

# **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:

---

# Hold op med at skjule katastrofen – Se den i øjnene, og tag ansvar!

*21. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Finanssystemets kollaps kan ikke længere skjules for befolkningerne i Europa og USA. Bankerne er gået i panik – med en udvidelse af den kvantitative lempelses pengetrykning, negative rentesatser, banker, der opkøber deres egne aktier for at bevare skinnet af solvens, og snak om »helikopterpenge«, som om penge var problemet. Det handler ikke om penge, men om realøkonomiens sammenbrud. Selvmordsraten blandt tidligere beskæftigede specialarbejdere handler ikke om penge – det handler om, at de er blevet skubbet til side af en satanisk politik, der kun er interesseret i penge, ikke mennesker.

Og alligevel accepterer de fleste mennesker det, af frygt – frygt for, at FBI og NSA skal »fange dem«, hvis de taler offentligt, hvis de taler om det, der er en åbenlys kendsgerning. USA og Europa er i forfald, i færd med at dø, mens Kina og Rusland vokser og lægger vægt på deres befolkninger, og verdens befolkninger, og de rejser ud i rummet, mens Obama lukker NASA ned; de bygger jernbaner i hele verden, mens Obama lukker dem ned, og de udvider uddannelse, mens Obama legaliserer narkotika.

Den amerikanske kulturs død kan ikke udtrykkes bedre end gennem den kendsgerning, at Obamaregeringen fremlagde en »Ven af retten«-brief (Amicus curiae) i en sag, der blev anlagt af Colorados nabostater for at standse Colorados legalisering af marihuana, som gør det umuligt at begrænse den narkotika, der strømmer over grænsen. Den største heroinepidemi i amerikansk historie, der nu berører hver eneste kommune i landet, stammer direkte fra legaliseringen af narkohandlen – eftersom netværkerne for pot er de samme som dem, der spreder heroin og

kokain. Narkohandler George Soros var henrykt, da Højesteret i dag dømte til fordel for Obamas narkohandel og afviste at lade sagen mod Colorados narkopolitik komme for retten.

Chefen for Indiens centralbank, Raghuram Rajan, advarede i dag om, at verden befinder sig i en »voksende farlig situation« pga. de vestlige bankers tiltag med at trykke penge, mens deres fysiske økonomier er ved at kollapse. »Det internationale samfund har et valg«, fremførte Rajan. »Vi kan lade som om, alt står vel til med det globale, monetære ikke-system og håbe på, at der ikke er noget, der går helt galt. Eller også kan vi begynde at opbygge et system, der passer til det 21. århundredes integrerede verden.«

Wall Street og City of London, der meget vel ved, at deres finansimperium er ved at smuldre, er af den mening, at det eneste svar er krig for at bryde den »trussel« mod deres magt, der kommer fra Kina og BRIKS-nationerne. Befolkningerne i USA og Europa bliver således tvangsfodret med en daglig dosis hysteri om »russisk aggression« og »kinesisk aggression«, i et desperat forsøg på at forhindre befolkningen i at se, at det nye paradigme, baseret på videnskab, udvikling og menneskeligt fremskridt, der er centreret omkring Kina og Rusland, er en kendsgerning. Selv, når amerikanere hader deres præsident og væmmes ved det klovneshow, der kaldes præsidentvalget, så forstår de ikke, hvorfor 80 % af det russiske folk støtter Vladimir Putin, og at over 90 % af kineserne støtter Xi Jinping.

Det er der en grund til. Det er baseret på at give befolkningen en fornemmelse af en fremtid, i en mission, der indbefatter fremskridt for hele menneskeheden – en vision, der engang var kendt som Det amerikanske System. Det må genoplives i Vesten og erstatte det døde pengesystem og den døende kultur. Alle borgere har ikke alene en andel i denne mission; de har også et ansvar for at virkeliggøre den.

*Foto: Den tidligere bilfabrik Packard i Detroit, Michigan. Da fabrikken blev bygget, var den verdens mest moderne bilfabrik.*

**Info:** Indbyggertallet i byen Detroit er faldet betydeligt fra slutningen af det 20. århundrede og frem til i dag. Mellem 2000 og 2010 faldt indbyggertallet med 25 procent. I 2010 havde byen et indbyggertal på 713.000, et fald på mere end 60 % fra byens top-indbyggertal på 1,8 mio. ved folketællingen i 1950. Faldet skyldes, at Detroit's industri, primært bilindustri og maskinværktøjsindustri – realøkonomien – gradvist er blevet afmonteret, med den heraf følgende enorme arbejdsløshed. I 2013 blev byen erklæret konkurs, med en ubetalelig gæld på 1,8 mio. dollar.

Lyndon LaRouche har foreslået, at byens fabrikker ombygges – gennem Franklin Roosevelts politik med statslig kredit til investering i den produktive økonomi, i traditionen efter USA's første finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, også kaldet Det amerikanske System – til at deltage i produktion i forbindelse med LaRouche-bevægelsens foreslåede NAWAPA-projekt, samt i forbindelse med opbygning af et højhastigheds-jernbanenet i USA, og mens der endnu findes faglærte arbejdere, der kan være med til at videreføre deres knowhow til den unge, arbejdsløse generation, der aldrig fik chancen for at tilegne sig faglige, produktive færdigheder.

**Se også:** LPAC's digitale brochure: *The US joins the New Silk Road*

**Se også:** Brochure (dansk): *Hvorfor USA og Europa må gå med i BRIKS*

---

# »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)

---

**Hvad betyder Ruslands  
militære  
tilbagetrækning fra Syrien  
for den**

**fredsproces, der er begyndt i Genève?**

**Fra LaRouchePAC Fredags-webcast  
18. marts 2016**

*Alt dette er et mål for det faktum, at det transatlantiske område er dødt; og det vil kun begynde at vende denne død omkring, hvis der finder en revolutionær, fundamental forandring sted i politikken. Denne alternative politik gennemføres i det eurasiske og asiatiske Stillehavsområde, anført af Kina, af Rusland, og er reflekteret i den måde, hvorpå præsident Putin har navigeret den strategiske situation.*

*Så den store trussel kommer fra det faktum, at et døende Britisk Imperium – der er uigenkaldeligt dømt til undergang – kæmper for sit liv og forsøger at bevare noget, der ikke længere kan bevares.*

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](http://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 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 whorehouse 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](http://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

---

**Den Europæiske Centralbank  
skruer op  
for pengehanen. Eksproprier  
spekulanterne, ikke  
bankkunderne!  
Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

*Vi står på randen af det totale sammenbrud, og det er absolut utilgiveligt, at regeringerne giver mulighed for, at dette system, der er baseret på bedrageriske intriger og fusk, kan opretholdes så meget som en dag længere. Storspekulanternes kasinoøkonomi må øjeblikkeligt lukkes ned gennem en streng*

*Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling! Der findes en løsning, men den kræver, at man på dramatisk vis går bort fra den nuværende, neoliberale model og genindfører realøkonomi og økonomisk genopbygning.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Det er vores job at blive ved med at kæmpe og opbygge ting, som vi kan opbygge**

*10. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Under en diskussion den 9. marts med LaRouchePAC's Komite for Politisk Strategi karakteriserede Lyndon LaRouche kampagnen for at bryde BRIKS-gruppen op som følger:*

*»Det er britisk. Se på omstændighederne. Der er visse kendsgerninger her, der er meget klare. For det første står briterne bag alt dette, og briterne triumferer over den fordærvelse, de har været i stand til at indføre i USA og i den amerikanske befolkning. Det er et faktum. Når man lige har fordøjet dette, så må man se på, hvad det er for problemer, der findes i Europa, og så bliver man virkelig lidt skræmt, for man ser hele områder af Europa, der disintegrerer for øjnene af os, og især dem, der er på den forkerte kurs.*

*Det, Putin gør, er virkelig godt; det er meget effektivt – det er rigtig godt. Og det er succesfuldt, og det hænger sammen med Kina og andre former for operationer omkring dette, der*

bygger det op. Så det er en god situation for os mht. tingenes udsigt. Der er ikke noget problem her. Der er bekymring, men ikke noget virkeligt problem.

Vores problem ligger hovedsageligt i USA. Det er den kendsgerning, at USA's befolkning er blevet gjort sindssyge, voldsomt, af Bush-familien, og nu af Obama. Det har været en degeneration. Disse ting er så åbenlyse, at det må siges højt, fordi det er så åbenlyst. Kongressen er i et forfærdeligt rod.

Hvis man indser disse ting, og man laver en liste med en sammenligning af det ene mod det andet, finder man ud af, at tingene ikke står så dårligt til i det ene kvarter, men at de er forfærdelige mht. USA og den amerikanske befolkning. USA er i en tilstand af desperation. Desperation, fordi de accepterer spekulativ investeringsbankvirksomhed, men de accepterer ikke Glass-Steagall, der automatisk ville hjælpe udviklingen. Sådan står det til. Vi har i virkeligheden ikke noget andet problem end dette. Vi har Wall Street, som er rådden, FBI er råddent, og en masse mennesker er ikke andet end de rene svindlere. Og vores befolkning er på både kunstig vis, men også aktivt, blevet demoraliseret. Demoraliseringen af den amerikanske befolkning er en meget farlig ting.

I Sydamerika ser man også, at udsigterne er ved at blive forfærdelige. Det behøver de ikke at være, men det er de. Så vi må virkelig samle vore tanker og ikke udbrede sygdomme, der ikke er virkelige.

LaRouchePAC-leder Kesha Rogers er ved at komme tilbage, og det er vigtigt. Hendes rolle med udgangspunkt i Texas, og i baggrunden dernede, er meget styrkende mht. hele situationen.

Wall Street og Washington ved, at Dodd/Frank-loven har været en total fiasko. De ved det! De er rædselsslagne. Folk har tendens til at være bange; en meget stærk frygt. Men det bliver bare til hysteri. Det politiske system er råddent: der var nogle styrkeområder, men det meste af det er råddent.

*Demoralisering er nøglespørgsmålet; situationen er forfærdelig, men der er noget, der er værre: demoralisering. Og demoralisering kan selvfølgelig ikke bekæmpes, med mindre der er reel styrke bag; man kan ikke bare bluffe det.*

*Dette er en ekstremt dødbringende situation. Spørgsmålet er, om hele USA's økonomi vil kollapse, før balladen virkelig begynder. Kina befinder sig i en god situation; Putin er i en god situation, relativt set, og der finder en opbygning sted i visse dele af planeten.*

*Vi har endnu ikke fået kontrol over tingene. Vi har udsigter, men ingen kontrol. Og denne kontrol må vi selv levere.»*

*Rachel Brinkley (fra LaRouchePAC Policy Committee, -red.) fra Boston sagde, at befolkningen er rasende over, at økonomien er i færd med at kollapse, og at ingen gør noget ved det.*

*LaRouche svarede:*

*»De tror ikke på, at de kan gøre noget ved det; det er derfor. De tror på, at det er noget, der overgår dem; ikke noget, som de gør.*

*Jeg håber på, at vi kan bryde igennem med noget her, for der er gennembrud i ting, der er internationale faktorer. Men jeg har ingen præcise beviser, så jeg er lidt forsigtig. Jeg mener, at der er muligheder; helt bestemt i Kina og Rusland og så fremdeles, er der gode tegn. Men en stor del af det transatlantiske område og relaterede tilfælde er en stor katastrofe. Det vil formentlig vedblive at være en katastrofe, endda forværrende. Så vi står ved et punkt lige nu, hvor vi ikke har nogen præcis konklusion om noget som helst; vi har en masse tilkendegivelser.*

*Det kommer til at handle om globale faktorer; jeg tror ikke, der er mange chancer i lokale områder; jeg tror, at globale faktorer er de eneste, der virkelig er signifikante. For se på økonomien, se på moralen osv., som vi ser generelt. Der er*

*intet at hente her. Der er visse udviklinger, der omfatter nogle af problemområderne og giver folk en vis fornemmelse af et optimistisk syn. For situationen er ikke så dårlig, som mange mennesker tror, hvis den blev håndteret korrekt. Eller den er værre – hvilket er mærkeligt. Man har noget, som folk tror, vil være godt for dem, når det er ubrugeligt. Men de får også undertiden et frisk pust af at se frem til noget.*

*Det er vores job at blive ved med at kæmpe og opbygge ting, som vi kan opbygge. Vi ser ingen mirakler lige nu, undtagen når vi en gang imellem får en smule fordel – og det må man arbejde videre med. Og der kommer nogle lyspunkter her og der.»*

*Titelfoto: Lyndon LaRouche fortsætter med at arbejde for Det britiske Imperiums afslutning og for udløsningen af menneskehedens kreativitet.*

.

---

## **NYHEDSORIENTERING FEBRUAR-MARTS 2016: Forlæng Den Nye Silkevej ind i**

# Mellemøsten og Afrika

*Tom Gillesberg til Folketingets Udenrigsudvalg den 1. marts: 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.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Nancy Reagans død betegner 'Afslutningen af en bestemt æra'

*7. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Det transatlantiske systems kollaps er en dødbringende situation – fra det fysiske, økonomiske sammenbrud, til den finansielle nedsmeltnings kaos, til faren for krig og den rædselsvækkende virkning af det rådne opbud af kandidater til det amerikanske valg og dettes forløb. Det, der kræves under disse irrationelle omstændigheder, er en rationel respons. Der findes løsninger. Netop en sådan rationel respons er i gang i form af det fremstød, der kommer fra Ruslands og Kinas ledere, for samarbejde om rummet, videnskab, økonomisk udvikling i Eurasien og hele verden, og om fred. I sidste uge blev det under nationale møder i Beijing fastslået, at rumforskning nu vil blive en integreret del af Kinas økonomiske*

innovationsprogram. I USA leder LaRouchePAC's Kesha Rogers det politiske fremstød for at genrejse netop samme anskuelse, der oprindeligt var et varemærke for det Amerikanske System, og som NASA legemliggjorde.

I dag satte Lyndon LaRouche spørgsmålet om lederskab ind i et umiddelbart, historisk perspektiv med reference til Nancy Reagans død i søndags. Han sagde, at, hvis man tager perioden fra Ronald Reagans valg til præsidentskabet i 1980, i frem til Nancys død, så er det et tegn på, at »en ganske bestemt æra netop er afsluttet«. Reagan legemliggjorde en kvalitetsstandard for lederskab. Han var en meget dygtig person. LaRouche talte om sin forbindelse med ham, og nu om mindet om hans hustru.

I den ny æra, der nu er i gang, handler krisen ikke kun om fraværet af lederskabskvalitet, men om den udbredte fjendtlighed over for en sådan kvalitet. Folk i det transatlantiske område – Vesten – bliver mere og mere vanvittige. Men vi kan ikke desto mindre, hvis vi intervenserer med rationalitet for at levere lederskabet, komme til undsætning og have held med vores forehavende.

Fjendens deployering er intens, med fremstød imod BRIKS og mod krig. Ingen anden end selveste den britiske krones tjener Ambrose Evans Pritchard er på scenen i Sao Paulo, hvor han udgiver en artikel fra 7. marts om, at »BRIKS-fantasien« nu er forbi, og at »BRIKS-konceptet er blevet meningsløst ...« Han hævder, at »Brasilien er den første af BRIKS-kvintetten, der bryder sammen på så mange fronter på samme tid«, og at Sydafrika, Rusland og Kina alle er plaget af problemer. Han hævder, at kun Indien stadig har »vind i sejlene« – hvilket i realiteten refererer til beskidte, angloamerikanske tricks for at forsøge at få Indien til at blive 'den sidste, stående BRIK'.

Med hensyn til den relaterede, forrykte militære oprustningsfront, så er de største militære øvelser nogen

sinde – kaldet Key Resolve – nu i gang mellem USA og Sydkorea. Med et opbud af 17.000 amerikanske styrker og 300.000 stk. sydkoreansk personel vil øvelserne vare i otte uger. Dette finder sted på et tidspunkt, hvor der er skarpe spændinger med Nordkorea, i betragtning af den kumulative virkning af årevis med geopolitik.

I **LaRouchePAC's ugentlige TV Policy Committee-udsendelse** i dag formandede Lyndon LaRouche, »Det er slutningen på det gamle system. Det må erstattes af et andet. Det kan gøres.«

Det er farligt. Bliv ikke bange.

---

## Galsskab pulserer igennem USA

*8. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Præsident Obama holdt i mandags et møde i Det Hvide Hus for at fejre Dodd/Frank-lovens succesfulde forhindring af et nyt kollaps, som det i 2008. Eneste problem er, at hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er i frit fald, suget ned af værdiløs spillegæld til en 'værdi' af omtrent 2 billiarder dollar, og som Dodd-Frank intet har gjort for at forhindre – men tværtimod har fremmet. De vestlige økonomier står og vipper på randen, mens befolkningerne bliver ødelagt af den værste narkoepidemi i Vestens historie, og af selvmord, der begås af desperate, midaldrende, arbejdsløse arbejdere.

I mellemtiden gør Obama og hans kontrollers i London alt, hvad der står i deres magt, for at bringe den eneste del af verden, der fungerer – Rusland og Kina – til fald. Øverst på deres »dødsliste« står BRIKS, der repræsenterer podedkrystallen til et nyt verdensparadigme, baseret på udvikling, rumforskning og »win-win«-samarbejde nationerne imellem, som Xi Jinping beskriver det. Den kinesiske udenrigsminister Wang Yi sagde i



dag: »Bæltet-og-vejen er et projekt, som Kina lancerede, men mulighederne tilhører hele verden.«

Men Wang Yi måtte også advare USA om, at USA's indsats for at »forplumre vandene« ved at anstifte konflikt i Korea og i det Sydkinesiske Hav kunne »støde Asien ud i kaos«, og at Kina i så tilfælde ikke kunne se passivt til.

I Europa fortsætter NATO-ledere med at deployere større og større militære styrker op til den russiske grænse, som forberedelse til krig.

Alligevel har Putin flankeret dette krigsfremstød ved at intervenere i Syrien og knuse Obamas støtteapparat for terroristernes netværk, og ved at danne en arbejdende militær og politisk relation med de fornuftige elementer i det amerikanske militær for at gennemføre en våbenstilstand og tilintetgøre ISIS og al-Nusra. Putin viser nu, at han kan arbejde for fred såvel som at føre krig, og får hver dag flere og flere oppositionsgrupper til at gå med i våbenstilstanden og fokusere deres beskydning på ISIS' sidste tilbageværende bastioner.

Men, uden at vende USA omkring og tage kampen op med forbryderne i Det Hvide Hus og på Wall Street, vil den fremstormende, globale krig ikke kunne forhindres. De eksisterende institutioner er døde, som det bevises af den klovneforestilling, der kaldes præsidentvalgkampen 2016. For at skabe de krævede, nye institutioner, må den dræbende kultur rives ned gennem skønhed, en tilbagevenden til klassisk kultur og kreativitet, inden for musik, såvel som inden for videnskab.

I USA udgør LaRouche-bevægelsens 'Manhattan-projekt' og genrejsningen af NASA, med base i Texas, og den »Udenjordiske forpligtelse« (Krafft Ehrlicke) de uomgængelige startpunkter for en mobilisering af befolkningen til denne store opgave.

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 7. marts 2016: F16-fly til Irak og Syrien// Kinas femårs-plan inkl. videnskab og innovation**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **Intet kan lykkes uden opdagelsen af princippet om Månens bagside**

*3. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Hvad er nationer? Hvorfor har vi dem? Hvorfor er de der? Deres formål er i realiteten intet andet end at forbedre vilkårene for menneskeheden, som John F. Kennedy sagde, da han annoncerede missionen om at sende end mand til Månen og få ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden, ved slutningen af de for længst hedengangne 1960'ere. Midlet til denne fremgang for menneskelige vilkår – det er både målet og midlet på samme tid – er gennem ægte opdagelse eller noesis. Det, der er sandt for en nation, er endnu mere sandt for en alliance af nationer som BRIKS, den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union eller Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisationen. Selv om de stadig er nye og

skrøbelige, så peger sammenslutningerne af eurasiske nationer allerede frem mod menneskehedens fremtid.

Netop nu, i dette øjeblik, har den russiske præsident Putins bemærkelsesværdige og uventede succes med hans intervention i Barack Obamas og Hillary Clintons morderiske sammenkog i Syrien, tvunget den erkendelse, at det transatlantiske samfund har været en fiasko – en historisk fiasko – op til overfladen. Vi må rette vort blik mod Eurasien, og USA må fremover snarere være orienteret mod Stillehavet end mod Atlanterhavet.

Obama skinner tydeligt igennem som en britisk agent, og intet andet end en britisk agent, der har dræbt mange mennesker. Og Hillary Clinton er af samme støbning.

Det transatlantiske samfund er en tabt sag netop nu; det kan ikke, og vil ikke, komme tilbage i denne form. Hvis det skal komme tilbage, må det fødes på ny. Resterne af det transatlantiske samfund, i denne form, er færdigt. Vi må skabe en ny form for samfund, som det er blevet gjort i fortiden – af Karl den Store, f.eks. Det er, hvad vi må kæmpe for: en fremtid, som virkelig vil være en fremtid.

Dette er betydningen af Kesha Rogers' yderst intellektuelle og yderst inspirerende kampagne for at vende tilbage til vores fremtid gennem udforskningen og erobringen af rummet i vort Solsystem og vor Galakse. Nøglepersoner tiltrækkes allerede mod Kesha fra hele landet og fra hele verden.

Betydningen af dette er det, som Lyndon LaRouche sagde i en diskussion den 1. marts:

*»Vi må sige én ting. Én ting: intet vil lykkes, med mindre nationerne erkender opdagelsen af princippet om Månens bagside. Med andre ord, så kan man ikke sige, at man kan tage det, der foregår netop nu, og fortolke det til en god effekt. Man må annullere dette og sige, 'Problemet er, at vi endnu ikke har forstået, hvad det er, der ligger bagved Månen'. Og når vi finder ud af, hvad der findes bag Månen, hvilket*

kineserne og andre arbejder på, og vi går tilbage til det oprindelige rumprograms ABC, uden at gå tilbage til disse ting, som Obama beskar – Obama slog disse programmer ned, og dette burde han blive straffet alvorligt for, for sine forbrydelser i denne henseende. I stedet for at forsøge at fortolke noget og give det et andet og bedre spin – det fungerer ikke. For, uden rumprogrammet, hvilket vil sige den anden side af Månen i særdeleshed – uden en sådan tilgang får man ingenting, man kommer ingen vegne. Man må gøre dette! Det er ikke en mulighed, man kan tilvælge eller fravælge. Man kan ikke afvise det: man må erkende, at det er, hvad man må gøre.»

Foto: Præsident John F. Kennedy får en forklaring på opsendelsessystemet Saturn V, det system, der sluttelig skulle bringe mennesket til Månen, af dr. Wernher von Braun (i midten), på Cape Canaveral i november 1963.

---

**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

---

## **Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov: »Ikke ét eneste europæisk spørgsmål kan løses uden Ruslands mening«**

*3. marts 2016* – I en artikel, offentliggjort i det russiske magasin *Global Affairs* og oversat i dagens *RT*, påpeger den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at »i løbet af i hvert fald de forgangne to århundreder har ethvert forsøg på at forene Europa uden Rusland, og imod Rusland, uvægerligt ført til svære tragedier, hvis konsekvenser altid er blevet overvundet gennem afgørende deltagelse fra vort lands side«.

Idet han skitserede næsten 1000 års historie, påpegede Lavrov

Ruslands rolle i stabiliseringen af Europa. »Som efterfølger til Det byzantinske Imperium, der ophørte med at eksistere i 1453, indledte Rusland en naturlig ekspansion mod Ural og Sibirien og absorberede disse enorme territorier. Det udgjorde allerede dengang en stærk, afbalancerende faktor i de europæiske, politiske kombinationer, inklusive den velkendte Trediveårskrig, der affødte det westfalske system for internationale relationer [Den Westfalske Fredstraktat], hvis principper, og her primært respekt for staternes suverænitet, stadigvæk i dag er vigtige«, bemærkede Lavrov. Men Europa var fjendtlig over for Ruslands opkomst. I begyndelsen af det 18. århundrede lykkedes det Peter den Store at anbringe Rusland i kategorien af Europas førende lande på lidt over hans regeringstids to årtier. »Siden da har man ikke kunnet ignorere Ruslands position. Ikke et eneste europæisk spørgsmål kan løses uden Ruslands mening«, skrev Lavrov.

Senere, bemærkede Lavrov, i perioden efter Anden Verdenskrig, »havde vi en praktisk chance for at hele Europas splittelse og gennemføre drømmen om et fælles europæisk hjem, som mange europæiske tænkere og politikere, inklusive præsident Charles de Gaulle af Frankrig, helhjertet tilsluttede sig. Rusland var fuldstændig åben over for denne mulighed og fremlagde mange forslag og initiativer i denne sammenhæng.«

»Desværre traf vore vestlige partnere et andet valg. De satsede på at udvide NATO mod øst og fremskyde det geopolitiske rum, som de kontrollerede, tættere på Ruslands grænser. Dette er essensen i de systemiske problemer, der har forbitret Ruslands relationer med USA og Den europæiske Union. Det er værd at bemærke, at George Kennan, arkitekten bag USA's politik for inddæmning af Sovjetunionen, i de senere år af sit liv sagde, at ratificeringen af NATO's ekspansion var en 'tragisk fejltagelse'«, påpegede Lavrov.

Lavrov påpegede, at en holdbar løsning på den moderne verdens problemer kun kan opnås gennem seriøst og ærligt samarbejde mellem de ledende stater og deres associerede for at adressere

fælles udfordringer i den aktuelle sammenhæng, og skrev: »Vore fremgangsmåder deles af de fleste lande i verden, inklusive vore kinesiske partnere, andre BRIKS- og SCO-nationer, samt vore venner i EAEU, CSTO og CIS. Med andre ord, så kan vi sige, at Rusland ikke kæmper imod nogen, men kæmper for løsningen af alle spørgsmålene på et ligeværdigt og gensidigt respektfuldt grundlag, der alene kan udgøre et holdbart fundament for en forbedring af internationale relationer på lang sigt.«

*Foto: Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov.*

---

# **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.

---

# **Det rette navn for Menneskerettigheder er Udvikling, siger BRIKS- nationerne**

*Tirsdag, 1. marts 2016* – Med udstedelsen af en erklæring i går under FN's Råd for Menneskerettigheders årlige højeste panel i Genève stod BRIKS-nationerne for et indgreb i en institution, der har udøvet indflydelse som en klub imod lederne af flere udviklingslande, der ikke ville følge det britiske oligarkis diktater. Fælleserklæringen til Rådet for »Menneskerettigheder« siger: »Vi anser udryddelse af fattigdom for at være en uundværlig forudsætning for, og det overordnede mål hen imod, opnåelse af en vedvarende udvikling, promovering af samfundsmæssigt fremskridt, beskyttelse af fairness og retfærdighed og fremme af miljøbeskyttelse.« Den siger, at alle lande bør undgå en fremgangsmåde med »one size for alle«, i betragtning af de forskellige niveauer af udvikling, nationale realiteter og nationale historier.

Der har blandt BRIKS-nationerne været krav om, at denne organisation skulle blive mere involveret som en blok af nationer i internationale og »geopolitiske« spørgsmål. Dette synes nu at være på dagsordenen.



**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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

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

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

---

# **Foreløbig rapport fra Sikkerhedskonference i München: Værgerne har fejlet**

*12. februar 2016 – I dag åbnede den årlige Sikkerhedskonference i München, informeret gennem en foreløbig rapport, der blev udgivet for omkring tre uger siden, og som udtrykker beklagelse over den kendsgerning, at en stor del af verden er steget ned i en tilstand af kaos, og at det er mislykkedes Vesten at forhindre det.*

*»Verden, især fra et vestligt standpunkt, kan meget vel være i den værste tilstand, siden afslutningen af den Kolde Krig«, siges det i begyndelsen af rapporten, der har titlen »Grænseløse kriser, hensynsløse krigsmagere, hjælpeløse værger«. »Overvældede, undertiden hjælpeløse værger*

konfronteres med græseløse kriser og magtfulde, hensynsløse krigsmagere.« Rapporten identificerer krigsmagerne som Rusland, Kina, Iran og ISIS, men tager aldrig USA, EU og NATO med i betragtning som faktorer i denne 15 år lange proces, der har omsluttet Europa med et bælte af kaos og krig snarere end den fremgang, som EU's strategi fra 2003, der citeres i rapporten, hævdede, skulle være EU's mål. »Vores opgave er at fremme en ring af velregerede lande øst for den Europæiske Union på grænserne til Middelhavet«, sagde denne EU-strategi fra 2003. »Dette har i stedet forvandlet sig til en 'ildring'«, klager München-rapporten. Men dette er alt sammen andres skyld, ikke Vestens, der bevarede strukturerne fra den Kolde Krig og sine britiskinspirerede geopolitiske metoder, selv efter Berlinmurens fald.

En faktor, som rapportens forfattere fandt klart bekymrende, er udviklingen af strukturer, med Kina i førertrøjen, og som udgør en parallel til det internationale system, som Vesten har opbygget. For blot at nævne nogle få, så udgøres disse strukturer af BRIKS, AIIB og det Økonomiske Silkevejsbælte, blandt mange andre.

---

## **BRIKS er en betydningsfuld global magtfaktor, siger russisk viceudenrigsminister**

8. februar 2016 – Ruslands viceudenrigsminister Sergey Ryabkov understregede i dag, at angreb på BRIKS-grupperingen er den bedste indikator for dens globale betydning.

I bemærkninger til TASS i dag sagde Ryabkov, "Der er i dag, specielt i Vesten, megen spekulation om, at den økonomiske

dynamik i nogle af BRIKS-medlemslandene er ved at gå i stå, og at sammenslutningen ikke er, hvad den har været.” Han tilføjede imidlertid, at angreb på BRIKS, af hvilke der har været mange fornylig, ”er det bedste tegn på BRIKS’ betydning og sammenslutningens betydning for internationale relationer. Hvis dette ikke havde været tilfældet, ville BRIKS simpelthen være blevet ignoreret.”

Han bemærkede, at nogle af Ruslands modspillere lider under det problem, at ”de ikke kan opfatte ting – og bevare roen –, der ikke passer ind i deres egne begreber eller ideer vedrørende de internationale relationer. Hvis noget ikke bærer påskriften ’undfanget i Vesten’, giver det anledning til mistanke og afvisning fra starten af.” Den vestlige partiske kritik er så åbenbar, fortsatte Ryabkov, at ”den kun kan fremkalde et smil. Folk, der er parate til at fatte en moderne og multipolær verden, burde nærme sig et fænomen som BRIKS på en meget mere afslappet måde”, konkluderede han.