

**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 ICF coalition, led by America, the level of production of narcotic drugs in Afghanistan has increased extremely violently.

EIR: While the British in 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/Totalcredit

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
foretræde
for
Udenrigsudvalg**

**Instituttets
Folketingets**

den 1. marts 2016: Syrisk våbenhvile er en chance for et nyt paradigme for samarbejde om fred gennem økonomisk udvikling

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

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.

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](http://larouchepac.com)

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

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

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

that discussion.

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

arising, especially from the powderkeg of Syria, Northern Africa,

and the Middle East. The area of Syria, where, despite the efforts of Secretary John Kerry to find common ground with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Obama's refusal to tell

Saudi Arabia and Turkey to stand down is threatening to blow this

entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was

published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert

Parry, the editor of that publication, in which he says the risk

that the multi-sided Syrian war could spark World War III, continues, as Turkey and U.S. neo-cons seek an invasion that could kill Russian troops, and possibly escalate the Syrian crisis into a nuclear showdown.

What Robert Parry says in this article is that Barack Obama took questions from reporters on Tuesday, but he did not take the

one that needed to be asked: which was whether he had forbidden

Turkey and Saudi Arabia to invade Syria, because on that question

could hinge whether the ugly Syrian civil war could spin off into

World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say

is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in a

strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the point

of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff.

So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many more of the details, and then we'll come back to our institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also answer. So, Jeff?

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

much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi

Arabia

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash

point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear

sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of

trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's

a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to

an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how

to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy

Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia

of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that

the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted

to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping

around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in

Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see nothing

but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on the

verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place where

you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course Asia

and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but

relative

to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and in

the United States, we see a disintegration of the political and

economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of course,

Africa has been on the target list of the British and other European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time.

But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment of

geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis in

Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire European

financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt

under the present conditions and terms of thinking that dominate

Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning to

see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of the

people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in the first place.

So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself, now

saying there must be a Marshall Plan to rebuild Syria, to rebuild

other parts of the Middle East, and only on the basis of a Marshall Plan, which gives people a clear incentive to go back to

their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those

circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what applies

to the Middle East applies doubly for Africa, where the U.S.-British-French overthrow of Qaddafi unleashed absolute hell

throughout the African continent.

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

And for starters, that change means that the United States and Europe must reach out to Russia and China. You had the recent visit by President Xi Jinping of China to Saudi Arabia, to Iran,

and to Egypt, and what Xi Jinping made very clear is that China

is prepared to move towards the building of the Silk Road infrastructure, the New Silk Road land route, the Maritime Silk

Route, which will come up through the newly expanded Suez Canal

– China will do that. In fact, just this week, the first freight

train from Eastern China arrived in Iran, and this is part of the

entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the

cornerstone of their foreign policy.

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

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

portion

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

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

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

solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

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

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

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

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

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

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

real economy.

All of that means the United States coming into alignment

with what we see going on with China, with Russia, with India, with others. In other words, the United States becomes part of a genuine trans-Pacific collaboration, and under those circumstances, Europe itself would have no choice but to get on with the program.

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries – you have clinical insanity and folly, which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized, Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only way to solve this problem.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent

poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns. Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union – and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem. So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union, then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other

officials

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

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

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

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

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

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

much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint

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

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

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

Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a

safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy.

So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission,

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

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

current economic conditions. This has pushed people to begin to discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a new program of economic development for the Middle East and North Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry. The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan, and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek a better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this is a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China and Russia to develop the Middle East and North Africa along the Silk Road routes. This kind of cooperation between China and the rest of the world is what China is seeking in inviting the rest of the world to engage in; and this is the only way to solve the

crises and shift the geometry overall which is creating the existential threat which is now being faced by Europe. Now, this new paradigm; this is exactly what we have been talking about for quite a while, but I think the foundation for a new paradigm cannot be seen as merely some sort of extension of former or present geopolitical ideas about how the world works. This is not merely a rearrangement of political and economic and strategic alliances between countries that would still be dominated by the same axiomatic world view which is what has brought us to this crisis point to begin with. Rather, there needs to be a true renaissance; a new calibration, a re-examination of what our view of mankind is. What our view of man as a species is, and what mankind's role within this galaxy and his relationship to the entire universe; and indeed, what his responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this universe must be.

So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of the really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

an astonishingly tiny change.

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

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

world. Some of them are being upgraded; new ones are being brought on line. There is a proposal for a space-based interferometry experiment – the Lisa experiment; which NASA had been a part of, and has now left it to the European Space Agency, currently scheduled to launch in 2034. Perhaps it'll be sent sooner than that, based on this news.

But what does all of this mean? What does it tell us about – what are the implications? Well for one thing, this means we really have an entirely new tool for looking at the universe that we live in. All of our knowledge about the heavens beyond us, comes from sight, or various forms of sight. You can't smell a star, you can't taste it; you can't hear it, you can't feel it. You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we learn more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to Kepler when he determined how the planets moved; the use of telescopes in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen with the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that see what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes. Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

side of the Moon, where China is going to be within just a few years sending a lander. The potential to do long wavelength radio telescope work from that location; this represents

something new.

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

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

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

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

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to

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

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

wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in

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

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

it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at

things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

on this website. One of the specific things that he looked at was

in the world of physics, Leibniz's demonstration that there was

no absolute space; that there was no absolute time. This was contrary to Descartes, Newton, and others. Leibniz said there's

no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God, and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler. Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing that. Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power. Now between the lines, what these two were also saying was a view of government and a view of society. Implicit in this is Leibniz's view that the legitimacy of a ruler or of government is not simply from having gathered power; but from using it in a

wise way to achieve good ends. That may seem a little bit far afield, but it's true; and this is part of the background on this

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

He was right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

years.

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

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

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

what science really is?

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

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that. Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

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

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

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

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

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

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

Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are

familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was

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

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

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

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

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

1)

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

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

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

for the use of these kinds of instruments to provide us an entirely new window to understanding the universe around us.

Not

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

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

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

ability

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

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

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

of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational

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

experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar to

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

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

leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

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

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

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

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

to the Moon for the next trip?"

We've got a lot of objectives that have been defined that we have just been sitting on for decades. And if we eliminate the

source of this culturally, the frankly unscientific view of science, this anti-human view of humanity, we can do great things. And we can do it by removing Obama and giving this nation

a future-oriented mission again.

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

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

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Giv Schiller Partiet en vælgererklæring for at stille op på landsplan!

Med Schiller Instituttets formand Tom
Gillesberg.

Send gerne en e-mail til:

info@schillerpartiet.dk

om, at du gerne vil give en
vælgererklæring for at hjælpe Schiller
Partiet til at kunne stille op til det
næste folketingsvalg. Da det kræver cirka
20.000 vælgererklæringer for at kunne
gøre det på landsplan, må du også meget
gerne opfordre andre til at gøre det
samme.

I april vil du få en e-mail fra
vaelgererklaering.dk, der administreres
af Social- og Indenrigsministeriet, efter
at Schiller Partiets navn er blevet

godkendt.

Fra vælgererklæring.dk:

Social- og Indenrigsministeriet har ansvar for vælgererklæring.dk, som er en løsning, der understøtter nye partiers indsamling af vælgererklæringer til at kunne opstille til enten folketingsvalg eller Europa-Parlamentsvalg.

Hvis du ønsker at støtte et nyt partis opstilling til folketingsvalg eller Europa-Parlamentsvalg, skal du kontakte partiet.

Partiet skal bruge din e-mailadresse (eller CPR-nummer, hvis du ikke har en e-mailadresse). Du vil derefter få en e-mail, hvor du skal følge instruktionerne og følge linket i e-mailen videre til vælgererklæring.dk, hvor du logger på ved hjælp af NemLog-in og støtter partiet ved at afgive en vælgererklæring til dem online. Hvis du har givet partiet dit CPR-nummer, vil du modtage et brev med instruktioner.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 15.
februar 2016:**

**Hvornår krakker den første
storbank i Europa?**

**Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien på
vej ind i Syrien?**

Gravitationsbølger

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR med formand
Tom Gillesberg den 11.
februar 2016:
Deutsche Bank i krise//Kampen
om Aleppo**

**RADIO SCHILLER den 9. februar
2016:
Finansverden i
opløsning//Syrien**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Video: Schiller Instituttet
demonstrerer
imod den britiske
statsminister
David Cameron den 5. februar
2016:
Stop the British drive for
nuclear war**

Klik også her for videoen af Camerons bilkortege, sandsynligvis med hele den britiske pressegruppe, som kom lige forbi vores demonstration.

ALSO CLICK HERE FOR A VIDEO OF CAMERON'S CORTEGE, PROBABLY INCLUDING THE BRITISH PRESS CONTINGENT, DIRECTLY PASSING BY THE DEMONSTRATION.

**Video: Udenrigsminister
Kristian Jensen
til EIR: "Vi er ikke i
nærheden af en**

atomkonflikt med Kina og Rusland”!

København, 5. februar 2016 – Schiller Instituttet og EIR udfordrede i går, 4. feb. og i dag 5. feb., personligt den danske udenrigsminister Kristian Jensen, og ved en demonstration på Christiansborg Slotsplads imod den britiske premierminister David Cameron, om truslen om atomkrig mod Rusland og Kina.

Kristian Jensen holdt en tale på Københavns Universitet for studenter og Udenrigspolitisk Selskab. Folk, der ankom til mødet, fik **Schiller Instituttets flyveblad**, der gengav LPAC’s lederartikler fra 3. og 4. feb. samt rapporten om professor ved New Yorks Universitet Stephen Cohens udtalelser om faren for atomkrig.

Efter talen fik EIR’s korrespondent mulighed for at stille Kristian Jensen et spørgsmål under en privat pressekonference:

EIR’s korrespondent sagde,

»Vores redaktør Lyndon LaRouche og andre taler nu om en alvorlig fare for atomkrig imod Rusland og Kina som en måde at forsøge at begrænse deres rolle i verden. Baggrunden er den, at vi nu konfronteres med et nyt finanskarak, med de seneste [begivenheder omkring] de italienske banker, og med Deutsche Bank, der nu er på en kriseliste. I går sagde Stephen Cohen, professor ved New York Universitet, at, pga. USA’s beslutning om at firdoble militærstyrkerne langs Ruslands grænse, betyder det, at faren for en atomkrig med Rusland er farligere end under den Kolde Krig. Vil du tage afstand fra denne konfrontationskurs og søge at samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, f.eks. om at bygge den Ny Silkevej og at udvide den ind i Mellemøsten?«

Udenrigsminister Kristian Jensen:

»Jeg er slet ikke enig i din analyse. Jeg mener, du stiller dit spørgsmål på et helt forkert grundlag. Vi er ikke i nærheden af en atomkonflikt med Indien ... med Kina og Rusland.«

EIR's korrespondent:

»Vi har kombinationen af ... «

Kristian Jensen:

»Jo, men jeg er ikke enig med dig. Jeg er simpelt hen ikke enig i din forudsætning.« (Går).

I dag mødte den britiske premierminister David Cameron den danske premierminister Lars Løkke Rasmussen om den særlige, britiske EU-aftale. Ved indgangen til Statsministeriet måtte hans cortege passere direkte forbi Schiller Instituttets demonstration, centreret omkring et stort banner med ordlyden, »Stop the British drive for nuclear war against Russia and China. Win-win with the New Silk Road«. (Stop det britiske fremstød for atomkrig med Rusland og Kina, win-win med den Nye Silkevej). Den lille gruppe af demonstranter sang en speciel kanon baseret på dette og uddelte flyveblade på dansk og engelsk til forbipasserende.

Desværre var EIR ikke en af de tre journalister, der var udvalgt til at stille Cameron et spørgsmål under pressekonferencen med de to statsministre.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 4. februar 2016:

**Vi stifter Schiller
Partiet//atomkrig//
O'Malley trækker
sig//Deutsche Bank i krise**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Video i 2 dele:

1. del:

2. del:

EIR korrespondent Michelle Rasmussen spurgte Udenrigsminister Kristian Jensen om faren for atomkrig imod Rusland og Kina efter han holdt en tale for Udenrigspolitisk Selskab på Københavns Universitet den 4. februar 2016.

RADIO SCHILLER den 1. februar 2016:

LaRouche: Trussel om

atomkrig// Italienske banker// USA's præsidentkandidat Martin O'Malley// Genopliv rumprogrammet

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

Relevante links:

LaRouchePAC fredags-webcast om bl.a. USA's præsidentkandidat Martin O'Malleys støtte til Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling

Danmarks første astronaut Andreas Mogensen:
EIR interview

Fred gennem internationalt samarbejde om rumfart.
Interview med Andres Mogensen, første dansker i rummet.
Dansk version af en EIR artikel fra den 19. september 2015

SPØRGSMÅL OG SVAR den 28. januar 2016: Hvorfor skal vi skabe en ny renæssance med klassisk

ku!tur?

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

Links:

Vores side om klassisk musik.

Er skønhed en politisk nødvendighed? Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

»Beethovens årtier lange kamp for den Niende Symfoni« af Michelle Rasmussen.

Skønhed er nødvendigt, ikke praktisk, for menneskeheden.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

RADIO SCHILLER 25. januar 2016:

**Løsningen på
flygtningekrisen:
Silkevejen og Marshallplan
til Mellemøsten**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

POLITISK ORIENTERING 21. januar 2016: OECD's William White: "Det er værre end i 2007"

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video i 2 dele. Her er playlisten:

Lyd:

Er skønhed en politisk nødvendighed? Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Det var en anden af Schillers ideer, hvor han sagde, »Hvert menneske har et ideelt menneske i sig, og det er hans eller hendes store opgave i livet at opfylde dette store potentiale og gøre dette ideelle menneske, der potentielt set findes i enhver, identisk med det faktiske menneske.« Jeg finder også, at dette er et meget smukt svar på ideen om, hvorfor er vi her? Hvorfor er vi på planeten Jord? Hvad er formålet med vores eksistens?

Download (PDF, Unknown)

