

»Vi kan skabe et mirakel«

Interview med Helga Zepp-LaRouche

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**Det frydefulde ved at skabe
overraskelser!**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast 18. marts**

2016

Engelsk udskrift: I denne uge får vi en opdatering fra Kesha Rogers i Texas, som anfører en politik for en genoplivelse af det amerikanske NASA-rumprogram; Jason Ross fortsætter sagaen om Gottfried Leibniz; og Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches analyse af betydningen for fredsprocessen i Syrien af de seneste udviklinger, med den russiske militære tilbagetrækning.

– DELIGHT IN CREATING SURPRISES! –

International Webcast March 18, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's March 18th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to thank you for joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, on larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and Jason Ross, from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined via video by Kesha Rogers, multiple-time candidate for Federal office from the state of Texas, and leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

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

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

allies. He said that the initiative in creating the future and shaping present global policy, lies with those two countries, strategically – in the case of Russia, as is very clear with

what is occurring in Syria right now; and economically and scientifically – in the case of China.

You can see very clearly that the outdated and archaic methods of the trans-Atlantic system are proving to be impotent,

both in the case of resolving the current grave crises which are

facing mankind as a planetary species right now, but also impotent in setting the agenda and fulfilling and laying out the

vision for the future of mankind. The mission which has been undertaken by China, in terms of their objective to explore the

far side of the Moon – something which is going to be unfolding

over the coming two years – exemplifies the necessary identity which mankind must have in order to affirm and to fulfill our true nature as a creative species.

Mr. LaRouche stated that something that we should develop, in dialogue with him and with each other, is to think about the

open questions, the unanswered questions about how is mankind, a

species, reflective of a much larger, and as yet not fully understood, creative characteristic of the galactic system as a

whole. This is a relationship which Johannes Kepler drew out in

very unique detail in terms of his discoveries about our {Solar}

System, but we have many, many large and unanswered questions of

what is the role of the human species in our relationship to the

galactic system as a whole, and then the complex of galactic systems as a much, much larger whole.

Mr. LaRouche said that this mission to explore the "dark

side" of the Moon, so-called, is a pathway in order to begin to understand even the opening of the questions along these lines.

The dark side of the Moon, his hypothesis was, is where you can find some of the shadows of this much larger system, have insight into it, and also to begin to understand mankind's role as reflective of these broader creative processes which are involved in these great astronomical systems.

This is the spirit of the United States at our best. Our republic was founded on these kinds of unique ideas, as we've discussed here in previous weeks. The role of the great philosopher and scientist Gottfried Leibniz is a major contributor, a "founding father", or "founding grand-father" of our republic. This is something which I know Jason Ross has presented multiple times and is in the process of having a series of developing classes on that subject; and I'm sure we'll be part of his discussion later today.

But also, this is what you can see in a great statesman, such as Abraham Lincoln – very, very much so. Franklin Roosevelt; and John F. Kennedy. Tragically, that spirit in the United States has deteriorated drastically. We see now that the leadership does indeed lie with China and with Russia; and this is something which Kesha Rogers, who is joining us here today, wrote about in an editorial which is appearing in this week's edition of the {Executive Intelligence Review} magazine. Kesha's editorial is titled, "To Save the United States Economy, Revive

the Space Program."

Kesha and I had a brief conversation earlier this afternoon. I know she has some broader ideas to develop on this subject, so, without further ado, I would like to hand over the podium to Kesha Rogers.

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

we're seeing and will be developed further in these discussions

today – a new conception of what is the identity and what is the

purpose of mankind. I have continued to use the example and the

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

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

and understood.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

money and monetary value that is dying; and the other is

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

as a whole.

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

And

also the Classical Renaissance is something that contributed to the development of what became our space program and what was the intention that guided the direction of space travel and the space program.

I'll just read a quick quote from what he expressed on this idea. He says, "The development of the idea of space travel was always the most logical and most noble consequence of the Renaissance ideal, which again places man in an organic and active relationship with his surrounding universe and which, perceived in the synthesis of knowledge and capabilities, its highest ideals."

So you look at this from the standpoint of Krafft Ericke understanding that the Renaissance that was guided by the scientific breakthroughs which I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from my colleague Jason there, of Brunelleschi, or the breakthroughs that came about from the works of Kepler. That the idea of mankind, is to create something fundamentally new, something that had never been created before, and increasing the relationship of mankind to the Universe.

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

But the reality is, as I stated before, we have to have, in the defense of the space program, a new conception of the direction of mankind. That means we're removing all limitations to progress, all limitations that are put on mankind's ability to

continue to understand how to make new discoveries in the principles scientifically of what's out there. Why should we actually investigate the Solar System? What is our mission in doing so? And it's not about a money-making short-term gratification. And so, I think this emphasis that Krafft Ehricke put on the renaissance as an ideal of looking at why we have, as a human species, an extraterrestrial imperative, is really a continued expression of what you're seeing coming from China; not just in their space program, but in the development of the win-win strategy of cooperation for all mankind, for every nation to come to join together. And to further the progress of addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition of the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not lie right here on planet Earth. So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across; and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue this fight to identify what is the real mission of the space program, and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current dead system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we should be.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Kesha; and I can recommend that people read what you've written in the current edition of {Executive Intelligence Review}. I also know that you're planning on making a video statement – which will be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and available for people – developing

some

of these ideas a little bit more in detail.

So, if people have been watching this website, you know that Jason Ross has also been working very closely with Kesha to develop some of these ideas with their implications from the standpoint of a scientist, whom I hope you are becoming more familiar with by now – Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As we discussed last week on this webcast, I think if you begin to consider this question which Kesha just laid on the table for us,

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

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

A

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

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

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

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

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

to

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

Money

doesn't measure different qualities; money doesn't measure the future potential that something is able to create. And if you base money on how much somebody's willing to pay for something,

you don't distinguish between things that are good and useful versus bad and vices. People are willing to pay for heroin; people are willing to pay for other opioids if they're addicted

to it. Does that mean that those drugs, as used by those people,

are valuable, or worth something because they're willing to pay

for them? Quite the contrary. So, we need a different way of thinking about how we can measure economic value if we're going

to be human economists, instead of Wall Street magicians or Satanists.

So, the reason we have economy is that we aren't animals; animals don't have economies. Animals don't change what they do

from generation to generation; they don't improve, they don't develop. We do. We create a new kind of time for ourselves. In a

very real way, humanity is a totally new and totally distinct force of nature from anything else. Over geological time, geologists describe to us how the Earth has changed, or how a planet has formed; this is over hundreds of millions of years. Over evolutionary time, perhaps tens of millions of years, we're

able to see transformations in the kinds of life that exists on

the planet. Over biological time, we have short-term periods of

the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to

the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed.

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

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

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

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

willfully by developing new principles that if we were animals,

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

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

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

general. So, we're distinct.

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

we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to progress

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

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

world.

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

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

got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves announced

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

were somewhat new on the scene. They allowed pumping water, they

allowed grinding grain. That's excellent; that's a breakthrough.

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

was first discovered in the Sun, not on Earth. It was discovered

in the Sun by the kind of light that came from the Sun when that

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

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

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

experiments. It's also, as Helium-3, an ideal fuel for fusion.

So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our developing

understanding. How can we think about this?

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

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

Lyndon

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

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

from physical theories; they come from our thoughts about space.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

be

curved. He works out in general how you could do that; but he can't answer the question. He says, to answer the question, "What's the nature of the space, and which processes unfold?"; you have to leave the department of mathematics and you have to

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

said

very explicitly. Einstein considered that light moved at the same

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

we foster its social implementation through technologies that physically improve our power over nature and our ability to provide improving standards of living and promote the general welfare of human beings?" If this is our basis of economics,

fostering that kind of outlook, then I think we can say that Gottfried Leibniz was the first physical economist in that sense.

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

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

And

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

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

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

basis of our economics.

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

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

And

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

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

and the consideration of getting out into space.

Today, this overall outlook is best represented by Russia, and especially at present, by China. So, this doesn't have to be a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that we can take up as a mission for ourselves to contribute to here in the United States and in the nations around the globe. And we've got very special and precious people in the past that we can look to for insights in how to make the next breakthroughs in developing our understanding of what it is to be human, the basis of human culture, and how best to advance human economy.

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

happened

earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the way,

Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise; constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as Mr.

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

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

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

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

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

vividly what we mean by this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that he has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy is always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking; continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks were beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the Russian military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next morning – Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground, which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said, if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the infrastructure is in place for that to happen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis, that the Russian forces

would begin to be withdrawn.

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

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

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

the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a strategic fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria. Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs. Look what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway to destabilize the Zuma government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative. So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed – to a major confrontation between the United States and China. We had a report earlier this week from David Ignatius in the {Washington Post}, who is very often a kind of reliable leak sheet for what's going on inside the administration. And the

Obama administration is preparing for confrontation with China over the South China Sea; they're waiting for a ruling from the

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

So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China

in the eye, for carrying out new provocations against China.

The

sanctions that President Obama announced this week, ostensibly against North Korea, are in fact sanctions against China; they go

way beyond what was agreed upon by China and the United States at

the United Nations.

So, if you take all of these factors into account, and if you think of them as a process, not simply as a series of discrete events, then you get a very clear idea of what Mr. LaRouche means when he says that the planet, in general terms, is

in a state of war. Now, ultimately what this state of warfare comes down to, is the fact that you have a new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered future. It's defined by the economic initiatives of China, by the One Belt-One Road policy, and most

emphatically by China's systematic plan for collaborating with other nations on the kind of space exploration that once was a hallmark of American policy; but has not been abandoned.

President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and Kesha

is leading the fight to reverse that process.

Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney administration followed by the Obama administration, the United

States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at

the

beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And as

the result, the United States, really the entire trans-Atlantic

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

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

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

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

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

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

the strategic situation.

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

impose

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

efforts within the framework of the mindset of the British Empire, the mindset of the Obama administration, the mindset of

virtually all European leaders – the French probably the worst of the bunch on the continent – is doomed; it doesn't work.

Yet,

there is an opportunity; and opportunity for all of mankind in what's going on in the Asia-Pacific region, led by China, by Russia. India is clearly stepping in to play a significant role

in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for

purposes that go beyond national interests, but address the interests of all of mankind. Egypt is fully established as orienting towards that new Asia-Pacific combination.

So, this is the larger picture; this is the framework for judging the initiative taken by President Putin this week. And it

must be judged from the standpoint of the global consequences; and not just simply the consequences for the immediate negotiations around Syria. Although his actions this week have certainly greatly improved the possibility of bringing that five-year tragedy to an end.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I would just add, the initiative being taken by these countries also very much has to

do with the decades-long work Mr. Lyndon LaRouche and Mrs. Helga

LaRouche have undertaken. The One Belt-One Road policy that China

has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the

1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the

350-page Special Report that was issued by {Executive Intelligence Review} called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd

like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17. marts:

Putin sætter den strategiske dagsorden//

Kina forbereder finansstyring og Tobinskat

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Lyd:

**Hele menneskeheden behøver
Den Nye Silkevej nu!
LaRouchePAC Internationale**

Fredags-webcast 11. marts 2016

Engelsk udskrift: Matthew Ogden kommenterer Helga Zepp-LaRouches besøg og tale i Indien om behovet for en Marshallplan/Silkevej i Sydvestasien; Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches meget skarpe kommentar om EU's korrupte aftale med Tyrkiets Erdogan om mod betaling at tage syriske flygtninge tilbage, og Jason Ross fra LPAC Videnskabsteam taler om Gottfried Leibniz og nødvendigheden af kreativ nytænkning, som Kina i dag legemliggør.

WE NEED THE NEW SILK ROAD NOW FOR ALL OF MANKIND! –

International Webcast for March 11, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good afternoon. It's March 11, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday night broadcast from LaRouche PAC.com. I am joined in the studio

today by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science Team and Mr. Jeff Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and the three of us had the opportunity to have an extensive discussion

with both Mr. LaRouche and also Helga Zepp-LaRouche earlier today.

Now, as you know, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just recently returned from an extraordinary trip that she took to India.

This

is the first time that either one of the LaRouches has been to India since I think at least 2003; so this was a very important

trip, and during that visit to India, Helga was a featured speaker on one of the keynote panels at a discussion in New Delhi

called the Raisina Dialogue Forum. This was a major conference which included international representation, former prime

ministers, former heads of state, finance ministers, elected parliamentarians, and so forth.

Now during that speech, Helga LaRouche focused her remarks on the necessity for a new win-win, Marshall Plan development project for the Middle East and North Africa. She remarked that,

in the wake of Xi Jinping's visit to Iran, to Saudi Arabia, and

to Egypt where he brought the development vision of the Chinese

New Silk Road, that now was the time to adopt what she's been calling for, for years: which is, a New Marshall Plan to develop

that region of the world and to create a new era of peace and prosperity for a region of the world that has suffered so much under perpetual war, and a total breakdown of society.

Now this is very relevant, because obviously, as a representative of the Schiller Institute from Germany, Helga LaRouche was speaking directly from the standpoint of the perspective of a European, who is witnessing the unprecedented refugee crisis of millions and millions of refugees fleeing the

Middle East and North Africa, and flooding into Europe.

Our institutional question for this week actually focusses directly on that topic, and what I'm going to do is read the institutional question, and then give Jeff Steinberg and opportunity to go through, both specifically and more in general,

what both Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche's remarks were concerning this question, and some broader questions as well.

So the question is as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche, German Chancellor Angela Merkel has blamed

European nations for

unilaterally shutting the Balkan route for migrants. She said that this has put Greece in a very difficult situation, and

such

decisions should be taken by the whole of the EU. Austria, Slovenia, Croatia, and non-EU member states – Serbia and Macedonia – have all acted to stem the migrant flow. The European Union and Turkey – from which migrants reach Greece – have set out a plan to ease the crisis from their perspective. Under the proposals that have been hammered out at a summit that

occurred in Brussels on Monday, but still to be finalized, all migrants arriving in Greece from Turkey, would be sent back. For

each Syrian returned, a Syrian in Turkey would be resettled in the EU. European Council President Donald Tusk has said that the

plan would spell the end of ‘irregular migration to Europe.’ What

is your view on the EU’s new migrant policy?”

So, Jeff.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: To put it very mildly, Mr. LaRouche was extremely blunt. You’ve got to start from the standpoint that this is a rotten deal; it’s not going to work. And furthermore,

that nobody has any business making any kind of backroom deal with President Erdogan of Turkey. Here’s somebody who has been a

principal sponsor of the jihadist terrorism, including the Islamic State and the Nusra Front; who has robbed his country blind; he’s one of the most notorious thieves on the planet. He’s

killed his own people. He shut down the entire opposition newspaper, and, quite frankly, he’s carried out a 6 billion euro

extortion operation against the European Union.

So the problem, in fact the disease that we’re dealing with, is the tendency that’s rampant in the entire trans-Atlantic

world, to make these kinds of rotten deals with people who have no business being allowed to remain in power. You have an entire trans-Atlantic system that was really, in effect, characterized this week by two developments. Number One: this rotten deal with Erdogan, which should never be allowed to happen. And number two, by the announcement by the European Central Bank head, Mario Draghi, that the ECB was going to replicate the insane policies that were carried out in the United States under the Quantitative Easing, bail-out, and Dodd-Frank bill, all of which are universally known to have been complete and total failures. So, Draghi announced zero interest rates, and announced that the QE policy of the ECB would be extended up to \$80 billion euro a month, and furthermore, that the ECB would begin purchasing absolutely worthless private sector bonds to keep what one columnist called the "zombie banks" in business. Now, there's been an absolute revolt in Germany, in particular, against this Draghi policy, because the net effect is that, with zero interest rates, people are going to be pulling their money out of the actual savings banks and regional commercial banks, through which all of the lending into the real economy takes place. And as the result of that, you're going to see rampant bankruptcies on top of the already advanced complete breakdown of the European real economy. All of the European too-big-to-fail banks are already hopelessly bankrupt.

So you've got these two examples of absolute policy insanity, of attempting to operate and make compromises and "reforms," within a system that is already dead. As Mr. LaRouche said, you don't make deals with dead people; there's nothing in it for you. There's no future in it. Yet that's exactly what we're seeing as the dominant phenomenon throughout the trans-Atlantic region.

Now the fact of the matter is that there are viable solutions. In the case of the United States, you could just simply say, the Wall Street debt is unpayable, and we're going to just simply cancel it, and we're going to go back to the traditional American, Hamiltonian credit system, and we're going to just simply let Wall Street sink, period. It's already bankrupt. The people involved in it are absolutely correct – they should have been frog-marched off to jail a long time ago.

So, by and large, when you talk to people in the political system at a relatively high level, you're dealing with a system that is absolutely paralyzed with fear, and overwhelmed by corruption. Because you press the issue, and you'll get widespread admission that the system is doomed, we're headed for another blow-out far worse than 2008; it could happen any moment now. It could happen Monday morning when you wake up. And furthermore, you could cancel this rotten debt, wipe out those cancerous aspects of the whole system, and you could go ahead to rebuild, but based on a completely different set of premises. Same thing with the arrangement with Turkey. There's no grounds whatsoever for paying 6 billion euros in extortion, knowing that a character like Erdogan is going to come back

again

and again and demand more, and will continue to threaten to unleash massive waves of migration, while at the same time Turkey

is trying to sabotage the efforts of Lavrov and Kerry to bring an

end to this five-year monstrosity of a war that's been going on

inside Syria.

So, if you operate within a dead system, you are doomed to go down with it. Now there are things that are working in the world today. Putin is functioning. Putin is carrying out very effective flanking operations in Syria. China is functioning, and

is in fact functioning at a much higher level from the standpoint

of real economic growth. And China is willing to invest in real

physical economic growth all across Eurasia, down into Africa, into Latin America. And furthermore, China is leading a global science driver policy. The plans to actually land an orbiter on

the dark side of the Moon have been discussed frequently in recent weeks on this broadcast. China is now the leading R&D nation on the planet, and they embody the principle of human creativity. They're not trying to draw deductive, pragmatic, practical conclusions from policies that have failed. You can never derive success by trying to scrutinize and analyze systematic failure. You need human creativity, and you see that

in China.

Increasingly, there are nations that are grouping around these opportunities that are posed for real development, centered

around China. Russia has taken certain measures to assure that Russia survives, and that Russia has the military and material resources to be able to conduct the kind of flanking

operations

that may very well save Syria and the Middle East, and major parts of Africa, from the genocidal destruction that will occur

if the existing trans-Atlantic forces, led by the British Empire

and stooges that they've got at their disposal like President Obama, with his Dodd-Frank madness; like Mario Draghi; like the

corrupt Erdogan.

So, anytime that there's an offer to make a rotten deal with a rotten SOB like Erdogan, the obvious answer should be, run in

the other direction. Don't do it. And so, in response to the question that's been posed, this is a rotten deal that is doomed

to failure, but it's typical of a much larger problem, which is

the tendency to be stuck thinking inside the deductive box when

the only avenue for survival for mankind is to think creatively,

and align with those people who've demonstrated that they've got

a viable commitment to the future.

You find that in China. You find that in many of the actions taken by Putin in Russia, and it's pretty scarce everywhere else.

And it's certainly virtually nonexistent in the entire trans-Atlantic region.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I also neglected to mention in my remarks in the beginning that, coinciding with Helga's trip to India and these very important developments with

Xi Jinping's visit to the Middle East. The Arabic version of the

EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the New Land-Bridge," which was available in English and also has been translated into Chinese; has now been translated into Arabic. And

I think Helga LaRouche's foreword or preface to that will put it

very appropriately; that "either this is an extraordinary coincidence or an act of divine intervention" that this would be

available at a time like this, when this is precisely what you need. This sort of vision for a new Marshall Plan, the World Land-Bridge, to bring development to this part of the world which

is in such dire need of it.

Now, as Jeff summarized quite succinctly, what Mr.

LaRouche's focus in our discussion was, is that we are on the edge of a total implosion of the trans-Atlantic system. That you

have a community of nations which is, in its present form, dead,

because of its own behavior; it has brought this upon itself.

On

the other hand, you have nations such as China and others, who are engaged in a process of real physical economic progress.

And

this was a willful choice that was made by China to invest in exactly the types of things that would create a future potential

of growth, scientific development and otherwise. So, Mr.

LaRouche's question was, why would you associate yourself with a

dead system, when the alternative is immediately at hand?

So, Mr. LaRouche had a much more developed idea, however, of what it is that brings success to a nation and to the human race

in general. And he was very specific to say that real creativity

is never a replication of the past; real creativity depends on new ideas that are new in a very real sense. That creativity is always {ad novo}, he said; and it's not achieved through the reform of a bad system. But it is only achieved through the introduction of an entirely new principle which is truly new. He said, Einstein is a good example of this; the personality of Brunelleschi is an ideal example of this. But the goal is never to deduce what the solution to a crisis must be from some sort of precedent; but rather, to ask the question, "What is it that we actually wish to accomplish for the future of mankind?" And, with that question in mind, therefore, what must be done? What must be done to achieve that future? And we tend to fail to ask that question, and we get too consumed by the details of the present; when we should be thinking from a total global standpoint about what we wish to achieve in the future. Now, I think at a time like now, where it's very clear that the nations of Europe and the United States are imploding, socially, economically, politically; what brought us to this point? But also, more significantly, what must be done to save civilization now? And we discussed, I think very appropriately, that when a nation loses its {raison d'etre}, when a nation loses its mission, it tends to implode and fall in upon itself. And we can learn a lot from the mission that China has, and the optimistic vision of the future which is shared by all of its citizens. So, with that said, I would like to invite Jason to

come to the podium. As you know, Jason Ross has been conducting a many-part series of presentations, classes on the LaRouche PAC website on the unique genius of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz; this is a series which will continue. But I would like to invite him to the podium now.

JASON ROSS: Well, this year, 2016, is the 300th anniversary of Leibniz's death in 1716. Leibniz lived from 1646 to 1716. And a number of the disputes that he was in, the discoveries that he made, are very freshly relevant for us today. Both historically from the standpoint of understanding where we came from, and because there are disputes that continue to the present. Disputes over the nature of the purpose of the nation, disputes over the nature of the Universe, disputes over the nature of mankind. To discuss one of those, I'd like to frame it by contrasting the views of Gottfried Leibniz and Isaac Newton. Many people are probably familiar, certainly if you've been watching this website, with the concept of the dispute over the calculus. That Leibniz plagiarized the calculus from Newton, as Newton and his friends said; no. Did Newton steal the calculus from Leibniz, who invented it first? Let's leave that aside; that's really not at issue for what I want to talk about today. Let's consider the dispute that was represented between the British outlook of Newton and the outlook of Leibniz in terms of the purpose for

humanity, as seen in their views of creation and of the Universe as a whole. In the very last years of Leibniz's life, he was engaged in a dispute via letters with a follower of Isaac Newton, Samuel Clarke. And in this discussion, one of the primary topics that came up was the basis of considering God to be great. On this, the two differed in a very fundamental way. Newton, via Clarke, said that God's greatness came from his power; Leibniz, while not disputing that, said that God's wisdom is also one of His perfections, and that in leaving this out, you have a total misunderstanding about God.

Now, I'm not going to make a theological point about this today. I want to look at this in terms of the existence of the nation-state. While Newton said that because God can do anything, that shows how wonderful He is; and while this same outlook – a religious outlook – was applied to man and society by John Locke and Thomas Hobbes, who said that a powerful ruler of society really exists for himself, and that people form a society through a compact to not infringe upon each other, not with the idea to have a mission together, but simply to get along as a way of putting under control the impulses of people to steal from each other and this sort of thing. So, on the one side, you have the notion that the state exists, the ruler exists and is justified in existing to maintain power; that that is the basis of

legitimacy of a ruler – holding power. It's a somewhat circular reason.

On the other side, you have Leibniz, who – in keeping with his view of God being worth reverencing, respecting, loving because of His wisdom; and having chosen in making the Universe,

to make it the best of all possible universes that could be created. Leibniz applies that idea as well to society; saying that the justification, the legitimacy for a ruler for a nation,

lies in how it is creating a happy society. And how it is imbuing

its people with wisdom, and developing science and economy to create a more productive and a happier future. Happiness is an important thing.

So, if you consider that today, and you look at – Matt had brought up where is the {raison d'être}; what is the justification for the United States, for example, right now? What

is our {raison d'être} right now under Obama? We don't have one.

Obama's destruction of the space program, which as a policy better encapsulates an attack on the future than anything you can

imagine, has left us without a future in the stars; contrasted with other nations, being led by China, with a serious, comprehensive, really breath-taking mission of advancements that

they have been making towards reaching out into the heavens, and

the potential of developing new scientific breakthroughs in that

way.

So, as Jeff and Matt said, LaRouche, in the discussion that we had with him today, was stressing that, in creating the future, it is made {de novo}; it isn't something we deduce

from

the past, although we can certainly learn from the past. The essential characteristic is making something where nothing of that sort existed before. He had singled out Brunelleschi and Einstein in this regard. Einstein, who made breakthroughs scientifically that did not follow from, or result from, the thoughts of his day; but rather, contradicted and overthrew them.

This is an example of the kind of thinking that's necessary.

In

the United States in our most recent history, the time under the

Apollo program, as launched in its strength by Kennedy to go to

the Moon and back; this was in recent times, probably the most singly powerful example of a potential to reach that. That program didn't result in Einstein's per se; it didn't have that

kind of effect. Amazing technological developments were made.

The

potentials that the space program has as a whole to make new scientific breakthroughs, however, is absolutely tremendous.

So, consider China. China, which has brought hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in just the past few decades.

China, which currently lends out more internationally in investments in nations than the whole World Bank does. China, which has played a major role along with Russia in setting up the

BRICS; the Shanghai Cooperation Organization for Peace and Stability; the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, to address

the \$5 trillion or more needs for infrastructure within that region of the world; offering loans that are without the conditionalities that are the hallmark of the World Bank. This ability to put into very specific practice a concept of "win-win"

cooperation, as it was put by President Xi; these specific ways of cooperating with neighbors, with other nations for development projects. As for example, the railroad operating in Ethiopia at present, allowing the transport of food to the interior of the nation in a timely fashion; preventing the intensity of starvation that would otherwise be likely given the agricultural disasters they've faced recently.

Take a look at space and science. China's East Tokamak, a super-conducting tokamak, recently had a 50 million-degree plasma held for 100 seconds; a breakthrough for them on their way towards developing fusion. Their space program – that was the first soft landing on the Moon in decades – the Chang'e 3 with the Yutu rover. Planning to come out next year, Chang'e 5, a sample return mission to the Moon; again, the first time in decades, and they'll be only the third nation to have done this.

And then in a few years, a space first – not only for them, but for the world – the Chang'e 4 mission, to land on the far side of the Moon. The first time ever; this is something new that mankind has never done before. It opens up new windows scientifically in terms of the potential the far side of the Moon offers for different types of telescopes – such as radio telescopes. They'll be able to show us things that no other – it's the most convenient place to be able to do these things. It simply is impossible from here on Earth, or in orbit; you need a body to place these things on.

So, I think when we think about what's the purpose of a nation, it can't be a short-term survival; it certainly can't

be

dominance per se, or maintaining a place in the world. For example, the United States; there's an unfortunate form of thought that the United States should be first in everything. Well, how did the United States become such a powerful nation? The policies that made that possible, the outlook that made that

possible, the sense coming from the American Revolution that there's a mission for the nation that is beyond having sovereignty itself, per se; but lies in a mission for development

and for the pursuit of happiness – as it's put – that's the concept that has to guide us today. Now, if we were to adopt this

in the United States, which we must, as we force the adoption of

this policy in our own nation, we have the potential for the US

to play a very important role among other nations internationally

in reaching these objectives. And there's really no reason for conflict among nations; it's simply not necessary at this point.

There might be some specific examples, but on the whole, by throwing out the British-led creation of conflicts, and putting

the US on a path towards cooperation, participation, and leadership on these sorts of ventures, we can regain in terms of

history, the right to exist, or reason for existing; a mission for the nation.

So, if we're going to turn around our domestic conditions, as we see frighteningly in the dramatic rise in deaths by drug overdoses or suicides in other forms that are increasing dramatically; if we're going to do this, we have to have a mission.

We have to have a vision for the kind of future that we're

going

to make that doesn't exist a present. The opportunities for this

exist; there are plenty of the particular policies that are needed. These things are known. What is necessary is a demand and

a change in direction in the United States without Obama, to adopt this orientation as our own. And if we do that, we can look

to the future with the knowledge that there is a reason for the

existence of the nation; and there's a purpose to be fulfilled,

and that we're taking up that purpose in our future which lies beyond the Earth and out in the stars.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. And I think we can use that as a promotional to encourage you to tune in to all of his

classes, which are available and will continue to be available on

larouchepac.com. And I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us here

as well, today. So, that's what we have to present to you here today; short and sweet. And we thank you for tuning in; and we encourage you to please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.

Flygtninge-aftale mellem EU

og

Tyrkiets Erdogan er korrump!

Der er intet grundlag overhovedet for at betale 6 mia. euro i afpresserpeng, når man ved, at en karakter som Erdogan vil komme tilbage ... og vil fortsætte med at true med at udløse massive flygtningestrømme samtidig med, at Tyrkiet forsøger at sabotere Lavrovs og Kerrys indsats for at bringe en afslutning på denne fem år lange monstrøsitet af en krig, der har raset i Syrien.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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)

En genrejsning af USA's økonomi med rumforskning som spydspids, og en international mission for menneskehedens fælles mål, som basis for en varig fred

Vi må genrejse fremtiden; og det begynder med kampen for at genoplive NASA. Og de gode nyheder er, at denne kamp nu er i gang; den er endnu i sit begyndelsesstadium, men det er en kamp, der kan vindes. Og USA's fremtid ligger i vægtskålene.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

DOKUMENTATION:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Gå ud i rummet med Kina, ikke ad Helvede til med Obama

6. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Da Barack Obama annullerede USA's planer om udforskning af rummet, begik han den største af sine forbrydelser, selv i sin egenskab af en »Vinder af Nobels Fredspris«, der udartede til en krigspræsident og massedræber. Rumprogrammet var Amerikas kultur, dets mission og fremtid, og Obamas handlinger vendte i realiteten den historiske kurs omkring og drev USA tilbage.

Tilstanden for økonomien i USA – for ikke at tale om Europa – er i en håbløs spiral for nedadgående og dræber millioner af mennesker gennem håbløshed, narko- og medikamentafhængighed og krig, som truer hele den amerikanske befolkning.

En total genoplivelse af udfordringerne i forbindelse med udforskning af rummet kan ændre alt. NASA's rumprogrammer, der nu er skåret væk og suspenderet, er Amerikas eneste potentielle center for økonomisk håb.

For at vende degenerationen af USA og dets befolkning omkring, er den totale genoplivelse af rumprogrammet, på et højere niveau, den eneste farbare vej.

LaRouche-demokraten Kesha Rogers fra Texas fører an på denne vej, med den mobilisering, hun har genlanceret sammen med veteraner fra NASA, for at bringe rumprogrammet tilbage. *EIR's* stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche kalder dette for videnskabeligt arbejde af højeste rang; det er den eneste, videnskabelige aktivitet i USA, der har ægte betydning for menneskehedens fremtid.

Og Amerika vil stå foran et samfundsmæssigt kollaps, hvis vi ikke meget snart gør dette.

De eksempler, som USA må samarbejde med om enhver bestræbelse inden for rumfartsvidenskab, som der gives mulighed for, er

Kina og Rusland.

Dér, hvor den amerikanske »fremskridtskultur« engang blomstrede – i udforskningen af rummet – dér er Kina nu den drivende kraft. Kinas plan for de næste fem år er centreret omkring rumforskning. Med målet om at undersøge galaksen fra Månens bagside inden for de næste to år, inkluderer Kinas nye plan for økonomisk og samfundsmæssig udvikling »en forståelse af universets oprindelse«.

Under en diskussion om det økonomiske program den 5. marts sagde chefen for Kinas største rumforskningslaboratorie: »Rumforskning er uadskilleligt fra Kinas innovationsdrevne udvikling. Hvis Kina ønsker at være en stærk, global nation, bør det ikke kun varetage sine umiddelbare interesser, men også bidrage til menneskeheden. Kun dette kan vinde Kina verdens respekt.«

USA har mistet verdens respekt under Bush, og især under Barack Obama. Obama må fjernes fra embedet, omgående, og hans onde »værk« må omstødes. Og mere presserende end alt andet må hans mord på Amerikas rumforskningsprogram vendes omkring i en total genoplivelse af rumforskning – »for en forståelse af universets oprindelse«.

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

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

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

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

Sagen om Nykredit/Totalkredit

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler ved Raisina Dialog i Indien

Men den indiske ungdom kan også lade sig inspirere til at påtage sig, som deres egen mission, at deltage i den økonomiske transformering af Sydvestasien og Afrika, og på denne måde blive en del af skabelsen af en fremtid for hele menneskeheden.

Virkeliggørelsen af et sådant udviklingsperspektiv er den eneste måde, hvorpå flygtningekrisen kan afsluttes og Europas og USA's økonomier kan genoplives, og hele Asien kan udvikles.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Eurasien har planer om global udvikling;

NATO har planer om global ødelæggelse

2. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – I dag talte Helga Zepp-LaRouche ved en konference i New Delhi, hvor hun opfordrede til, at Indien, Kina og Rusland gik sammen, forhåbentlig sammen med endnu andre, om at forlænge Silkevejsprocessen ind i Sydvestasien og Nordafrika, som det eneste middel til at redde verden fra den overhængende trussel om en atomkrig.

»Den nye aftale mellem USA's udenrigsminister Kerry og Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov«, sagde fr. LaRouche, »der omfatter en våbenstilstand for Syrien, har potentialet til at ændre spillet i hele den strategiske situation, under forudsætning af, at især Kina, Rusland og Indien omgående arbejder sammen med landene i Sydvestasien om at gennemføre et omfattende opbygningsprogram, ikke alene for de krigshærgede lande Syrien, Irak og Afghanistan, men for hele regionen, fra Afghanistan til Middelhavet, og fra Kaukasus til Den persiske Golf. Med præsident Xi Jinpings besøg i regionen – til Iran, Egypten og Saudi-Arabien – er denne forlængelse af Silkevejen nu på bordet.

Alligevel finder der en hastig eskalering mod global krig sted. Dette kunne ikke fastslås med større tydelighed end i den sindssyge erklæring, som general Philip Breedlove, kommandør over NATO og den amerikanske kommando i Europa, aflagde for den amerikanske senatskomite for væbnede styrker i tirsdags. Breedlove sagde, at det amerikanske militær i Europa må være forberedt til at »punktere« Ruslands regionale forsvar og til en »hurtig forstærkning« af tropper, der bevæger sig mod øst i tilfælde af en konflikt. »Rusland har skabt et meget fortættet mønster af 'A2-AD', eller 'Anti-Adgang og Adgang Forbudt-område' (Anti-Access, Area Denial) ... Vi må investere i de evner og kapaciteter, der giver os mulighed for at gå ind i

et A2-AD-område.«

Bemærk, at denne angivelige truende forsvarsevne, som russerne har, og som Breedlove ønsker at »punktere«, befinder sig inden for Ruslands egne grænser – dvs., at Breedlove åbenlyst taler om en invasion af Rusland. Lyndon LaRouche responderede, at der var noget alvorligt i gang, at de forsøger at fremprovokere en krig, »men de får måske ikke, hvad de forventer«.

Denne åbenlyse trussel om global krig står i skarp kontrast til aftalen om en våbenhvile i Syrien, der holder nu på femte dag – netop pga. direkte samarbejde mellem det amerikanske og det russiske militær! Og i dag vendte den amerikanske astronaut Scott Kelly tilbage til Jorden, efter 340 dage i rummet, som en af de få, tilbageværende helte fra resterne af det amerikanske, bemandede rumprogram – i et russisk rumfartøj!

Faktum er, at briterne er desperate. Hele den transatlantiske finansielle struktur er klar til at bryde sammen – den kan ikke overleve spekulationsboblens kollaps, som nu spreder sig i hele Europa og har kurs mod Wall Street. Og, bemærkede LaRouche, briterne ved, at, hvis Putin fortsætter, som han gør i dag, så er Det britiske Imperium færdigt.

Dette er en situation, hvor vi må være parat til at føre Amerika tilbage til mental tilregnelighed, baseret på de principper, som Helga fremlagde i dag i New Delhi.

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry taler med Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov den 11. februar, 2016, inden et bilateralt møde, med fokus på Syrien, forud for Sikkerhedskonferencen i München.

**RADIO SCHILLER 25. januar
2016:**

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 7.
januar 2016:**

**Finanskrak i luften
Saudi Arabien vil sætte
Mellemøsten**

i flammer

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Videoen er i 3 dele, som er samlet i en playliste.

Lyd:

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
december 2015:**

**Faseskifte til finanskrak i
begyndelsen af januar**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Indien angriber voldsomt
COP21 for**

**'kulstof-imperialisme';
Yderligere angreb
på svindlen med global**

opvarmning blomstrer i Storbritannien og Afrika

30. november 2015 – Arvind Subramanian, økonomisk chefrådgiver til den indiske Modiregering, opfordrede, på tærsklen til FN's Konference om Klimaforandring COP21's knusende, fascistiske slag i Paris, til et »Manhattan-projekt for Kul« og kaldte den politiske kampagne for at gøre en ende på anvendelse af fossilt brændstof for »kulstof-imperialisme«.

Subramanian forklarede, at, i »slutspurten op til konferencen er der et voksende krav – der første gang blev klart udtalt ved dette års topmøde i Gruppen af Syvs førende industrialiserede nationer[1] – om at udfase anvendelsen af fossilt brændstof. USA og andre har også lovet at stemme imod energiprojekter baseret på fossilt brændstof i udviklingslandene, når multilaterale banker stemmer om projekterne.«

Han fortsætter: »For Indien – et land, der kæmper for at forsyne omkring 25 % af befolkningen med basal elektricitet, iflg. konservative skøn – lugter dette af kulstof-imperialisme. Og en sådan imperialisme på vegne af de avanceret udviklede nationer kunne være en opskrift på katastrofe for Indien, og andre udviklingslande ...

I et hvilket som helst troværdigt scenarie vil kul levere omkring 40-60 % af Indiens energi frem til 2030. Det vil, og bør, fortsat være landets primære energikilde, fordi det er det billigste brændstof, der er til rådighed.«

I et interview med en stor, fransk avis, *Le Figaro*, den 27. nov., afslørede økonomen Rémy Prud'homme ligeledes COP21's »globale opvarmnings-imperialisme og nævnte bl.a. indsatsen for at nedlukke kulfyret produktion af elektricitet i Afrika

og Indien. Prud'homme forudsagde et voldsomt sammenstød på COP21-konferencen over denne kolonialistiske politik.

Alt imens en ny, anti-klima-skræmmekampagnefilm, »Climate Hustle« (Klima-plattenslageri) kommer den 1. dec., så er yderligere to angreb på den globale opvarmningssvindl udgivet på nyhedsmedier i selveste de grønne royales Britiske Commonwealth.

Den ugentlige avis i Cameroun, *Integration*, havde den 24. nov. et interview med tidl. NASA-forsker og meteorolog Tom Wismuller, der fordømte svindlen. *Integration* gav interviewet en højtråbende forsideoverskrift: »Thomas Wismuller: Der er ingen klimatrussel mod planeten«. Wismuller erklærer, at, hvis alle de forslag, der vil blive fremstillet for COP21, blev vedtaget, ville menneskeslægten blive kastet tilbage til Stenalderen. Han siger, at han ønsker at se Cameroun »hæve sig til et niveau, der bringer den bedste livsstil, sundhedsforsorg og fremgang, man kan håbe på, og dernæst komme hele menneskeheden til gavn!!! Når ens nations intelligens og intellekt fokuserer på at blive ligeværdige partnere i verden, vil verdens øvrige nationer byde éns indlemmelse i det etablerede, økonomiske fremskridt velkommen.«
[http://journalintegration.com/index.php/dossier/item/256-thomas-](http://journalintegration.com/index.php/dossier/item/256-thomas)

Og snart på engelsk på:
[http://www.committeerepubliccanada.ca/.](http://www.committeerepubliccanada.ca/)

Svindlen blev udtømmende afsløret i »Climate Change Science and the Climate Change Scare« (Klimaforandringsvidenskab og Klimaforandrings-skræmmekampagne) af Andrew Kenny, en sydafrikansk ingeniør, og artiklen blev publiceret samme dag, 24. nov. i @Liberty, det Sydafrikanske Institut for Racerelationers politiske bulletin, og blev dagen efter udlagt i sin helhed på den meget læste sydafrikanske erhvervsnyheds-webseite, biznews.com.

Kennys 24 sider lange artikel gør det klart, at plattenslagernes forskrifter vil forhindre industrialisering og fastholde milliarder af mennesker i fattigdom. Idet han fremkommer med mange af de videnskabelige tilbagevisninger, der fremstilles i *EIR's* egen Specialrapport, »Skræmmekampagne om global opvarmning er befolkningsreduktion – ikke videnskab«[2], skriver Kenny: »Men vi må stole på videnskab. Det er vores sikreste, og måske eneste, vej til sandhed. Og videnskabens og fornuftens fremskridt har bragt menneskeheden dybtgående, praktiske fordele.«[3]

<http://irr.org.za/reports-and-publications/atLiberty/files/>

[1] Canada, Frankrig, Italien, Tyskland, Japan, Storbritannien, USA.

[2] <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=8531>

[3] Se Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport: En Prometheus-tilgang til nye former for ild: Udvinning af helium-3 på Månen, for en menneskehed med fusionskraft, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=1894>

**RADIO SCHILLER den 30.
november 2015:
COP21-klimakonferencen:**

fra 40 lande, som vi har fastslået, inkl. nogle G20-lande.« Især efter tragedien i Paris, sagde han, »forstår vi alle, at kanalerne til finansieringen af terrorisme må afskæres«. Han understregede, at han havde leveret satellitfotos »til vore kolleger, der tydeligt viser det sande omfang af ISIS' marked for illegal handel med olie og benzin. Det er bilkonvojer, der strækker sig over dusinvis af kilometer, som forsvinder bag horisonten, når man ser det fra en højde af 4.000 til 5.000 meter«.

Som en refleksion af drøftelser, der fandt sted den 14. nov. i Wien, samt igangværende diskussioner mellem den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, sagde Putin, at en side af den syriske opposition »anser det for muligt at indlede militæraktioner imod ISIL med assistance fra russiske luftstyrker, og vi er parat til at yde denne assistance«. Hvis dette sker, forklarede han, vil Bashar al-Assads »hær på den ene side og oppositionen på den anden side bekæmpe en fælles fjende«. Rusland har brug for støtte fra USA, Saudi-Arabien og Iran i kampen mod terrorisme, tilføjede han. »Dette er ikke et tidspunkt for en debat om, hvem, der er mest effektiv i kampen imod ISIL; det, vi har brug for at gøre, er at konsolidere vores indsats.«

Putin refererede til det arbejde, der er i gang, med at skabe lister over de terrororganisationer, der opererer i Syrien, en opgave, der, iflg. amerikanske efterretningskilder, er blevet uddelegeret til Jordan, hvis Kong Abdullah II står Putin nær, men også anses for at være en nær allieret til USA.

Klimasvindel i vanskeligheder

26. oktober 2015 – »Det er ikke til at se det, ud fra det tilfredse spin, der stråler ud fra det Ovale Kontor, men i Bonn, Tyskland, i denne uge havde et oprør fra den Tredje Verden nær afsporet forhandlingerne om klimaforandringer i Paris til november. Selv om freden for indeværende er genoprettet, skete det kun ved at tapetsere med denne fundamentale gåde: Verden kan enten undgå en klimakatastrofe, eller også søge 'klima-retfærdighed', ikke begge dele.«

Dette er indledningen til en artikel af Reason Foundations Shikha Dalmia med overskriften, »Hvorfor 'Klima-retfærdighed' har fået Indien og Vesten til at fare i struben på hinanden«, udgivet af *The Week*. Dalmia stiller ikke spørgsmålstegn ved hele aftalens videnskabelige svindel, men er vred over implikationerne:

»Der er ingen lavkulstof-energiteknologier til rådighed i dag, der kan opretholde de økonomiske vækstrater, som disse lande har brug for, for at løfte deres befolkninger ud af nedværdigende fattigdom, for slet ikke at tale om at tilbyde vestlige levestandarder til noget, der minder om en billig pris. Over 300 mio. indere lever stadig under fattigdomsgrænsen, hvor de tjener mindre end 1 dollar om dagen. Indiens energiforbrug pr. person er 15 gange lavere end USA's. Indien må fortsat øge sit energiforbrug, og derfor sin udledning af CO₂, i mindst yderligere to årtier for at fjerne dyb fattigdom, hvilket er grunden til, at landets nedbringelsesplan kun forpligter sig over for at skære ned på 'udledningsintensiteten' – dets udledningsrate som en procentdel af dets BNP – ikke selve udledningerne.

Med fokus på, hvad det vil koste i penge at implementere de krævede nedbringelser i udledning, bemærker Dalmia den udfordring, dette ville repræsentere »for et land, der endnu mangler at give grundlæggende kloakering, transport og

infrastruktur til rent vand til alle sine borgere.«

Endnu mere langt ude rapporterer Dalmia, at klimasvindelfanatikere i Bonn drøftede, om handelssanktioner skulle påtvinges de lande, der nægter af dræbe deres befolkning i bekæmpelsen af kuldioxyds navn. Hun advarer: »Det er også tænkeligt, at et virkeligt fast besluttet Vesten, under en eller anden FN-lignende, global organisations regi, kunne forsøge at skabe en stående militær angrebsstyrke til at bombe eller drone lande til overholdelse? Selve menneskehedens eksistens ville trods alt stå på spil. (Var der nogen, der sagde præsident Al Gore?)

Læs også: Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur, af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Indien/Afrika-Topmøde: BRIKS' Ny Udviklingsbank udser sig udvikling i Afrika som mål

26. oktober 2015 – I et nedskrevet interview med afrikanske journalister ved det tredje topmøde i Indien/Afrika-Forum (IAFS) i New Delhi sagde den indiske premierminister Narendra Modi, at BRIKS' Nye Udviklingsbank var et betydningsfuldt initiativ, der kan få en dybtgående virkning på den globale, finansielle orden.

»Jeg tror, at Afrika vil blive et betydningsfuldt område for fokus, og vi vil forhåbentlig også få et afrikansk vindue eller en regional tilstedeværelse for Banken i fremtiden«, sagde Modi.

BRIKS-posten rapporterede søndag, at repræsentanter for 54 afrikanske nationer, inklusive stats- og regeringschefer fra omkring 40 lande og den magtfulde Afrikanske Union, forventes at deltage i det fire dage lange Indien/Afrika-Topmøde, der begynder i New Delhi den 26. oktober.

Blandt de magtfulde, afrikanske ledere, der har bekræftet deres deltagelse, er Sydafrikas præsident Jacob Zuma, Egyptens præsident Abdel Fattah el-Sisi, Zimbabwes præsident Robert Mugabe og Nigerias præsident Muhammadu Buhari.

Fredag bad Modi også de 54 afrikanske nationer om at tilslutte sig Indiens krav om en revision af De forenede Nationer og andre globale institutioner. Modi sagde, at verden er i færd med at gennemgå en politisk, økonomisk og teknologisk transition på en skala, der sjældent er set i nyere historie. Han advarede om, at FN og andre globale organisationer løber en risiko for at miste deres betydning, hvis de ikke tilpasser sig.

Rhodos-konference, »Dialog mellem Civilisationer«:
Ruslands Yakunin meddeler

skabelse af nyt forskningsinstitut til fremme af global infrastruktur

11. oktober 2015 – Vladimir Yakunin, præsident og medstifter af Verdensforummet »Dialog mellem Civilisationer« (eller Rhodos Forum), på hvilket Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har talt gentagne gange i årenes løb – åbnede det 13. årlige Rhodos Forum den 10. okt. ved at meddele lanceringen af en ny, stor global tænketank, der fokuserer på globale infrastrukturprojekter.

Yakunin, der indtil for nylig også var chef for Russiske Jernbaner, brugte sine indledende bemærkninger til et kraftigt angreb på geopolitisk tankegang og faren for krig. »Vi har set, at en verden, der er domineret af en enkelt civilisation, ikke fungerer. Nylige konflikter i Afghanistan, Irak, Libyen og Syrien har vist, at Vestens interventionspolitik er en fiasko. Det står ud fra den aktuelle tilstand med konflikt i hele verden klart, at interkulturel dialog er af vital betydning.«

Blandt de fremtrædende talere på Rhodos var Jayshree Sengupta, økonom, Observer Research Foundation, fra New Delhi, Indien, der også talte på Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris i juni 2015. I sine bemærkninger på Rhodos understregede hun betydningen af infrastruktur og opfordrede især til samarbejde med Kina. Hun sagde, at der var 700 millioner indere i landsbyer i landdistrikter, der ikke har nogen infrastruktur, men, med BRIKS og dennes Nye Udviklingsbank (NDB), har vi håb om at kunne finansiere vore behov for infrastruktur. I BRIKS er vi alle lige, men det er vi ikke i IMF, udtalte hun. BRIKS' reservevalutafond, CRA, vil tage sig af mange problemer, med

overgangslån, når penge begynder at strømme ud. Men ulig IMF stiller CRA ingen forhåndsbetingelser, ingen diktater og ingen forhåndskrav (især om budgetnedskæringer og 'nøjsomhedspolitik' over for befolkningen, -red.).

Under Kinas lederskab, sagde hun, er Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, AIIB, operationel, og Europa har trodset USA og tilsluttet sig. Nogle folk i Indien er nervøse over Kina, idet de er bange for, at den ene stormagt skal afløses af den anden, nemlig Kina. Men jeg siger nej, fastholdt Sengupta: Vi er ligeværdige i AIIB og NDB, og det er grunden til, at jeg støtter dette.

Foto: Vladimir Yakunin åbner det 13. møde i Rhodos Forum

Den indiske premierminister Narendra Modis tale til FN's Generalforsamling – engelsk voice over

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche-interview
på kinesisk TV, med**

udgivelsen på kinesisk af EIR's rapport »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen.«

Zepp-LaRouche: » For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; ... Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret.«

2. oktober 2015 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, var en af tre panelister på CCTV's show »Dialogue: Ideas Matter« (Dialog: Ideer er vigtige), den 28. september. Vært for showet var Yang Rui, og deltagerne var prof. Jin Canrong fra Kinas Renmin Universitet, der var i studiet sammen med fr. LaRouche, og prof. M.D. Nalapat, formand for UNESCO Peace ved Manipal Universitetet i Indien, over video.

Showet, der varede en halv time, var helliget spørgsmål, der er blevet rejst under det nylige sammentræde af FN's Generalforsamling. Her følger fr. LaRouches interventioner:

Spørgsmålet om udvikling

Da værten Yang Rui bad fr. LaRouche om at kommentere præsident Xi's forpligtelse til at yde 2 mia. dollar til fattige nationer i hele verden, svarede hun:

»Jeg mener, at det bør ses i lyset af **den fremragende tale,**

han holdt i FN, der var den mest optimistiske, mest opmuntrende tale af alle lederne, efter min mening, fordi han understregede den lovede udvikling for hele verden som en del af Kinas win-win-politik. Han understregede f.eks. innovation. Så disse 2 mia. dollar er blot en slags gestus for den langt bredere politik med win-win-politikken og den kinesiske model, som Kina netop nu tilbyder.«

[... Prof. Nalapat bemærkede, at Kina har bragt 500 mio. mennesker ud af absolut fattigdom i løbet af den seneste generation, samt har fremmet kvinders rettigheder.]

Værten Yang Rui spurgte fr. LaRouche, om Xis og Modis oplevelser af fattigdom tidligt i deres liv har haft, og i hvilken grad, en indflydelse på deres politik.

Zepp-LaRouche: »Meget, tror jeg. Jeg mener, at begge de to ledere virkelig er exceptionelle ud fra et standpunkt om at kere sig om deres befolkning. De har begge givet udtryk for en enorm optimisme for fremtiden. Narendra Modi har f.eks. sagt, at BRIKS-landene er den første alliance af lande, som ikke defineres ud fra deres nuværende kapaciteter, men af deres fremtidige potentiale.

Jeg mener, at de begge, med deres egne erfaringer om fattigdom, og om vanskelige tider – i Xi Jinpings tilfælde var perioden under kulturrevolutionen meget vanskelig ... «
[afbrydes]

Efter nogen diskussion om den internationale flygtningekrise, spurgte værten Yang Rui alle de tre paneldeltagere om Millennium Udviklingsmålene, der erklærer, at fattigdom på nuværende tidspunkt efter planen angiveligt skulle have været halveret, samt om Pave Frans' holdning til den ukontrollerede grådigheds voldsomhed. Prof. Nalapat rejste spørgsmålet om præsident Clintons ophævelse af Glass-Steagall og antydede, at dette førte til krakket i 2008 og til store uligheder i indkomster.

Yang: Er Kina et »udviklet« land eller et »udviklingsland«? Værten bemærkede, at der eksisterer et nyt niveau af aftaler mellem Kina og USA, inklusive løfter fra Washington om at støtte AIIB's indsats. Vil Kina yde store bidrag til folkeslagenes udvikling?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Det mener jeg, Kina allerede har gjort. For, i BRIKS-politikken, og i Xi Jinpings win-win-politik, har Kina bidraget til eller taget lederskabet for at skabe en totalt alternativ, økonomisk model; og det på et tidspunkt, hvor det transatlantiske finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at nedsmelte i et krak, der er større end det i 2008.

Jeg mener, at hele verden har tilsluttet sig AIIB, f.eks., fordi den er en mere attraktiv model, fordi den er målrettet mod reel investering, infrastruktur og andre aspekter af realøkonomien, mens den transatlantiske verden står umiddelbart foran en bankerot. De europæiske banker er totalt bankerot; Wall Street er mere end bankerot. Og da nu herren fra Indien nævnte Glass-Steagall – der er i øjeblikket en stor bevægelse for at genindføre Glass-Steagall, hvilket ville betyde at erklære de bankerotte Wall Street-banker bankerot. Det ville være en meget god ting.

Så det er virkelig en gave fra himlen, næsten, at Kina er begyndt at skabe dette alternative system, som en redningsbåd netop, som Titanic er ved at gå ned.

Så alt imens det er godt, at der nu er en bedre forståelse mellem USA og Kina, så løser det ikke problemet med, at USA's tilbøjelighed stadig går i retning af en unipolær verden.

Jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en periode med enorme forandringer. Europa er ved at forandres; der er stor respons på flygtningekrisen, for det har 'prikket hul på boblen' om, at vi lever i en verden, hvor krige, der begynder i én del af verden ... « [afbrudt]

Yang: De er også forfatter til rapporten, »[Fra Silkevejen til](#)

Verdenslandbroen« [viser den frem], en fantastisk, meget imponerende rapport.



Se også: "Silkevejen bliver til Verdenslandbroen" udgivet på kinesisk præsenteres på pressekonference i Beijing, 30. sept.

De ser »Dialog« med fr. LaRouche, stifter af Schiller Instituttet, og prof. Jin Canrong og prof. M.D. Nalapat. Vi diskuterer spørgsmål fra FN's Generalforsamling New York.

Spørgsmålet om kvinders rettigheder

CCTV-værten Yang rejste spørgsmålet om angrebene på Kina for sin tilstand mht. kvinders rettigheder, og beder om alle paneldeltagernes mening. Efter at de andre havde talt, sagde fr. LaRouche:

Zepp-LaRouche: »Jeg mener, at den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan overvinde kvinders underprivilegerede stilling, er, hvis begge kønnene lever et kreativt liv; for kun, når alle mænd og kvinder opfylder deres skabende potentiale fuldt ud, kan der blive ligestilling.

Og i denne henseende mener jeg, at der i hele verden er behov for at gøre mere, uden tvivl. Men jeg mener, at Kina promoverede kvindelige taikonauter – kvindelige astronauter – og dette er et godt tegn. Vi har i Tyskland udgivet en bog, hvis forside viser et foto af en kvindelig, kinesisk taikonaut, der kommer tilbage fra rumfartøj – det er

fuldstændig optimistisk.



Det er denne form for rollemodeller, vi har brug for. For det er ønskeligt med et image, hvor kvinder befinder sig i avantgarden af videnskab og kultur: og det mener jeg er meget godt. Det er meget bedre end i mange dele af USA ... «

Repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd

Efter en drøftelse af kravet fra flere lande, inklusive Japan, Indien, Tyskland og Brasilien, om at have en permanent repræsentation i FN's Sikkerhedsråd, spurgte Yang fr. LaRouche: Bør Tyskland blive permanent medlem af Sikkerhedsrådet?

Zepp-LaRouche: »Ja, det mener jeg, men spørgsmålet rækker ud over dette. For jeg mener, at vi befinder os i en forandringens epoke, hvor både geopolitik må lades tilbage i fortiden; men også, at jeg ikke nødvendigvis er enig i, at ideen om en multi-polær verden skulle være særligt meget bedre end en unipolær verden, for det indeholder stadig ideen om geopolitik. Jeg mener, at vi, som menneskehed, må komme frem til et nyt paradigme, hvor menneskehedens fælles mål virkelig er fokus for hele den menneskelige familie, og ud fra dette standpunkt mener jeg, at alle lande virkelig må være klart repræsenteret. Så jeg mener, at vi må finde en modus operandi, hvor Afrika, Latinamerika og Asien er repræsenteret på en passende måde.

Men jeg mener, at hovedspørgsmålet er, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme, i hvilket hele menneskehedens interesser, menneskeheden som den udødelige art for fremtiden, må være det, der er vejviser for, hvad alle lande gør. Jeg mener, at tiden er inde til, at et folks legitime interesse, eller endda en gruppe af folkeslags legitime interesse, som et

modsnætningsforhold til en anden gruppe af folkeslag, nu må tilsidesættes, og at vi i stedet må definere, hvad menneskehedens fælles problemer er, hvilket vil sige at fjerne sult og indføre sikkerhed for energiforsyning og forsyning af råmaterialer.

Her igen mener jeg, at Kina har taget føringen med sit Måneprogram. Kinas Månemissioner viser virkelig, hvordan videnskab og teknologi kan håndtere spørgsmålene om sikkerhed for forsyning af råmaterialer og energi. For, Kina arbejder hen imod at udvinde helium-3 på Månen til brug for, at der i fremtiden endelig kan komme produktion af fusionsenergi på Jorden.

Jeg mener, at det mere er et spørgsmål om en vision for fremtiden. Det er mere et spørgsmål om at definere menneskehedens fælles mål, og dernæst bør repræsentationen reflektere denne holdning.«

[Video med CCTV's program Dialogue kan ses her.](#)

**Leder 30. september 2015:
Obama – udmanøvreret, skubbet
af scenen, kørt ud på et
sidespor, men ...**

Stadig i embedet

I den nye lederskabsdynamik, der demonstreredes på FN's Generalforsamling, og som anføres af præsident Putin, præsident Xi og andre BRIKS-nationer og samarbejdspartnere, er præsident Obama og hans herrer på dramatisk vis blevet udmanøvreret og skubbet af scenen. Faren består i, at Obama stadig er i embedet. Dette definerer amerikanernes fortsatte opgave, som den blev gentaget i fuld offentlighed under et livligt gademøde, der blev afholdt af **aktivister fra LPAC's Manhattan-projekt mandag ved FN Plaza**, med det klare budskab på deres bannere, som dette: »Obama: Hjælp med Verdensfreden: Gå af i dag!«

Et foto af denne planche, samt et andet: »Putins stopper Obamas Holocaust; Smid Obama ud«, blev sendt ud i hele verden af Sputnik News i løbet af de seneste 48 timer. Sputnik-Amerika dækkede fhv. senator Mike Gravel i går, under overskriften, **»Obama burde tilslutte sig Putin i en forenet indsats i Syrien – fhv. amerikansk senator«**.

Med hensyn til Syrien, så var den ene, umiddelbare og konkrete ting, der kom ud af det 90 minutter lange møde mandag aften mellem Putin og Obama, en bekræftelse på, at det amerikanske og russiske militær ville kommunikere med hinanden med det formål at fremme »de-konfliktion« i deres militære operationer. Det er ironisk, eftersom netop denne proces blev indledt den 18. sept. i en telefonsamtale mellem den russiske forsvarsminister Shoigu og den amerikanske forsvarsminister Carter, men kort tid efter blev afvist af Obamaregeringen. Dette er typisk, og farligt. Kerry og Lavrov skal også mødes onsdag for yderligere at gå i dybden med de russiske, diplomatiske initiativer. Ifølge en amerikansk kilde, så dominerede Putin diskussionen med Obama med konkrete forslag til en reel krig, med FN-mandat, for at udslette Islamisk Stat, og han fik for første gang fornemmelsen af, at Obama var blevet tvunget til at høre efter.

Men, som Lyndon LaRouche gentog tirsdag, så findes der ingen tryghed, før Obama er fuldstændig fjernet fra magten.

Efter Putin-Obama-mødet førte Putin omgående en lang, åben dialog med russiske journalister ([tilgængelig i fuld længde på Kremls webside](#)).

Men Obama forlod mødet uden et ord.

Putin gentog til reporterne det, han tidligere på dagen havde sagt til FN's Generalforsamling: de amerikanske, franske og australske bombninger i Syrien er illegale, uden et mandat fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd eller en invitation fra den syriske regering. Vi må i stedet handle efter streng »overholdelse af normerne for international lov ... «

Putin opfordrer til samarbejde om Syrien for at bekæmpe terrorisme, og han opfordrede til, at der afholdes et møde mellem alle de berørte parter i oktober måned. Der har været flere russiske initiativer om dette, forud for denne uges møde i FN. Det fælles efterretningscenter i Bagdad (Rusland, Iran, Irak og Syrien) blev lanceret og vil være operationelt i oktober; der er en parallel, bilateral kanal mellem Rusland og Israel; og sluttelig mødtes Rusland, Kina og Indien for nogen tid siden i Beijing for at iværksætte et omfattende samarbejde om international terrorisme inden for rammerne af FN's Sikkerhedsråd.

Midt i alle disse vigtige handlinger kommer et særligt, strategisk initiativ imod de grønne fascister. Under præsident Putins tale den 28. sept. til FN's Generalforsamling fremkom han med det tilbud, at Rusland, sammen med FN, ville ko-sponsorere en global konference om »biosfæren og tekno-sfæren« for at behandle nye, avancerede teknologier, der kan løse problemet med ressource-udtømmning og forbedre planetens miljø. Hertil kommer, at den indiske premierminister Modi har genoptaget sit angreb på den udviklede sektors intriger, der blev lanceret i København (COP15), og advarede om, at Indien

ikke vil acceptere nogen såkaldte aftaler om klimaforandring, der udelukker nationerne i udviklingssektoren fra reel, videnskabsdrevet, økonomisk vækst. Under et møde på tomandshånd med Modi fik præsident Obama efter sigende et stilfærdigt vredesanfald over Modis modstand og vil sende amerikanske regeringsekskursioner til New Delhi for at klemme Indien, forud for klimatopmødet i december i Paris (COP21).

Leder, 28. september 2015: Krig eller fred står på spil i Manhattan i dag

I dag, mandag den 28. sept., er en afgørende mærkedag i historien, med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, der kommer til Manhattan for at fremlægge sin flankemanøvre imod præsident Obama og hans herrer i London og på Wall Street. Det er et opgør mellem kreativitet og sindssyge, mellem global udvikling og global disintegration; mellem krig og fred. Putin er allerede begyndt at deployere ekstensivt militærudstyr i Syrien, på anmodning fra den legitime, syriske regering under præsident Assad. Som han sagde til Charlie Rose i et interview, der skal sendes i afsnit mellem søndag nat og tirsdag, så er han forpligtende engageret til at forsvare denne legitime regering, eftersom »alle andre handlinger i modsat retning« ville skabe en katastrofe, »som vi nu ser det« i Libyen. Han påpegede, at denne deployering var helt i overensstemmelse med international lov, ulig tilsvarende deployeringer fra præsident Obamas side, hvis

»levering af militær støtte til illegale strukturer er i

modstrid med principperne i moderne, international lov og De forenede Nationers Charter«.

Der er panik i Det Hvide Hus under Obamas forberedelser til at mødes privat med Putin, efter at de begge taler til Generalforsamlingen i dag. En afvisning af Putins forslag om en international koalition mellem nationer for at beskytte den suveræne stat Syrien, og verden, mod det barbariske ISIS, vil afsløre Obama som en åbenlys støtte af præcis disse terroristnetværk – nøjagtig som general Michael Flynn, den tidligere chef for det amerikanske Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste (DIA), sagde den 31. juli til Al Jazeera, hvor han anklagede Obama for »bevidst« at støtte al-Qaeda for at opnå et regimeskift i Libyen og Irak.

TASS rapporterede søndag, at Irak, Iran, Syrien og Rusland allerede har etableret et center i Bagdad for koordinering af efterretninger og operationer imod ISIS, og som skal ledes af repræsentanter for disse nationers generalstabe. Vil Obama modsætte sig denne indsats?

Præsident Xi Jinping sendte yderligere chokbølger gennem FN i lørdags, hvor han fremlagde kinesiske planer om yderligere flere store udviklingsprojekter i hele verden, med en alvorlig kritik af den eksisterende politik, hvor der kun gives hjælp til de lande, der lydigt følger de vestlige magters ordre. Kina, sagde han, vil, i sine udviklingsprojekter, sætte »retfærdighed over interesser«.

Og den tredje leder af Rusland-Kina-Indien-trekanten, der anfører BRIKS-nationerne i skabelsen af et nyt paradigme for fred gennem udvikling, sprængte hul i den grønne fascistdagsordens planer om at bruge svindelen med global opvarmning til at nedlukke udvikling over hele verden. Den indiske premierminister Narendra Modi sagde til FN's generalsekretær, Ban Ki-moon, at der bestod et »tillidsunderskud« over for de udviklede lande, der bruger klimaspørgsmålet til at afholde udviklingslandene fra at

forbedre deres befolkningers levestandard, under påskuddet om kontrol af CO₂-udledning. Det var Indien og Kina, der førte an i den heldige afvisning af tvungen nedbringelse af CO₂, og som ødelagde Klimakonferencen i København i 2009, »COP15«, og det er sandsynligt, at vi kan vente det samme ved »COP21«, Klimakonferencen i Paris i december måned.

EIR's nye Specialrapport, *Skræmmekampagne om 'Global Opvarmning' er Befolkningsreduktion, ikke Videnskab[1]*, må læses og distribueres for at sikre netop et sådant resultat.

I lørdags blev **Lyndon LaRouche**, under en konference i **Manhattan**, spurgt, hvilken fremgangsmåde, man skulle anvende for at mobilisere folk på et tidspunkt, hvor faren, som nu, er så alvorlig. Han svar var, i uddrag:

»Obama var på randen af at lancere en atomkrig fra selve USA. Det var, hvad han var helliget til. Og Putin blokerede det! Hvordan blokerede han det? Han gik over til en anden kæde og ændrede spørgsmålet og kom ind i et helt område, som ikke var det europæiske område i den almindelige forstand. Og hele dette område, fra Tyskland, og fra andre dele af Europa, begyndte at respondere til det, Putin havde gjort!

Pointen er derfor, at vi på alle punkter altid må søge menneskehedens fremskridt, i den forstand, at vi søger efter menneskelig udødelighed i de mennesker, der vil tage vores plads, når de skal tage vores plads, ud fra den antagelse, at de vil være i stand til, som en gruppe mennesker, som et samfund, at skabe evnen til ægte menneskelighed i fremtiden, eller i nutiden og ind i fremtiden.

Og det er denne optimisme, der giver folk inspiration til at hellige deres liv til det, der ligger forude, selv, hvis de skulle stå over for en trussel om døden. Og de inspireres af den kendsgerning, at de har folk, der bidrager til udviklingen af en mere fremskreden grad af udvikling af samfundet, end de nogen sinde tidligere har kendt.«

Titelbillede: St. Georg dragedræberen

[1] Se: Rapport fra pressekonferencen i anledning af rapportens udgivelse

Samt også: Introduktion til EIR's rapport v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche, »Klimaforandring som middel til oprettelse af et globalt miljødiktatur«

**RADIO SCHILLER den 28.
september 2015:
Optakt til Obama-Putin møde
ved FN/
Xi Jinpings statsbesøg i USA**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg