis for Iran to play an important, stabilizing role in the region.

The P5+1 agreement also cleared the way for Iran's peaceful nuclear energy program, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was just signed with China, to develop peaceful nuclear energy. What were the highlights of the agreement, and what are the plans for Russian-Iranian civilian nuclear cooperation?

Ambassador Moradian: Between Iran, Russia, and China, there has been good cooperation through the years regarding the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

32:36

Because of the reneging of the Western governments, the construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant was left unfinished, and after the Russians agreed to pick up the pieces, we reached an agreement, and were able to develop, and make this very important plant operational. The cooperation between Iran and Russia on peaceful nuclear energy has been very constructive. All of Iran's atomic activities have been under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). As we have had no deviation from our peaceful nuclear program, after 10 or 12 years, the Western countries, the P5 + 1, finally came to the conclusion that Iran's nuclear program has always been peaceful. I believe that they knew this at the beginning, as well. This was just a political game. We have also had some kind of constructive cooperation with China over the past two decades on peaceful nuclear energy. During the recent visit to Iran by the Chinese president, an agreement was also signed in this regard. In the implementation of the cooperation agreement, China, Iran and America are also the three countries forming the committee for the implementation of the agreement. It was agreed during the recent visit that China will reconfigure the Arak heavy water plant. The Chinese and the Iranians have also agreed to have cooperation on the building of small-scale nuclear power

plants. This, I think, is very important for Iran, in terms of producing electricity, and the Chinese welcome this. We have also signed a number of agreements with China on the construction of a number of nuclear power plants in the past. Iran, because of its extensiveness, has always welcomed cooperation on the development of peaceful nuclear energy for the production of electricity, and other things. In fact, based on the cooperation agreement between Iran and the P5+ 1, there will be agreements with a number of the members of the P5+1 regarding the nuclear issue.

EIR: You already mentioned the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC), linking India, Iran, and Russia with Central Asia and Europe. Is there anything more you would like to say about this project, and the benefits that are envisioned?

Ambassador Moradian: I explained about the corridors in my previous answers, but the North-South corridor is one of the most important corridors in the world. If this corridor were completed, it would be very effective in three most important areas – it would be a contributing factor in security, speed, and cost. This corridor starts in Finland, comes through Iran, then on to the Persian Gulf, from there to India, and then towards Africa. If we look at the present route now, it takes 45 days, but if we use the North-South corridor that I just mentioned, this would reduce the time to 20 days. The route will be 3,000 kilometers shorter. This can be a very important factor from a world economic point of view.

We are faced with realities, with situations, that nobody can ignore. For this reason, during the past few years, Iran has made endeavors, extensive efforts, to actually complete what I call the subsidiary corridors. Right now, in Iran, we have 10,000 kilometers of operational railroad lines. For our present government, the further development of railroad links is very important. We have plans to build another 10,000 kilometers in the future. It is my view, that in the next

couple of years, we will see a revolution in transportation. There are some missing links, which we think should be completed as soon as possible. As I said, from our point of view, the section between Rasht and Astara is very important, and it has to be completed very soon. In fact, during the recent visit of the Danish foreign minister to Teheran, this issue was also brought up. The Iranians announced that if the Danes are prepared to do so, they would be welcome to invest in this section. And we have that link to the Chabahar port. If this port is developed to utilize its full capacity, then this will serve as an important link in the North-South corridor. In the Persian Gulf we also have an island called Qeshm, which has an extreme potential. In fact, because Qeshm, itself, also has gas, and has a strategic location in the Persian Gulf, it can play an important role in the North-South corridor. We are seeing that various countries, like China, Japan, and South Korea, are interested in entering into these areas. In fact, there was a seminar on shipping in Copenhagen, a couple of weeks ago, and I said that to the Danish participants there, that this condition is conducive to involvement for mutual benefit. The benefits to be accrued from the North-South dialogue are global. Iran is making all efforts to complete this corridor.

A lot can be said about the North-South, and East-West corridors. Just to point out, very briefly, on the East-West corridor, some very important developments have taken place. We have had good negotiations with the Turkish side. One of the most important links in the East-West corridor, is the link between the cities of Sarakhs and Sero. Sero is located on the border with Turkey, and the Turks and the Iranians are now in very extensive negotiations to develop this route. The other route is the railway link between Iran and Iraq, and this is also being constructed on an extensive level. As I said, the subsidiary corridors – the one from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan to Iran; and the one from Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Oman – are now operational, and we are

also planning on development, and making other subsidiary routes operational.

EIR: What about cooperation on water desalination, and nuclear fuel?

Ambassador Moradian: Iran is faced with a shortage of water. We have quite a number of projects for water desalination in the Persian Gulf. In fact, one of the main reasons that we wanted nuclear power plants in the Persian Gulf, was to use that energy to desalinate water. Currently, a number of Iranian companies are engaged in this. One of the very big projects came on stream during the past couple of years. Regarding the desalination plants, there is good cooperation between Iran and foreign countries. I think that this is another area where Danish companies can enter into the competition. President Rouhani made a trip to the city of Yazd, in the center of Iran, and he said there, that transfer of water from the Persian Gulf to the center of Iran, to the city of Yazd, is one of the important projects that the government has in mind.

Regarding nuclear fuel, within the framework of the P5+1 agreement with Iran, it envisages extensive cooperation between Iran and these countries on nuclear fuel. Iran is now one of the countries that have the legal right to enrich uranium, and this has been recognized. So, based on the capacities that Iran has, we can exchange nuclear fuel. Within this framework, we have exchanged quite a lot of fuel with the Russians, and we have cooperation plans with China on the heavy-water plant in Arak.

EIR: Can you speak about cooperation on fighting terrorism and drug trafficking?

Ambassador Moradian: On the issues of combating extremism and terrorism, and trafficking with drugs, and otherwise, there is extensive groundwork for cooperation. The development of extremism, and the instability that follows, is extensive in the CIS countries, and part of China. Iran has extensive

experience and knowledge about combating terrorism, and in this regard, Iran can cooperate with those countries regarding this menace. Afghanistan is the world's biggest producer of narcotic drugs. In fact, unfortunately, after Afghanistan was occupied by the ICEF coalition, led by America, the level of production of narcotic drugs in Afghanistan has increased extremely violently.

EIR: While the British and the Danish troops were in the Helmand province, I think the production went up about 20 times.

Ambassador Moradian: Exactly. In that region, Helmand, in particular, there was an incredible increase in the amount of production. In fact, in combatting smuggling drugs to come to Iran, to this side, Iran has been a sturdy wall, and we have unfortunately lost quite a number of our security forces in that region, bordering on 4,000. Just something on the sideline which is very important. In fact, Iran is on the frontline in combatting drugs. When Europe talks about helping other countries stem the tide of immigrants to Europe, I think that stemming the tide of narcotic drugs coming to Europe, also requires the same sort of agreements. Iran is very active in combating and preventing drugs coming this way, and the death penalty, the capital punishment we have for the warlords of the drug traffickers, is, actually, in the pursuit of this policy of trying to prevent drugs from reaching outside of the region. Just imagine if Iran would stop cooperating, stop combatting these drug traffickers? The road would be an open highway, and just imagine how much drugs would then come across. There already exists very good cooperation between Iran, China, and Russia on combating drug trafficking. We have had multi-lateral sessions in the field of combating drug trafficking. I think that within the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Iran can play a leading role in combating drug trafficking, extremism and terrorism. In the recent session of the SCO, it was agreed that after the

sanctions were lifted against Iran, that Iran's status would be lifted from an observer to a full member. In the next session, which is planned in Uzbekistan, I think that this issue will be raised.

EIR: I think we have covered a lot of very many essential things. Is there anything else that you would like to say to our readers?

Ambassador Moradian: I would like to refer to a few points in this interview, which is about the cooperation between Iran, China, and Russia. The cooperation between Iran, Russia, and China is very important. The more this cooperation increases, the more it can help peace and security in the region. The revival of the old Silk Road is a very important issue. Within the framework of the revival of the Silk Road, the strengthening of the SCO cooperation, and the ECO cooperation is very important. In fact, the cooperation between ECO and SCO is also very important, and has to be developed.

Other very important issues that I would just like to briefly mention are – the first thing is that Iran's full membership in the SCO is important. In fact, in the area of security, SCO needs Iran's experience and influence in this regard. The next thing is that cooperation within the framework of the SCO, can enhance security and peace in the region.

The next thing, is that China must make more investment in Iran. In order to actually develop the Silk Road, it has to invest more in Iran. China must also make more investments in the port city of Chabahar, and also in the Iranian island of Qeshm.

The other point I would like to mention, is that the Eastern SWIFT (financial transaction network) is also an important idea. I think that the important countries in the East, like China and Russia, should have an alternative financial connection. And the other thing is, the monetary exchange between these two countries is important. What I mean by this, is that these countries can conduct their transactions in the

local currencies of the Iranian Rial, the Chinese Yuan, and the Russian Ruble.

The other thing I would like to point out, is that China is the number one country in the world that needs energy, and Iran is one of the leading producers of such energy. But the important point to be born in mind here, is Iran's independence in its decision making regarding its energy resources – oil and gas. In fact, if you look at its record, Iran has never played games with its energy policy. Any country that wants to have economic cooperation with Iran, must take this aspect into consideration, and it is an important consideration. Other countries in our region do not operate in this way.

Finally, I am very pleased that this opportunity arose for me to air my views on economic development in the region, and very important issues that will have global consequences. Thank you.

EIR: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

End

**RADIO SCHILLER den 14. marts
2016:
Den gamle verden kommer ikke
tilbage//
Valget i Tyskland//**

Draghis bazooka// Syrien-forhandlingerne

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR
med formand Tom Gillesberg
den 10. marts 2016:
Rusland og Ukraine; Hillary
Clinton;
Nykredit; finansspekulation;
EU-Tyrkiet; Schiller Partiet**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**RADIO SCHILLER den 7. marts
2016:**

F16-fly til Irak og Syrien// Kinas femårs-plan inkl. videnskab og innovation

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3.
marts 2016:**

**Schiller Instituttet har
foretræde for Folketingets
Udenrigsudvalg:**

**Syrisk våbenhvile er en
chance for fred gennem
økonomisk udvikling//**

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:
Forlæng Silkevejen til
Mellemøsten**

Sagen om Nykredit/Totalkredit

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: Den Asiatiske Infrastruktur Investeringsbank (AIIB) præsident Jin Liquns tale i København den 2. marts 2016

Redrawing the Global Financial Map – Jin Liqun President of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank

“How Can the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank Contribute to Economic Development and Integration in Asia? What is in it for Europe/Denmark?”

Meeting arranged by Copenhagen University's Asian Dynamics Initiative, Asia Research Centre, and Copenhagen Business School.

Question by Tom Gillesberg, chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark at ??

Link til København Universitets side om mødet.

**Schiller Instituttets
foretræde
for Folketingets
Udenrigsudvalg
den 1. marts 2016:
Syrisk våbenhvile er en
chance
for et nyt paradigme for
samarbejde om fred gennem
økonomisk udvikling**

En delegation fra Schiller Institutet, med formand Tom Gillesberg som ordførende, havde foretræde for Folketingets Udenrigsudvalg. Hør talen og se diasbilleder:

Vi står netop nu med en enestående mulighed for at sikre, at den langvarige mareridtsagtige proces med krig og

ødelæggelse, der har præget Mellemøsten i årtier, og som har spredt sig til Europa og resten af verden i form af terror fra Islamisk Stat og en flygtningebølge, der er ved at løbe Europa over ende, kan bringes til ophør og erstattes af et nyt paradigme for fred gennem fælles økonomisk udvikling.

GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid

Dias til mødet:





RADIO SCHILLER den 29. februar 2016: Kun Silkevejen kan få våbenhvilen i Syrien til at holde

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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:

**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

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 races, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more of. Proposing a scientific dictatorship, using murder to eliminate people who became intelligent and opposed the ruling class, keeping science secret from the majority of people; this is some of the nice outlook that Russell had on things. He also, in his own work as a "professional" you might say, worked on destroying the concept of science and turning it into mathematics. He did this before and after the year 1900; this is somewhat earlier in his life, where he wanted to throw away what Einstein ended up doing, which was creating a new concept that contradicted the past. And say instead, that every thought in the future, will have to derive from thoughts in the past; that we can replace creativity with logic. Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was opposed to war, to conflict; especially to nuclear weapons. And, included in that, technology itself; the concept that science is dangerous, that perhaps science should be held back, because these technologies allow us to exterminate ourselves. The idea that the appropriate response to that would be to eliminate technologies, rather than to have a productive, future-oriented basis for relations among nations. This really sprung up in a major way around anti-nuclear activism, of which Russell was a

major proponent.

So, I think what we can reflect on, what we can take from the excitement around these gravitational findings, is that:
1)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational

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

experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar

to

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

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

leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

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

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people

are actually thinking about as citizens of this nation. "Wow! What are we going to send up there?" "What are we going to take

to the Moon for the next trip?"

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

a future-oriented mission again.

OGDEN: Well thank you very much, Jason. I think that's certainly exciting; the idea to be able to directly perceive changes in space-time itself. So, I'd like to thank Jason for his

presentation, and I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us remotely

today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

POLITISK ORIENTERING 18. februar 2016: Rusland tager strategisk lederskab/ Bail-in ikke holdbart/ Gennembrud for Fusionskraft

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd: