

EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg fremlægger Lyndon LaRouches analyse af Libyens rolle i Nordafrikas og Mellemøstens nuværende situation, med fare for en generel atomkrig, og Hillary Clintons rolle

Disse handlinger, denne operation for regimeskift i Libyen, førte, som nu er velkendt, direkte til, at Libyen blev til en mislykket stat og skabte et vakuum, i hvilket Libyen kunne blive stedet for iscenesættelse af det, der i dag kaldes ISIS – disse radikale, jihadistiske terrorister, der i mange områder bruger de våben, der blev kanaliseret ind i Libyen på tidspunktet for Hillary Clinton/Obama-operationen, med henblik på at vælte Gaddafi. De bruger nu disse våben til at overtage store bidder af territorium i Nordafrika og Mellemøsten. Dette skal naturligvis ses i forbindelse med de tragiske begivenheder, der udspillede sig den 11. september [2011] i Benghazi, hvor ambassadør Stevens og tre andre amerikanere blev dræbt. Men dette påpeger den mere betydningsfulde diskussion, der burde finde sted: Hvad var Hillary Clintons rolle? Hvad var Barack Obamas rolle i beslutningen om at gennemføre regimeskift i Libyen, og hvad vil resultatet blive, hvis vi tillader denne samme operation for regimeskift at finde sted i Syrien og mange andre lande?

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Titelfoto: En bevæbnet libysk oprørskæmper sparker til en fodbold i nærheden af Moammar Gaddafis kompleks Bab al-Aziziya, mens dette omsluttet af flammer. Libyske oprørere indtog paladset efter flere dages kampe for at vinde kontrollen over Tripoli, 2011. (Maxppp/ZUMAPRESS)

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-Webcast 4. marts 2016: Vi må udvikle rumprogrammet for hele menneskeheden. Engelsk udskrift

Megan Beets fra LPAC Videnskabsteam rapporterer fra en begivenhed med Kesha Rogers i Texas om rumprogrammets betydning for USA og hele menneskeheden; Jeffrey Steinberg fremlægger en analyse af begivenhederne omkring Libyen, som Hillary Clinton var en del af, med afsættelsen og mordet på Gaddafi, og hele operationens konsekvenser for den aktuelle situation i Nordafrika og Mellemøsten, der kan føre til generel atomkrig; og Jeff Steinberg fremlægger hr. LaRouches tanker om en genrejsning af USA's økonomi, med en genoplivning af rumprogrammet som spydspids. Engelsk udskrift.

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's March 4th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you are joining us for our weekly broadcast

here on Friday evenings for the LaRouche PAC webcast, at larouchepac.com. I'm joined in the studio this evening by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}, and Megan Beets from the LaRouche Pac Science Team. And Megan Beets just returned from a trip to Houston, Texas where she was involved in a very significant event and other meetings with Kesha Rogers. Many of you might have seen the recording of this event, which was also live-streamed on this website last Saturday. It featured Tom Wismueller, and Kesha Rogers, as well as Megan Beets. We're going to begin our broadcast this evening with some remarks from Megan Beets, coming off the discussion that we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning. As many of you know, Mr. LaRouche has placed a premium on Kesha Rogers' role as a champion, a unique champion, of the resurgence of the United States space program. Kesha Rogers very aggressively campaigned for this cause in her three campaigns for Federal office that she has run so far – 2010, 2012, and 2014, in which she was the Democratic nominee two elections in a row, in the 22nd District of Texas, for the United States House of Representatives, and also ran an internationally profiled Senate campaign in 2014. So, without further adieu, I would like to ask Megan Beets to come to the podium to deliver a few opening remarks, and then after that, we'll feature some more discussion coming off of the meeting we had with Mr. LaRouche this morning, with Jeffrey Steinberg filling in some of those details.

MEGAN BEETS: Thanks, Matt. I can tell you from my visit to Texas that at this moment, when the breakdown of the trans-Atlantic system is undeniable – we're witnessing the complete malfunctioning and shutdown of this old system – we're also see the reopening of the space program down in Texas. Now the event that I was privileged to participate in with Kesha and Tom Wismueller down in Texas, represents a real beginning of a change of direction of the United States, a rebirth, so to speak, of the United States as a nation. Now, the requirement today is that the United States dump our commitment, our addiction, to this dead, dying trans-Atlantic system, and decide once again to take up a mission in the sense of purpose and contribution to mankind. Now, you look around today. You look around at our citizens. You look at the heroin epidemic. You look at the death, the self-induced deaths from drugs, from suicide, from alcoholism, and so forth. You look at the breakdown in cities like Flint, Michigan, the breakdown in places like certain counties of West Virginia that were once booming coal towns. There's no reflection in the United States of reality. Now, what's reality? Look at the leadership coming from Asia, particularly from China. Look at the kinds of optimistic developments, the progress for humanity, that's coming from the leadership of China and their space program; and in their commitment to development projects which are beginning to take hold and take place all across Eurasia. That's reality. There's no reflection of this yet inside the United States. And so when we look around, it's not just that the U. S. economy has disappeared. The United States has disappeared. There's no

sense

of a unified purpose. There's no sense of a unified mission for

the existence of the United States as a nation, and there's no sense within our people of what {we}, as a nation, will organize

ourselves to contribute to the purposes of mankind.

Now you contrast that with the U.S. sense of purpose and mission as under John F. Kennedy and his Presidency, and his leadership within the United States, and his dedication to the space program. Now, as anyone who truthfully remembers – and most especially, those people who were directly involved – can tell you, this wasn't just a mission for the United States. This

was a real mission for all of mankind. And this was reflected in

some anecdotes in the event last Saturday from some of the attendees, who themselves were engineers or otherwise employed in

NASA during the Apollo missions.

One anecdote that was told by someone saying that he disagreed with Werner von Braun that we should be sharing some of

our technology with the Russians, and his mind was changed by von

Braun. There was another former NASA employee who said that at first in the 1990s, he disagreed with President Clinton's sharing

of U.S. space technology with the former Soviet Union – with Russia. And he said once he started working with Russian engineers, he realized that our mission is mankind; it's unified;

it's the same. And this was reflected throughout the entire event: the sense that our work during the space program was contributing fundamental developments and contributions, not to

the progress of the United States, but to the progress of man

as

a whole.

Now, why? What is the space program? What happened during the space program in the United States?

Well, not only was the common, the general citizen, transformed. Not only were there innumerable and immeasurable benefits from the economic spin-offs. But most importantly, the

people were transformed. The astronauts were fundamentally transformed. The engineers working in a space program were fundamentally transformed, as we confronted problems in space, problems that forced us to overturn our assumptions about the principles which govern and control the Universe that we lived in. And each of these problems that we confronted, we were to conquer. And you see that in the accounts of the people who were

involved during that time in the space program: that we were able

to pull together around a common mission, thousands and thousands

of people across the country to confront these challenges in our

knowledge about the Universe, and to conquer them.

And in that way, in a very short period of time, man began to rapidly transform and change into a more powerful species.

We

began to progress into a species with more power and control over

the processes in the Universe, so much to the point that we were

able to land people on the surface of the Moon, which fundamentally transformed our ideas and our knowledge of what the

Moon itself is, of what potential the Moon holds for a new platform of development for man, which was completely unknown until the accomplishments of Apollo.

Now this is what the Chinese are doing today with their

space program. In 2018, just two years from now, the Chinese plan to land on the far side of the Moon. This has never been done before. The far side of the Moon has been imaged with satellites, it's been seen by human eyes in the American astronauts who travelled there. But nobody has ever landed on the far side of the Moon.

Now, people may say, "Well, we know what the Moon is; we've looked at it. We've taken pictures." But the fact is, the far side of the Moon is a completely unknown quantity to us. When we land there, for example, what do we think the far side can teach us? When we land there, we'll have a chance to confront our fundamental notions about the formation of the Moon, the formation of the Earth, and possibly other planets in the Solar System with the unique geological investigations that we'll be able to perform there.

When we land there, and when we're able to set up astronomical observatories in the very low radio frequency range, which is a band of the electromagnetic spectrum which is impossible to look at the Solar System in from anywhere attainable to us besides the far side of the Moon; when we are able to look at the Solar System in this new range, we're very likely going to discover that the planets, the interstellar medium, distant galaxies, different stars, could exhibit processes to us which were completely invisible before.

It's this kind of potential for mankind to transform our powers, to transform our relationship to the Solar System itself, that's being offered by the Chinese actions today. And it's this sense of meaning, this sense of mobilization and commitment to progress for all of mankind, which is what we, down in Texas,

are

reminding people of. What Kesha is reminding people of – even people who participated in these great accomplishments 40 or 50

years ago, and who might have encountered now a sense of demoralization with the actions since that time. We're drawing people back out to a commitment of this mission. And Kesha is showing once again that the United States can, and must, commit

itself to this kind of purpose for all of mankind.

So I can just conclude by reporting that the beginnings of these developments that we're seeing coming out of Texas, is that

people down there still associate themselves with reality, and are now playing a leading role, with Kesha, in being moved toward

recognizing that this is the viable option for the United States.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Megan. And like I said, if you haven't gotten a chance to see the recording of the event that occurred down in Texas last Saturday, it is archived on the larouchepac youtube channel, and I would encourage you to watch

it. It was a very uplifting event, and we can expect to hear much, much more from Kesha Rogers, obviously.

Now, the second item on our agenda tonight is something which you may have heard Mr. LaRouche emphasize during the discussion with the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee this past Monday. Towards the end of that show, you might have caught Mr.

LaRouche's reference to a series of very significant articles that were published in the {New York Times} over the weekend. They were titled: "Hillary Clinton, Smart Power, and a Dictator's

Fall: The Role of Hillary Clinton in the ouster and killing of Colonel Muammar Qaddafi That Left Libya a Failed State and a

Terrorist Haven.” This article, or series of articles, which were based on a number of interviews from people who were right on the inside of the entire decision-making process that led into the decision to overthrow Qaddafi, and to ultimately have him killing, very vividly paints the picture of the months leading up into that decision, and Hillary Clinton’s central role in making that decision on the inside of the Obama White House. And this, despite dire warnings from intelligence experts, and military experts, as to what the aftermath of that decision would be, and also even overtures of peace that were coming from Libya itself, and the Libyan government – overtures for a peaceful transition, which were directly and decisively ignored by the Clinton State Department and the Obama White House. These actions, this regime-change operation in Libya, as we know now very well, directly led to Libya becoming a failed state, and creating the vacuum in which Libya could be the staging ground for what has now come to be called ISIS today – these radical jihadist terrorist who in many parts are using the weapons that were channeled into Libya at that time by the Hillary Clinton-Obama operation, in order to overthrow Qaddafi. They are now using those weapons to take over large swaths of territory in Northern Africa, and in the Middle East. Obviously, this is the context for the tragic events that unfolded on Sept. 11 in Benghazi in which Ambassador Stevens and three other Americans were killed. However, I think this point to the more important discussion that should be being had: What was

Hillary

Clinton's role? What was Barack Obama's role in the decision for

regime change in Libya, and what will be the outcome if we allow

this same regime-change operation to continue to take place in Syria and in many other countries?

One note I would say just before inviting Jeff up to the podium to discuss this more in detail, is the importance of the

coincidence of the publication of these series of articles in the

{New York Times} with Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard's surprise announcement that she was resigning as vice-chair of the DNC in

order to more aggressively campaign against Hillary Clinton, explicitly because of Hillary Clinton's identity as a strong and

vocal advocate of the policy of regime change what Tulsi Gabbard

has said she personally witnessed the tragic and disastrous consequences of on the ground in Iraq, after the decision to have

regime change against Saddam Hussein. Tulsi Gabbard was active service military. And we saw the decision again in the case of Libya, and now we are confronting directly head-on whether or not

that decision will be made in Syria.

This also obviously has a lot to do with the context of Secretary of State John Kerry's efforts to create the framework

for a ceasefire, along with Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov in Syria.

Now, what I would like to ask Jeff to discuss at the podium is what Mr. LaRouche's take has been on the significance of these

articles, and also the very precise timing of these articles

being published right now, during this Presidential campaign season, and what the implications of this should be seen in terms of the ongoing fight behind the scenes continuing to this day in the Obama Administration.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. Well, the two-part series, lengthy articles that were published late last week, early this week, in the New York Times bring back into stark relief and memory, the fact that the decision to overthrow and execute Qaddafi was not only a turning point in recent history. It unleashed a flood of instability. Massive amounts of weapons flooded out of Libya. All across Africa a structure was set up for laundering those weapons into Syria, where they ultimately wound up in the hands of both the al-Qaeda, and later the Islamic State forces. This has been a source of mass death, grave instability, throughout the entire Africa and Middle East region, and beyond.

Now, what the {New York Times} articles make clear is something that was well-known to us and which Mr. LaRouche commented on exhaustively as these events were playing out. But from the standpoint of the current elections and things related to the ongoing war danger, now at the threshold of the danger of a general war, a nuclear war, it's very important to reflect back on this.

Effectively, as the result of Hillary Clinton joining the White House, joining President Obama, joining Samantha Power, joining Susan Rice and Valerie Jarrett, in pressing for the violent overthrow of the Qaddafi government, the assassination

of

Qaddafi, and effectively the installation of the Muslim Brotherhood and al-Qaeda into power in Libya, this meant that Hillary Clinton had completely capitulated to Obama. Prior to that point, during the Obama administration, despite the fact that it was a grave political mistake on the part of Hillary Clinton to have become a part of the Obama Administration in the

first place, the fact is that she had generally aligned herself

with Defense Secretary Gates, with General Dempsey, chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and had been a barrier to the worst kinds of British policies coming out of Obama, Jarrett, Rice, Power, and the others grouped around this President.

Obama is a British agent, plain and simple, and that was one of the first points that Mr. LaRouche emphasized in our discussion earlier today. And he said, Look, Hillary Clinton was

terrified into playing the role that she played in Libya. She was

not the only person pushing for regime change; she was, in the words of Roberts Gates, "the tilt factor". The decisive vote in a

very close 51-49 vote, where Gates himself, the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, were opposed to launching the no-fly zone. Launching what

was being mislabelled a humanitarian intervention, when from the

very outset it was always about regime change. You've got to remember that the characteristic of the Obama Presidency is to be

found in those Tuesday kill sessions; where the President sits down with a group of national security advisors, Cabinet members,

representatives of the military and intelligence community,

and
makes life-or-death arbitrary decisions to add people's names
to
the kill lists. In some cases – we know in at least four
instances – people were put on that kill list who were
American
citizens; who were deprived of any day in court, any due
process,
and were summarily assassinated. Whether by special forces,
whether by drone attacks, or combinations of both.
So, that's the character of the Obama administration. And
with the 2011 decision to overthrow Qaddafi, Hillary Clinton –
out of absolute fear – remember, you're dealing with a
President
who relishes the idea of coming up with weekly lists of
targets
for assassination. With that Libya decision, with Clinton's
decision to side with her own worst enemies, going all the way
back to the 2008 campaign when she campaigned against Barack
Obama; when Samantha Power publicly went out on the stump
calling
her a witch. When she capitulated and sided with those
British
forces in the Libya operation, she not only participated in
the
unleashing of absolute Hell across much of Africa and the
Middle
East region; but she caved in to people who, at an earlier
point,
she knew were absolutely despicable and were her avowed
enemies.
That capitulation is something that she will live with
forever.
Now, recently, in the course of reviewing the Africa events,
the Libya events, some additional information has come out
that
even puts a further punctuation point on the fact that there

was

a top-down decision in which Secretary Clinton participated, along with President Obama, to overthrow Qaddafi; no questions asked, no second thoughts. There's a very precise timeline that

has been provided by a retired US Navy Rear Admiral named Charles

Kubic, who was retired from the Navy and was a business man working in Libya – also a trained engineer. And when the United

Nations Security Council passed the resolution to establish a no-fly zone and a “humanitarian corridor” around Benghazi – this

was on March 19, 2011 – on that very day, Rear Admiral Kubic was

contacted by people in the inner circle of Qaddafi; and they said, “Let's talk.” Let's not go with diplomatic formulations.

Let's immediately convene a battlefield 72-hour truce. And during that time, let's discuss an orderly procedure for standing

down the Libyan forces that were moving on Benghazi, and on an orderly transition of power. Qaddafi was prepared to leave Libya, to go into exile; to arrange a negotiated government to follow from him, and to basically stand down the Libyan forces that were, in fact, battling al-Qaeda and other jihadist networks

in the area around Benghazi and Misurata inside Libya. Admiral

Kubic conveyed immediately the approach that he had gotten from

the head of Qaddafi's personal security. He conveyed it to Stuttgart, Germany; it was reported to General Carter Ham, the head of the Africa Command, and General Ham responded favorably.

Details were being worked out the very next day to convene exactly this kind of battlefield truce and negotiating

process;

either in Tripoli, or right off the shores of Libya on a designated US military ship. And in fact, there was a halt on the part of Qaddafi of the military movement toward Benghazi and

Misurata. So, in other words, everything was there within the first 24 hours of when the bombing began of Libya, for the conflict to stop right there; for Qaddafi's departure; for none

of the death and destruction that followed to actually take place. On the evening of March 20, 2011, General Carter Ham issued a statement saying that the United States had no interest

in targetting Qaddafi. That was the return signal that the Libyans were looking for, coming from AFRICOM, that the negotiations could begin perhaps as early as the next morning. However that entire situation was cancelled; Admiral Kubic was ordered to stand down, to drop the contact. AFRICOM was ordered

to stand down and abandon any plans for any such negotiation for

Qaddafi's departure. Because the decision had been made "higher

up in the administration" that there would be no turning back; that this was a regime change operation, and in fact, a part of

that was the fact that the British – who had agents inside the inner circle of Qaddafi's own personal security detail – were the ones who fingered his location and set up his assassination

later that year.

So, in other words, the destruction of Libya, the destruction of Africa, that came in part as a measure of Hillary

Clinton's capitulation to President Obama, and above all else, to

the British; could have been at least short-circuited and the

worst damage prevented. The death of Ambassador Stephens and the three other American officials a year and later probably could have been averted. But none of that happened, because there was a willful decision; undoubtedly the decision was made in London, was passed in through Obama. And rather than fighting against that, Hillary Clinton capitulated; and it was out of a fear of Obama, out of a fear that this was a killer President. There were a number of opportunities where she had the possibility to resign and put the spotlight where it properly belonged; but none of those things happened. And as the result of that, all of the African continent is now one extended battle zone. As the result of that, we have the existence of the Islamic State; because Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar flooded Syria and Iraq with the kinds of weapons that had been derived from what was at one point a secured Qaddafi arsenal of all kinds of weapons. And those weapons have now spread chaos, death, and destruction across that entire swath of North Africa and the Middle East. That's the legacy, that's the consequence of the fact that, as Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton failed to uphold her responsibilities; capitulated to her own worst avowed enemies in the Obama administration, and unfortunately, the rest is history. Mr. LaRouche, at the time, pointedly said, from the moment that he heard that Qaddafi had been assassinated, that the real targets were Russia and China; and that these events in 2011 were

the beginning of a process that would now accelerate towards the general warfare – potentially thermonuclear warfare – involving the United States, Russia, and China. So, look back with a certain degree of hindsight, and understand the consequences of what happened in that critical moment of March of 2011; and see how all of the events that have followed from that, and why we are on the verge of a potential thermonuclear war of annihilation of mankind. Understand how critical decisions in critical moments, shape events for long periods of time to come.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. Now, in the context of what Jeff just said about the overarching policy that has emanated from this Obama administration against Russia and against China, you've seen obvious economic warfare also that's taken place from the United States against both of those countries. The next question pertains to one of those aspects; and I know that it will also give Jeff an opportunity to discuss a little bit about what Mr. LaRouche's views are on the necessity of a massive mobilization inside the United States to rebuild our economy, spearheaded by Kesha Rogers' efforts in Texas to revive the legacy of the NASA space program. So, the question reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche, the US Department of Commerce has imposed a 265% tariff on Chinese cold-rolled steel. The Department of Commerce stated that the tariffs are meant to punish China for dumping cold-rolled steel

onto the market; which is used to make auto parts, appliances, and shipping containers. In your view, will these imposed tariffs help the US steel industry? And if not, what measures do you recommend to revitalize our steel industry?"

STEINBERG: Well, the first thing that Mr. LaRouche said was, if you want to revitalize the US economy, then you've got to start out by shutting down Wall Street; because Wall Street right now is about the only steel sector left in the United States – they steal everything that's available to be stolen. Now, I think that this move by the Commerce Department came as the result of pressure from a number of members of Congress; most of whom are simply desperate and misguided and are not even among the worst people in the US Congress. The idea that somehow or other, putting prohibitive tariffs on the importing of Chinese steel at this stage of the game, when the entire real economy of the United States is in a state of absolute collapse, is the ultimate folly. Now, let's just look at some of the basic facts of what's been going on inside the US economy; and particularly, let's look at the steel sector. We don't have the data for all of 2015, but we know that between 2014 and 2015 there was actually a 26% decline in the amount of steel imported from China. And the reason for that is because there was an even greater decline in the overall steel utilization inside the US economy; because the US economy is in a state of physical, economic collapse. One of the areas where you had substantial

use of steel, not on a gigantic scale, but on a significant scale, was in the shale oil and gas sector; which we know is in a

state of collapse right now. And the fact that it was that sector that was a major source of steel use in the US economy, just tells you how far down the scale of real economic development that we have fallen.

Now, the fact of the matter is, that on a global scale centered in the trans-Atlantic region, you have a significant collapse in physical economic output. Real production in the United States has collapsed; we've gone through 15 consecutive months of a decline in industrial output. The shale oil and gas

sector collapse is a small piece at the tail end of a 40-year process of economic collapse, disintegration, out-sourcing of what little real economic activity was going on. So the idea that a tariff, at this point, is going to protect a domestic industry that collapsed over the past 40 years, is an act of desperation; when in fact, we need real creative thinking.

Now, {Executive Intelligence Review} has recently – we've talked about it on this show before – produced a supplement to the World Land-Bridge report, called "The United States Must Join

the World Land-Bridge"; and it lays out a clear game plan for a

genuine economic revival of the United States. It starts by shutting down Wall Street; they're hopelessly bankrupt. And the

bankruptcy of Wall Street is now in the process of advancing the

disintegration of the real economy of the United States; and the

real economy of the United States means the American people.

When we were discussing earlier today with Mr. LaRouche, he said,

"Look, what's the most chilling indication of the real rate of collapse of the US economy? It's the exponential increase in

the
number of people dying of heroin overdoses; it's the number of
people, the exponential rise in the number of people
committing
suicide in other ways, as well. It's the desperation and
demoralization of a population that was once inspired, that
was
once the most productive population in the world; and is now
fallen into a state of complete collapse." In 2005, we saw
the
takedown of the auto sector; and what that meant was the
machine
tool design sector associated with the US auto sector was
wiped
out. Under President Obama, there has been a conscious and
systematic policy of shutting down our space program; and it's
only through that space exploration, as Megan just emphasized,
that you have any prospect of a genuine future for mankind.
The good news is that the report coming out of Texas is that
some of the leading circles historically associated with NASA,
current and former NASA employees, have reached the point
where
they realize: 1) that it's all over for the United States if
there's not a real fight to revive the space program. They
see
certain glimmers of reflection of what was once a driving
force
in the growth of real productivity in the American economy;
namely, the space program, centered in NASA Houston. You had
the
return to Earth of Scott Kelly, who spent a year up in space;
an
exciting development, it's a glimmer. It's a sort of smell or
fragrance of the fact that NASA can be revived; that we can
have
a resurgence of the kind of optimism that we had during the
Kennedy Presidency, before he was assassinated. Where the

Apollo

program was the centerpiece for the whole development of the real

US economy. You've got NASA people now beginning to say, "Yes,

we're ready for a real fight." The fight is on; and you've got

reflections of that that you'll see emerging as a tendency in other parts of the country. Southern California used to be a major center of our space program; you had the Jet Propulsion Lab

in the Los Angeles area, a crucial component. And you, of course, had the Lawrence Livermore Lab up in the Bay area. These

are centers that can be revived; but only if we get a core revival of that NASA mission. The mission to join with China, with Russia, with India, with other nations, in exploring and developing the universe as part of man's extraterrestrial mission.

So, if you think about the steel issue again, from that standpoint, how much steel would be required for the kind of nationwide high-speed rail system that is part of the "US joins

the World Land-Bridge"? How much steel will be required for a proliferation of nuclear power plants throughout the United States? The modernization of the existing plants, and they're replacement where appropriate, by fourth generation nuclear power

plants. What would be the requirements once we've actually completed the process of successfully commercializing fusion? These are the issues for the future; but these fights have to won

today. And if you want to understand the biggest mass kill factor with President Obama, it has been his killing of the NASA

space program; because that is a mass execution of the future. And so, these issues are all very much inextricably tied

together. Unless we get a revolutionary change in policy, which means a return to the kind of Hamiltonian principles that we last saw on display in the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency overall, and in the Kennedy Apollo program in particular. These ideas are there; and we're getting now, coming from the Houston vicinity, from the NASA center there, a rumbling. The start of a real fight to basically bring the United States back into space; as part of a collaborative mission for all of mankind. And as I say, once that happens, the issue of steel, the issue of dumping; all of this becomes meaningless. Because the actual physical requirements will be so enormous, the return to optimism and the benefits of that – particularly for a lost generation of young people, who represent a high percentage of those who are going off as heroin addicts, who are committing suicide, who have no sense of future. We've got to restore the future; and that starts with a fight to revive NASA. And the good news is that that fight is now beginning; it's in its early moments, but it's a fight that is winnable. And the future of the United States hangs in the balance.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. Because Jeff mentioned it, I would just encourage our viewers to revisit the pamphlet; which is both available in print form, and in digital form: "The United States Must Join the New Silk Road; A Hamiltonian Vision for an Economic Renaissance"; which features much of what Jeff just discussed in terms of a national high-speed rail program, a Bering Straits tunnel or bridge project to connect us to

Eurasia.

To the phenomenal developments that are happening now in China;

but it also has an entire section on a science-driver development

mission, which includes much of the cutting edge work that needs

to be done with a revived space program – not just in the United

States, but also collaboration that we must begin to cooperate with China's and Russia's space programs. And have what Mr. LaRouche has so aptly termed the common aims of mankind; that is

the truest form of a war avoidance program for a durable piece.

So, with that said, I would like to thank Jeff; and I would also like to thank Megan Beets for joining us here this evening.

And I would encourage you to stay tuned to larouchepac.com.

Thank you very much.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 3.
marts 2016:
Schiller Instituttet har
foretræde for Folketingets
Udenrigsudvalg:**

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

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:
Forlæng Silkevejen til
Mellemøsten
Sagen om Nykredit/Totalcredit**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Endnu flere millioner af
flygtninge vil komme,
hvis der ikke er økonomisk
udvikling**

3. marts 2016 – Hjemvendt fra sit besøg til Marokko, Algeriet og Tunesien sagde den tyske minister for udvikling, Gerd Müller, til *Evangelischer Pressedienst (EPD)* den 1. marts, at det er på høje tid, at verdenssamfundet øgede investeringerne i de krisehærgede lande i udviklingssektoren. Især for de nordafrikanske lande er det nødvendigt med et økonomisk partnerskab af en helt anden dimension, sagde han, »for at styrke staterne omkring Middelhavet i vores umiddelbare

nabolag ... og derigennem stabilisere dem i deres nuværende situation af transformering.«

»Hvis vi ikke gør dette, vil hundrede tusinder, måske endda millioner af mennesker, komme til os i de kommende år«, advarede Müller og fortsatte med, at, alt imens den igangværende diskussion i Tyskland fokuserer på konflikterne i Syrien, Irak og Afghanistan, »så er der ud over dette selvfølgelig konflikter og krisebrændpunkter, der vil berøre os på længere sigt. Jeg tænker på Ukraine, som vi ikke bør glemme, eller Sydsudan eller Den Centralafrikanske Republik«. Det er også nødvendigt at yde bistand for at stabilisere disse lande.

Hans eget ministerium, forklarede Müller, har tredoblet sine støtteprogrammer til flygtninge i løbet af de seneste to år og bruger nu 1 milliard euro. »1 milliard euro er mange penge – hvis Europa ville øge dette beløb til 10 – 10 milliard euro, som jeg anser for nødvendigt, kunne vi give hundrede tusinder af mennesker et perspektiv på stedet [i deres hjemlande]«, sagde Müller. »Vi er i færd med at uddanne flygtningebørn og -unge, og vi bygger skoler. Vi bygger infrastruktur i det nordlige Irak ... Og vi genopbygger landsbyer sammen med flygtningene, så folk kan vende tilbage til deres hjem.«

Foto: Gerd Müller sammen med den tunesiske premierminister Habib Essid

En Marshallplan ville ikke alene standse udvandringen af flygtninge, men mange ville vende hjem, siger FN's de Mistura

2. marts 2016 – »I det øjeblik, vi, om Gud vil, har en standsning af fjendtlige handlinger, adgang for humanitær hjælp og gennemførelse af disse tre punkter – ny styrelse, forfatning og valg – vil jeg vædde på, af mange [syrere] ikke alene ikke vil rejse, men vil vende hjem, især, hvis vi har en massiv 'Marshallplan' for genopbygning af Syrien«, sagde FN's særlige udsending Staffan de Mistura til Reuters' Tom Miles den 1. marts.

FN vil påbegynde den næste runde af fredsforhandlinger for Syrien den 9. marts, sagde de Mistura til Reuters i går. »Vi har udskudt det til eftermiddagen den 9. af logistiske og tekniske årsager, og også, for at våbenstilstanden skal være bedre etableret«, sagde de Mistura. »Jeg vil ikke udskyde det længere.«

»Vi ønsker ikke, at diskussionerne i Genève skal blive til en diskussion om krænkelser eller ikke omhandlende våbenhvilen; vi ønsker, at de faktisk skal adressere kernen i det hele«, sagde han i et interview. De forenede Nationer håbede, at en standsning af fjendtlighederne ville gøre det muligt for humanitær hjælp at blive sendt ind i belejrede områder, og muliggøre nye fredsforhandlinger.

USA og Rusland, der udfærdigede aftalen om ophør af fjendtligheder, aftalte at dele information og håndhæve våbenhvilen, fordi FN ikke var involveret i denne proces,

sagde de Mistura. Det fordrede, at begge sider skulle dele fælles kort over slagmarken og overvåge situationen med droner og satellitter, fordi det ikke var muligt at udstationere tusinder af observatører på jorden. FN havde kun generelle kort over situationen inden våbenhvilen, sagde de Mistura.

Efter at den første runde af fredsforhandlinger stoppede den 3. februar, sagde de Mistura, at han ønskede, at diskussionerne skulle fokusere på forfatningsmæssig reform, styrelse og afholdelse af valg om 18 måneder, og at løsladelse af fanger også ville »stå meget højt på dagsordenen«. Hertil kommer, at krigen har skabt flere end fem millioner flygtninge, der også skal have en mulighed for at stemme ved et fremtidigt valg, sagde de Mistura.

Reuters rapporterer fra Damaskus, at mange, der overvejede at forlade Syrien, gentænkte denne beslutning pga. standsningen af fjendtlighederne, »så skrøbelig og vanskelig, den end er«.

Foto: FN's særlige udsending for Syrien Staffan de Mistura, foto fra 26. februar 2016.

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.

Den tyske udenrigsminister Steinmeier citerer Franklin Roosevelt i Washington; kræver åbne grænser og en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten

Tirsdag, 1. marts 2016 – Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier talte i dag på George Washington Universitet og citerede her Franklin Roosevelt og krævede åbne grænser.

»Det værste, vi kan gøre, er at forsegle os«, sagde Steinmeier med henvisning til flygtningekrisen i Europa, så vel som til debatten om immigration i USA.

Han lagde ud med at tale om flygtningekrisen i Europa. Han citerede Roosevelts berømte, første indsættelsestale, at det eneste, vi har at frygte, er selve frygten, men henviste dernæst til det efterfølgende, hvor Roosevelt sagde, at frygt »lammer den nødvendige indsats for at vende tilbagetog til fremgang«.

»Vi må inddrage og adressere rødderne til dette problem«, sagde Steinmeier. »Tilhængerne af frygt gør det modsatte. Men vi kan ikke flygte fra problemet. Verden er for indbyrdes forbundet«, sagde han. »At rejse mure er en dårlig idé, uanset, hvem der betaler for dem«, sagde han, med tydelig adresse til Donald Trump.

Han understregede Ruslands betydning. »En del af dette lederskab vil være vores dialog med Rusland«, sagde Steinmeier. »Vi kan ikke undvære Rusland. Vi må inddrage Rusland. Vi må huske den lektie, vi lærte af vore fædre og bedstefædre [der var udstationeret til Sovjetunionens grænser under den Kolde Krig].«

Med hensyn til våbenhvilen i Syrien sagde Steinmeier: »Hver eneste time, hvor våbenstilstanden holder, er vigtig for verden, så vel som for de mennesker, der er direkte berørt af den. Vi må yde de flygtninge, der flygter fra denne krig, beskyttelse. Det er ikke alene en humanitær pligt, men er også indskrevet i EU's statutter og Genève-traktaterne. USA har altid været kendt som et land, der har givet et tilflugtssted for dem, der flygtede fra krig og undertrykkelse. Dette vil lykkes os, hvis vi angriber den grundlæggende årsag til denne migration.«

Det første spørgsmål kom fra en repræsentant fra *EIR*, der spurgte ham, om ikke han var enig i, at vi har behov for en ny

Marshallplan for Mellemøsten, der indledningsvis kunne bygge på den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings vigtige initiativ for en forlængelse af det økonomiske projekt for Ét bælte, én vej ind i Mellemøsten og herigennem fjerne det grundlæggende problem med regionens manglende udvikling.

Steinmeier kom med et temmelig langt, men noget forsigtigt, svar på spørgsmålet. Han bemærkede, at omstændighederne i det ødelagte Europa efter Anden Verdenskrig var meget anderledes end i nutidens Mellemøsten. I Europa var der en kvalificeret arbejdsstyrke, som omgående kunne sættes til at arbejde. I Europa fandtes der allerede en industriel udvikling, som man kunne bygge på. Dette var generelt ikke tilfældet i Mellemøsten. Alt imens der fandtes nogen kapacitet af denne art i Irak, så var det ikke tilfældet andetsteds. Og selv i Irak, så var en stor del af landets territorium stadig under ISIS' kontrol. Mange mennesker var allerede migreret til Europa. Alt imens der var behov for økonomisk assistance, især mad og husly, så eksisterede der stadig en militær situation i store dele af regionen. »Vi må først skabe en situation, hvor folk kan vende tilbage til deres hjemlande. Vi må bruge alle vore kræfter til at forsøge at samle disse lande igen.«

Tyrkiet og Saudi-Arabien vil sabotere våbenstilstand i Syrien

29. februar 2016 – Generalløjtnant Sergei Kuralenko, chef for det russiske militære koordinationscenter i Latakia, sagde i går, at, ikke alene var der indløbet rapporter om, at Tyrkiet havde skudt ind over grænsen ind i Tel Abyad, men også, at

skønsmæssigt 100 militante kæmpere var krydset over grænsen fra Tyrkiet og ind i Syrien for at tilslutte sig et ISIS-angreb på landsbyen. Tel Abyad, der ligger omkring 70 km øst for Kobani, blev tilbageerobret af det kurdiskanførte Folkets Beskyttelsesenheder (YPG) og hermed allierede arabiske militser i juni måned 2015. Den russiske rapport kom tilsyneladende fra YPG, der hævdede at have slået ISIS-angrebet tilbage.

Den russiske viceudenrigsminister Sergei Ryabkov udstedte i dag en ligefrem advarsel til, og om, Tyrkiet. Det er meget farligt, at Tyrkiet »ikke har forladt ideen om angreb hen over grænsen ... for at skabe visse zoner på syrisk territorium langs den tyrkiske grænse«, sagde Ryabkov. »Vi har tidligere set eksempler, hvor følelserne rent faktisk løb af med dem, der traf beslutningerne i Tyrkiet.« Hvis dette skulle ske under våbenstilstanden, »kunne det udvikle sig til en tidsindstillet bombe, der ville afstedkomme, ikke en forsinket, men en omgående handling. Jeg ønsker at advare mine tyrkiske kolleger imod dette«, sagde han.

Unavngivne tyrkiske regeringsfolk benægtede, at de skulle have beskudt Tel Abyad; men i dag indrømmede andre derimod, at der var blevet skudt hen over grænsen ind i Azaz og hævdede, at deres mål er ISIS og ikke de kurdiske YPG-styrker, der er omfattet af våbenstilstanden.

Den saudiske udenrigsminister Adel al-Jubeir anklagede også Rusland og den syriske regerings luftvåben for at overtræde våbenstilstanden og sagde, at Riyadh diskutererede spørgsmålet med internationale magter. Under en pressekonference med den danske udenrigsminister [Kristian Jensen] i Riyadh sagde al-Jubeir, at der ville foreligge en »Plan B«, hvis det blev klart, at den syriske regering og dens allierede ikke var seriøse mht. våbenstilstanden, selv om han ikke kom med nogen detaljer. Virkeligheden er den, at saudierne ikke har magt til at gennemtvinge nogen Plan B.

Foto: Den saudiske og danske udenrigsminister, hhv. Adel al-Jubeir og Kristian Jensen, under den fælles pressekonference i Riyadh, 28. februar 2016.

Syrisk våbenstilstand holder trods forsøg på sabotage

29. februar, 2016 – Den amerikansk-russiske våbenstilstand i Syrien synes at holde på tredje dag, men forsøg på at ødelægge den er i fuld gang. Ifølge en rapport fra Reuters sagde FN's generalsekretær Ban Ki-moon i dag, at indstillingen af kamphandlingerne i det store og hele holder. Men i Geneve, hvor våbenhvilens særlige arbejdsgruppe, den Internationale Støttegruppe for Syrien, holdt møde, sagde den franske udenrigsminister Jean-Marc Ayrault til journalister, "Vi har modtaget indikationer på, at angreb, inklusive luftangreb, er fortsat i zoner, der kontrolleres af den moderate opposition."

Det russiske koordinationscenter i Latakia rapporterede i går om ni overtrædelser, inklusive en hændelse i den nordlige del af Latakiaprovinsen, hvorunder militante kæmpere fra gruppen Jabhat al Nusra skød mod en oppositionsgruppe, der er omfattet af våbenhvilen.

Den saudisk-støttede Højeste Forhandlingskomité, hvis virkelige sigte har været regimeskifte i Damaskus, har truet med, at, hvis russerne og den syriske hær ikke ophører med at overtræde våbenstilstanden, vil den bryde sammen. I et brev til FN's generalsekretær Ban Ki-moon i går sagde oppositionen, at overtrædelserne ville undergrave internationale bestræbelser på at garantere den fortsatte våbenstilstand og føre til sammenbrud af den politiske proces, der er vedtaget

af FN. Komiteen hævdede, at russiske krigsfly i søndags gennemførte 26 bombetogter over områder, hvor oprørsgrupper, der overholder våbenhvilen, opererer; Komiteen beskyldte Moskva for at kaste klyngebomber over beboede områder, og den hævdede, at bomberne forårsagede mange civile tab og tilskadekomne. FN's særlige udsending for Syrien Staffan de Mistura sagde, at overtrædelser vil blive taget op, men en vestlig diplomat sagde til Reuters, at de Mistura har påpeget, at antallet af luftangreb er gået ned fra 100 om dagen til 6-8 om dagen, så man måtte se på situationen i et vist perspektiv.

Hvorom alting er, så sagde Komiteens talsmand Salem al-Muslat, at Riyadh-gruppen alligevel ville overholde aftalen. "Det er besluttet at forholde sig i ro og ikke foretage sig noget, og jeg tror, de vil holde sig til våbenstilstanden," sagde Muslat. "I går var den første dag, hvor folk virkelig kunne gå ud og spadserere i gaderne."

Det russiske Forsvarsministerium annoncerede i går, at overvågningscentret ved dets luftbase vil udsende daglige rapporter med aktuelle data for forholdsregler for forsoningen mellem parterne på begge sider. Disse vil blive sendt til det amerikanske center i Amman, til arbejdsgruppen i Geneve samt blive offentliggjort på Forsvarsministeriets webside. Generalløjtnant Sergei Kuralenko, chefen for det russiske center, rapporterede i går, at de havde fået kendskab til ni overtrædelser af våbenhvilen i de foregående 24 timer. "Generelt bliver reglerne for våbenhvilen overholdt i Syrien," sagde Kuralenko.

USA's Centralkommando er angiveligt enig. En talsmand for det amerikanske militær i Bagdad sagde til den russiske nyhedsstation Sputnik, at, "som det fremgår af talrige rapporter, så ser det ud til, at indstillingen af fjendtlighederne stort set holder."

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

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

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

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

GDE Error: Requested URL is invalid

Dias til mødet:





Mulighed for fred i Syrien. EIR's Jeffrey Steinberg forklarer, hvordan våbenhvilen kom i stand, og hvad der må til for at den bliver varig

LPAC fredags-webcast 26. februar 2016, dansk oversættelse.

Hvis man derfor sluttelig ønsker, at den syriske fredsaftale skal blive en succes, altså holde, så må man, ud over det presserende nødvendige behov for en Marshallplan/Landbro-hjørnesten for at sikre, at freden er varig, også fjerne

Obama. Og man må bringe det britiske imperiesystem til fald.

Der findes muligheder for en erstatning, men disse erstatninger vil kun ske, når Obama er blevet fjernet af reelle forfatningsmæssige grunde, og på det tidspunkt, hvor Det britiske Imperium har fået en reglementeret begravelse.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

En Fredsplan for Sydvestasien. Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche. EIR Pressemeddelelse for udgivelse af den arabiske udgave af »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«

The English and Arabic version is below the Danish.

På et tidspunkt, hvor flygtningekrisen truer med at blive til en hidtil uset humanitær krise, og som sprænger Den europæiske Unions sammenhængskraft og endda muligvis selve dens eksistens i stumper og stykker, er en vision om håb for udvikling af Sydvestasien og Afrika den eneste måde, hvorpå situationen kan vendes til det bedre. På et tidspunkt, hvor den transatlantiske verdens finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at

krakke, er udviklingsperspektivet for en genopbygning af Mellemøsten og resten af Sydvestasien til at udgøre en bro mellem Asien, Europa og Afrika den eneste drivkraft for økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

28. februar 2016 – Den arabiske version af EIR's specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«, i sin fulde udstrækning, er nu færdig og klar til udgivelse og distribuering. Den 400 sider lange rapport (med et appendiks del 6 om Sydvestasien, der omfatter EIR's Projekt Fønix: En genopbygningsplan for Syrien) er blevet oversat af Hussein Askary (med færdigt layout af Ali Sharaf), og »Den Nye Silkvejs-lady«, alias Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har på smukkeste vis skrevet forordet, som følger:

En Fredsplan for Sydvestasien

Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Washington, D.C., 26. februar 2016

Det er muligvis et udslag af et lykkeligt sammentræf eller af Forsynets indgriben, at den arabiske oversættelse af rapporten om Verdenslandbroen udkommer netop nu, hvor udsigten til en våbenhvile i Syrien er ved at blive en realitet. Overenskomsten mellem den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov har et potentiale til at bringe den fem år lange krig, der har kostet hundreder tusinder af mennesker livet, til en afslutning. Men i betragtning af de enormt komplekse omstændigheder i regionen bør det også stå klart, at en blot og bar kontrakt om at standse kampene vil være for skrøbelig til at vare ved og overleve nye provokationer fra de samme kræfters side, der

oprindeligt var ansvarlige for krigen.

Den eneste måde, hvorpå en varig fred kan garanteres, er den omgående iværksættelse af en omfattende udviklingsplan for hele Sydvestasien, med en udviklingsplan for integreret infrastruktur; en plan, der ikke alene genopbygger krigens ødelagte byer og landsbyer, men som anviser en langt mere fundamental fremgangsmåde for atter at forvandle denne region, der engang var en af den menneskelige civilisations vugger, og som på forskellige tidspunkter i historien var hjemsted for tidens mest fremskredent udviklede kulturer, til en af verdens mest avancerede. Målet må være at udløse regionens folks kreativitet og bringe deres produktivitet op på samme niveau som Europas, USA's eller Kinas.

Dette er absolut muligt, og i særdeleshed, fordi Ruslands og Kinas samarbejde repræsenterer magtfulde naboer, der, sammen med lande i regionen, kan udvirke denne udvikling. Hvis de udviklingsprojekter, som foreslås i rapporten, i bogstavelig forstand bliver gennemført med start fra i morgen, således, at udbyttet ved fred bliver synligt for alle parter i regionen, så kan våbenhvilen i Syrien og gennemførelsen af det, man kunne kalde en Silkevejs-Marshallplan, dog uden denne betegnelses tilknytning til en kold krig, blive en agent for et nyt scenarie for hele verden.

På et tidspunkt, hvor flygtningekrisen truer med at blive til en hidtil uset humanitær krise, og som sprænger Den europæiske Unions sammenhængskraft og endda muligvis selve dens eksistens i stumper og stykker, er en vision om håb for udvikling af Sydvestasien og Afrika den eneste måde, hvorpå situationen kan vendes til det bedre. På et tidspunkt, hvor den transatlantiske verdens finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at krakke, er udviklingsperspektivet for en genopbygning af Mellemøsten og resten af Sydvestasien til at udgøre en bro mellem Asien, Europa og Afrika den eneste drivkraft for økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

Den arabiske *EIR*-rapport kan bestilles (kun i papirudgave) gennem *EIR* News Service og alle internationale institutioner, der er associeret med LaRouche-bevægelsen, herunder Schiller Instituttet i Danmark.

The English and Arabic version pdf. of
A Peace Plan for Southwest Asia
by Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

EIR press release in English and Arabic on the occassion of the release of the arabic version of "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge."

(The English, Arabic, and Chinese versions of the report are available from The Schiller Institute in Denmark at: +45 53 57 00 51 or +45 35 43 00 33, or si@schillerinstitut.dk

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

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

Den russiske præsident Putins intervention med en flankoperation i Syrien og den bredere, regionale situation, med begyndelse i september 2015, har på dramatisk vis omformet hele geometrien i de globale anliggender. Obama er mod sin vilje blevet banket ind i et samarbejde med Rusland om den aktuelle våbenhvile i Syrien, der fortsat holder under det amerikanske og russiske militærs voksende koordination. Dramatiske, positive forandringer finder sted i Iran, Egypten og andre nationer, der har valgt at alliere sig med BRIKS-udviklingen. Og befolkningen i USA – på trods af en årtier lang, britisk fordummelsesproces ind i pragmatisme, og som nu er ved at kvæles af et valgcirkus – responderer med uvant optimisme til LaRouche-bevægelsens mobilisering, der på enestående vis resonerer med det aktuelle, politiske fremstød fra både Putin og Xi Jinpings kinesiske regering. Når alt kommer til alt, så blev meget af deres politik, og mest eftertrykkeligt den Nye Silkevej, oprindeligt udtænkt og promoveret af Lyndon og Helga LaRouche.

Som et eksempel på denne begyndende renæssance står den særdeles succesfulde **Schiller Institut konference, der blev afholdt den 27. feb. »i skyggen af Johnson Space Center«** i Texas, med medlem af LPAC Policy Committee og tidligere

demokratisk kandidat til Kongressen, Kesha Rogers, der genaktiverede og på ny gav liv til NASA-veteraner og andre omkring vores nødvendige mission: at mennesket sluttelig er en fornuftsart baseret i rummet, som Rogers understregede det. På samme måde var en *forandring* i modtagelighed åbenlyst til stede ved den nylige konference i Seattle, med Helga Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler; ved et arrangement på Georgetown University, hvor Matthew Ogden holdt hovedtalen; ved LaRouche-bevægelsens Verdenslandbro-konferencer i Hermosillo (Mexico) og i Lima (Peru), samt andre steder.

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

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

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

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

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

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast

26. februar 2016:

Mulighed for fred i Syrien

Jeffrey Steinberg giver os Lyndon LaRouches tanker om muligheden for fred i Syrien, og Benjamin Deniston taler om tre nødvendige aspekter af rumforskning.

Engelsk udskrift.

Jeff Steinberg gives Lyndon LaRouche's thoughts on the potential for peace in Syria, and Ben Deniston speaks on three necessary aspects of space science.

TRANSCRIPT

JASON ROSS: Good evening. This is February 26, 2016, and you're joining us for the regular LaRouche PAC Friday webcast. I'm Jason Ross, and I'm joined in the studio today by Jeff Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review, as well as Ben Denison from the LaRouche PAC Basement team. The three of us had an opportunity to speak with Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche this afternoon, and the comments you'll be hearing tonight reflect that discussion.

To start off, the topic is Syria. As few days ago, on February 22, an agreement for a ceasefire was reached, brokered by the

United States and by Russia, giving today as a deadline for armed groups to register themselves with the terms of the ceasefire, which is to take effect tonight. The institutional question to Mr. LaRouche, reads: "In your view, what efforts will make this Syrian peace process a success?" And I'd like to ask Jeff to deliver Mr. LaRouche's response.

JEFF STEINBERG: Thanks, Jason. Well, let's start with the positive side of the equation. As Jason just indicated, there is an agreement. It's been accepted by the Syrian government. It's been accepted by – at least nominally – by a number of the rebel groups. The only exclusion is ISIS and the al-Nusra, the al-Qaeda group inside Syria, who are both on the United Nations list of international terrorist organizations, and have not even been asked to participate. They are the targets, and they will continue to remain the targets as the ceasefire takes place in other parts of the country, and among other groups, both government and opposition rebel groups.

There are many difficult and complicated challenges here, obviously starting from the fact that you're talking about a ceasefire that will be going on simultaneous to ongoing combat. And the Russian government, the Syrian government, have made clear that they do intend to continue taking the war to the al-Qaeda and Nusra Front areas. And of course, they're not always going to be so clearly delineated.

What's important is that the United States and Russia are taking co-responsibility for the monitoring of this process.

Now you've seen a number of fairly dramatic announcements over the last several weeks. You had the announcement a week ago today where the terms of this detailed ceasefire agreement were worked out. Earlier in the month, on Feb. 11, on the sidelines of the Munich Security Conference, there was a meeting of the International Syria Support Group, again chaired by the U.S. and Russia, and that's where they announced the original earlier framework for the ceasefire.

Needless to say, when Secretary of State Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov sit down, they're not starting out simply with an empty clean piece of paper. There's an enormous amount of back-channel secret diplomacy that's been taking place between Russian and American officials leading to the point where these breakthroughs are at least potentially in sight within a matter of hours. And so you've had extensive U.S.-Russian military to military coordination. In fact, the advances being made against the Islamic State heartland, hardcore area of control, by the group known as the Syrian Democratic Front, largely the Kurdish YPG and certain Sunni tribes that make up that Syrian Democratic Front, they've been getting active support for their advances both from Russia and the United States. So, there are things that are going on that you will not read about in the mainstream American media, but which have all contributed to this process.

Now there is strong opposition to this entire arrangement, coming from elements within the Obama administration. President Obama himself has been caught in a kind of a trap, because on the one hand, a success by Secretary of State Kerry, who's clearly the point man on behalf of the Administration for this effort, looks good on Obama's report card, makes his legacy appear to be better than it actually should be. So, he's got a certain tendency to want to see this thing succeed.

But there's a deeper underlying hatred of Russia, and after all, he is a tool under the orders, under the thumb, of the British Empire faction. And I'll get to that aspect of the situation in just a moment.

To go at the heart of the question that's been posed, to make this work, you've got to have a solid economic foundation, and fortunately, in the Eurasian part of the world – say, the area from Russia extending all the way out to the Pacific Coast – you've got coordination among major states, particularly Russia, China, and India, and the Chinese policy of One Belt,

One Road – which involves both the New Silk Road, the overland, high-speed development corridor transportation corridors, and the Maritime Silk Road, are all ultimately programs that are the basis for a stabilizing and full development of the Middle East Region.

I should say that quite a number of years ago, Lyndon LaRouche was invited to the Zayed Center in the United Arab Emirates, to deliver a paper on the economic future prospects of the Persian Gulf, and he identified this region as the crossroads for where Eurasia and Africa come together under one great big development design that he's been working on, that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has been working on, literally for decades and decades.

So, we have a living experience from not that long ago, when under the impetus of President Bill Clinton, the late Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, head of the PLO, chairman of that organization, and Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin of Israel, where you had back in 1993, a breakthrough secretly negotiated in Oslo, and then finally signed and commemorated with the Oslo Accords which were signed at the White House. And I remember vividly that Prime Minister Rabin called this the "peace of the brave," because peace is only realized when you are willing to come up with a common plan with your worst avowed enemies, for the betterment of all.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche said at that time by way of a warning, because of his clear understanding of the overarching power of the British Empire system, the dominant political-economic system in the trans-Atlantic region: he said the only way that Oslo would work is if there were shovels, crane, building material brought in immediately. Start building up the West Bank, building up the Gaza Strip. Tap into the tremendous scientific and technological capabilities of Israel. Create a new fundamentally different reality on the ground, a reality of optimism, born of genuine economic progress.

That did not happen. The World Bank interceded. The British, through their radical elements inside Israel, assassinated Prime Minister Rabin. In all likelihood, Chairman Arafat was also assassinated through poisoning. And so that whole process basically disintegrated, and leaves us now with a worse cancer in Israel-Palestinian relations than probably we ever had.

So, it's a powerful lesson to be learned, and it's the same exact neighborhood. So, unless you've got a perspective of a genuine Marshall Plan, that is anchored in the Chinese policy of One Belt, One Road – because that's where the momentum is in the world today for real development. Unless you do that, then this will not succeed. Yes, Kerry is doing a heroic job, working in partnership with Lavrov. Putin is playing a key role. He's holding his nose and engaging in an open dialogue to keep President Obama boxed in, and prevent him from wrecking this whole thing. But really, the key is going to be fully integrating the One Belt, One Road policy, the New Silk Road, with the Middle East, as precisely the kind of crossroads that Lyndon LaRouche talked about quite a number of years back in that lecture that he delivered at the Zayed Center in the UAE.

Now, to fully answer the question, and to step back further and really face the cold hard reality: You've got to start from the fact that so long as President Obama remains in office, there is an imminent danger that the British Empire will pull the plug not just on the Syria situation, but will pull the plug on the whole planet, and draw us into a devastating war that will likely be a war of thermonuclear extinction.

At the very same time that Secretary Kerry was working on this Syria situation, in full partnership with the Russians, you've had the spectacle this week on Capitol Hill of General Breedlove, the head of NATO, Defense Secretary Ash Carter, making their pitch for a major defense budget, and in so doing, demonizing Russia. You've got all kinds of demands for

added defense spending in order to put NATO forces on the borders with Russia, in addition to their various minions around Europe and the United States. And so when you're coming under that kind of pressure, that kind of psychological tension, the tendency is going to be to look for some avenue of relief. And the avenue of relief that they're looking at is war against Russia, and secondarily, war against China.

They know perfectly well that the world from Russia, extending eastward all the way to the Pacific Coast, is an area of relative economic recovery. Russia to be sure has major economic problems, major economic policy problems. But Russia has taken a critical leading role in taking up the Syria flank in a way that has completely overturned the apple cart in terms of how the British and how Obama were steering that Middle East situation, in partnership with Turkey and Saudi Arabia. Russia seized the initiative because Putin understood the strategic principle of the flank.

China is the center of scientific and technological growth on this planet. India is aligning with that combination. So you have an area defining where two-thirds of the population now live and work, that is relatively doing well, particularly when you compare it to anything going on in the trans-Atlantic region. So you've got a situation where the British Empire is bankrupt, is desperate, and will continue by impulse to drive for war, so long as they continue to exist.

So therefore, ultimately, if you want the Syrian peace agreement to succeed, in addition to the urgent need for a Marshall Plan, Land-Bridge cornerstone to make sure that that peace is durable, you've got to remove Obama. And you've got to bring down the British Empire system.

You've got options for replacement, but those replacements will only come about when Obama has been removed for cause, for good Constitutional cause, and at the point that the British Empire has been put through an orderly funeral.

ROSS: Thank you, Jeff. On the other direction, in terms of what is possibly outside of the dying, collapsing current trajectory of the trans-Atlantic, Lyndon LaRouche has been very emphatic over the recent period on the role of space as a driver for a uniquely human mission of discovery and of economic development, pointing in particular to the role here in the United States of Kesha Rogers, for example. I'd like to ask Ben to deliver some prepared remarks that he has on space, economics, and where we need to go.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Jason. I want to take a few minutes just to lay out some conceptions about how to think about approaching this perspective for a new space program that Mr. LaRouche has been re-emphasizing recently.

And I think, to start, the most fundamental point is this is an issue of understanding the nature of mankind: getting a deeper understanding of what is mankind and mankind's mission as a uniquely creative species in what Mr. LaRouche has defined in his work, as a creative universe. That we cannot separate the ostensible space program, maybe the way a lot of people tend to think about it, in terms of spaceships and rockets and spacesuits – those are all elements of it – but this is a necessary expression of the true scientific principle of mankind's existence, as not just another animal species on this planet, but a species that has a fundamentally unique creative capability. And we must always continue to exercise that creative capability in new domains, new frontiers, new deeper principles of the universe, and that's our destiny. That's what we have to do, and that's why we look to space. That's why space is necessary at this point in the development of mankind. And as we juxtapose the horrid direction under Obama and the trans-Atlantic and the British, this is – as Jason just said – the alternative, the reality that we should be pursuing if we return to an issue of principle.

This really defines what some people discuss as, to some

degree in the highest sense, the common aims of mankind. This is the common unifying objective of the human species as a single species: the pursuit of our true nature as this creative force, into the Solar System in the near term, and looking out farther into the galaxy and the galactic perspective as the frontiers we want to push towards.

And the point is, this is what is happening in the Asian sector of the world. This is what China is doing. This is what Russia is doing, what Russia would like to do. This is what China's lunar program is vectored towards. And this is what China and Russia and their allies are openly asking the United States to come join. This is the offer being presented to the United States. China's explicit policy of "win-win" cooperation. And I want to just reference that that was a very beautiful concluding remark given by the Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi at a press conference he had with Secretary of State Kerry, just this past Tuesday, where he said, again reiterating China's conception of this "win-win" policy, he said, "Our two countries, China and the United States, we should work to make the pie of our common interests bigger. We should enlarge the pie of our common interests. We should look through telescopes to visualize the future, rather than a microscope to magnify our differences." So again, you're just continually getting this from China; this perspective of if we cooperate in true, fundamental scientific economic progress, we expand the pie. We create more wealth; we create more resources available to the human species as a whole. So, let's just get rid of this crazy imperial perspective, and get on board with the development of the future in this very real sense.

As Jason emphasized, one of the most important things I think about what Kesha Rogers has done, is she has shown that the American people want this; that they're ready for this. What she demonstrated in her campaign is, that if there is real leadership out there, the American people will respond; they

want this. They want this perspective; they're sick of what's going on. If we can provide real leadership and remove this terrible fake leadership running our country right now, there's the potential, the inherent desire in the American people to move in this direction. And she showed that very clearly in her leadership in her multiple Congressional campaigns; where with orders of magnitude less financial support than her adversaries, no support from the Democratic Party establishment – the certified hacks of the Democratic Party over there – despite all this seeming lack of resources, she showed a couple of resounding victories. Which shows you that if you have real qualified leadership out there, this is what the American people want; this potential is there.

So, this is where we have to go. Now from this standpoint, to break this down a little bit and to just kind of put some of this on the table, I think we ought to look at the space program perspective from the standpoint of two dimensions; two dimensions of what we mean about the space program. We have first, what I think is really the primary issue; and I think this is something that Mr. LaRouche is rather uniquely focussed on, and very focussed on; and I think this is something that he has uniquely and emphatically brought to the forefront of this discussion. Which is the primacy of the role of fundamental scientific discovery in this whole process. If we want to talk about space and the Solar System, in a certain very real sense, you're talking about pursuing the fundamental potential created by the scientific revolutions and discoveries of Kepler through Einstein, for example. That it's that quality of fundamental scientific discovery which is what ultimately in the most basic sense, enables mankind to rise to a fundamentally different relationship to the universe as a whole. That our ability to not just be a species on Earth interacting with the universe from the standpoint of Earth-based processes; and to actually fundamentally change our relationship to the very substance, the nature of organization of the universe. That comes in the most primary sense from the

unique quality of creative discovery per se; typified by Kepler, typified by Einstein. And I think if you draw an arc between Kepler's initial discoveries of the organization of the Solar System, the development of Kepler's work all the way up through Einstein is kind of defining another bounding condition on our understanding of the organization of the Solar System. You get a very clear picture of the kind of fundamental, uniquely human, discovery process which is the substance, the real root, of our ability to progress and transform the nature of our species, of our organization. So, that's one dimension; that's in a sense the more fundamental issue that we need to put up front and center when we talk about the "space program".

I would say the second dimension is, you could say in a sense, the realization of the potential created with those types of revolutions. Stuff we might discuss more as the infrastructure, or the physical economic development, or maybe physical economic platform which enables mankind to realize his potential to develop the Solar System. And Mr. LaRouche has been putting a lot of emphasis on the work of the German space pioneer, Krafft Ehricke, as a critical person defining many of the key elements of mankind's development of the Solar System. He was one of the original German space pioneers, the visionaries who really worked through in really significant on a very real sense. And anytime we bring up the work of Krafft Ehricke, who was also very much a collaborator of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche in the 1970s and 1980s; and there was a very clear resonance with the perspective that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche were defining at the time, and Krafft Ehricke's own work in terms of bringing mankind into this next stage.

But anytime we talk about Krafft Ehricke's work, I think it's worth emphasizing what we have on the first slide here [Fig. 1], his three laws of astronautics; which I think define very beautifully the scientific principle that he worked from when developing his whole perspective for the space program. So, I

just want to read this; I'm sure many people have heard these, but I think it's worth continuing to re-emphasize his insight into this. His first law states: "Nobody and nothing under the natural laws of the universe impose any limitations on man, except man himself." And his second law: "Not only the Earth, but the entire Solar System and as much of the universe as he can reach under the laws of Nature, are man's rightful field of activity." And his third law: "By expanding through the universe, man fulfills his destiny as an element of life endowed with the power of reason, and the wisdom of the moral law within himself."

So, this was Krafft's own insight into the nature of mankind, the destiny of mankind, and defining a space program from that standpoint, from that perspective. More work is being done on reviving and continuing Krafft Ehricke's approach, but he defined and elaborated in great detail much of the fundamentals of the development of space from this proper scientific perspective.

Now, going from Krafft Ehricke's work, the work of LaRouche in the 1980s with his own space program proposal, I think it's useful just to fill out a little bit this idea of what I would call a physical economic platform for the development of the Solar System. I think there are three categories of activity which we should take a serious look at and focus on, if we want to enable a great expansion of mankind's capability to be an active force in the development of the Solar System.

If we really want to fulfill the potential created by Kepler and Einstein in that sense, and fulfill Krafft Ehricke's vision and bring mankind to a level of really mastering and developing and interacting with the Solar System as a whole; I think there are three key categories that we want to look at. That we need fundamental breakthroughs in. So, one, first, is the issue of getting into space; space launch. The issue of getting from the surface of the Earth up into Earth orbit. And it's been said that getting from the Earth's surface into even

low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System; that's very true in a certain sense.

We can see this in the next graphic [Fig. 2]; this is illustrated rather clearly if we look at the case of the Saturn V rocket. The rocket that took the Apollo astronauts to the Moon. Some people might be familiar with this; some people may be not, but most of that entire rocket was not the elements that actually landed on the Moon and brought people back. Most of that was just to get up off the Earth. 92% of the mass, the weight of the entire Saturn V rocket, was all fuel; most of that fuel was used just to get into orbit. So, in the pie chart, you can see the breakdown; just the total amount of weight that's fuel – 92% – the dry weight of the rockets and the systems to utilize that fuel is another 6.5%, and around 2% of the weight of the entire thing is the actual people and the stuff you're trying to get on the Moon, and the stuff you're trying to get back. So, you can get a clear sense of how much effort it takes just to get into space; this is also illustrated in the bar chart next to it. If people are familiar with the way the Saturn V worked, you had a series of stages; so you had the first main rocket fires, it gets up off the ground, and starts taking you up through the atmosphere, through the sky. And once that first rocket burns up all its fuel, it's jettisoned, it's released, and a significantly smaller part of the total rocket then continues as a new stage fires, a new rocket fires. So, you had three stages to the Saturn V rocket; the entire first stage, the entire second stage, and part of the third stage was all needed just to get into orbit. And then from there, the third stage carried the astronauts to the Moon; it landed and came back, and then that third stage carried them back to Earth.

So, as we saw with the case of the Apollo, it's a nice, clear case study illustration of how much energy and expense it takes right now, currently, just to get into orbit. If we want to get a little bit more technical, this could also be

expressed in terms of what's discussed as changes in velocity, changes in speed. This is a way to look at travel around the Solar System. Now, to get into Earth orbit, you don't just go up into space; if you just went straight up into space and then stopped firing your rockets, you'd just fall straight back down. Orbit is not just getting into space. You have to get up to a certain speed, where you're orbiting the Earth; and you're talking about thousands of miles per hour. You're talking about miles per second; so you have to get up to very high speed to actually get into orbit. And if you want to change orbits, once you're in low Earth orbit, and you want to get into a different orbit, you again have to change your speed, you have to again expend energy to change your speed. So, one way people discuss and analyze space travel, is what is referred to as changes in speed. So, here is just an illustration of the amount of change in velocity, sometimes called "delta V" is the technical terms sometimes used. The amount of change in velocity, the amount of change in kilometers per second needed to get to different destinations. And as you can see on the graph, each of those bars is to a different destination; the first one is to low Earth orbit, the second one is to geo-stationary orbit, the next one is to lunar orbit, and then we have each of our planets there. Venus, Mars, Jupiter, etc. So, in all of those cases, you can see that they all have that grayish-blue chunk at the very bottom; which in most of those cases, is well over half of the total change in velocity requirements is just to get into low Earth orbit.

So again, when you say that getting from the Earth's surface to low Earth orbit is halfway to anywhere in the Solar System, that's very true. So this is a major impediment, a major challenge and expense factor for space travel, for developing the Moon, for sending out more satellites, for everything we want to do. To the degree we have to bring stuff from Earth, this is a huge part of the cost. Now, there's been various designs proposed for ways to dramatically reduce this cost.

One thing I want to – this is by no means the only method used, but this is something I think is worth putting on the table for greater consideration and examination, is what's been designed as vacuum tube, maglev space launch systems. So, a magnetic levitation system, so you can propel a rocket, a spacecraft with magnetic levitation; if you put it inside a vacuum tube, you can actually get to much higher speeds. Because even with maglev technology, the main impediment to getting the higher speeds very quickly becomes wind resistance. So, if you put this in a vacuum tube, you can get to very, very high speeds. Remember, we need to get to high speeds to be into orbit. And then if you can elevate that track up above much of the atmosphere, you can actually use a maglev vacuum tube launch system to get into space.

And what's depicted here [Fig. 3] is a NASA illustration of one design done by a former senior scientist at Brookhaven National Lab, Dr. James Powell, who actually has some of the original patents on maglev technology; he was one of the first designers of maglev technology back in the 1950s and 1960s. He developed this proposal for a vacuum tube maglev space launch system in collaboration with Dr. George Maise; and this particular design they called the "startram". So, just to give a sense, through the analysis they did, this would lower the cost of launching things into space from the current range of something around \$10,000-\$20,000 per kilogram to something more on the order of \$40 per kilogram; just to put it in monetary terms. So, you're talking about a 100-, 200-, 400-fold drop in the cost of putting stuff into orbit. And this particular design was actually examined by an independent group in the Sandia National Labs, who had a so-called "murder board", which is a term for a group of people set up to see if they could find any fundamental technical flaws in a design like this. And so they examined it, and they gave it a clean analysis; they couldn't find any fundamental technical flaws in this general idea of this design.

So, you have these types of proposals out there, for dramatically lowering the cost and expense of getting stuff into orbit. And this general idea is being pursued in China. No surprise; China is where we see interest in actually pursuing these frontiers, and people are actually thinking about these things, are looking at these frontier technologies which can greatly give us a new capability to do these things. Specifically, at Southwest Jiaotong University in China, you have a group there looking at maglev technology, looking at vacuum tube maglev technology; they actually even have a test vacuum tube track actively working, where they're testing vacuum tubes for maglev. And the head of that project has openly discussed, he said this could also have great application for space launches; so, this is being looked at in China. So, this is one category of activity we want to get a fundamental breakthrough if we want to dramatically expand mankind's capabilities to develop the Solar System. And there are other variations, this isn't the only design out there that can address this. But this is just one that is worth highlighting to look at.

Second issue; second category of activity if we want to expand our ability to develop the Solar System – actually travelling in space, moving around in space. Once we're in Earth orbit, how do we get to the Moon, to Mars, to Jupiter, to Pluto, as we did recently? Well, to get to Pluto, it took us nine years; and after travelling for nine years, scientists hoping everything goes right, hoping they can turn the spacecraft back on because they had it in hibernation. They spent more years before that designing the mission. Finally, they're reaching Pluto, they finally get there; the space craft turns on, starts taking all kinds of pictures, readings. We're totally surprised by what we see; Pluto is actually a much more active planet than we thought. It's got all kinds of diversity in its geographical, geological features; evidence for a lot of recent activity. Stuff we didn't expect at all; just totally surprised, shocked the scientific community. And

then the space craft just passed by and kept going; didn't stop, didn't enter orbit. If it had entered orbit, we could be finding all kinds of more stuff; it could be getting awesome pictures of the entire thing, doing active studies to see if we can see changes taking place currently. But it didn't do that; it just kept going. Why did it keep going? Because we're still dealing with chemical propulsion for space travel. If New Horizons, the mission Pluto, wanted to stop and enter an orbit around Pluto, they would have had to carry the fuel needed to slow down enough to enter orbit; and also the rockets needed to use that fuel. And if they had carried that fuel with them, the launch would have had to have been much bigger, because you would have to lift all that fuel off the ground in the first place. So, this is just one illustration of how difficult it is to have any serious development and travel and moving around the Solar System

travel in space. We still don't want to take everything with us everywhere we go; we want to develop the resources of various environments in the Solar System. In the technical community, they talk about "in situ resource utilization"; I guess they want to make something exciting sound boring or something, so they call it "in situ resource utilization".

But developing the resources of the Moon, for example. What people in China again have talked about – mining the Moon for Helium-3, an excellent, perhaps the most advanced fusion fuel available to us. Which doesn't really exist in any significance at all on Earth, but it relatively abundant on the Moon. We could be mining the Moon for Helium-3; we could be getting oxygen from the Moon, water from the Moon. Being able to use the material of the Moon to build buildings and shelters, whatever; actually having the ability to use and develop all the resources available to us on the Moon, or on Mars or wherever else. So, again, the third category – maybe the third leg – of areas we need to make qualitative leaps and breakthroughs in to enable mankind to be a real controlling

presence in the Solar System. And again, China is looking at this; they're looking at the Moon, they're looking at the far side of the Moon in particular. Their next mission is going to be a lander on the far side of the Moon, which will be the first time that's ever happened in the history of mankind in space; they'll be landing something on the far side of the Moon to further prepare themselves to pursue these goals.

I think if you take these together – addressing the issue of getting from the Earth's surface up into Earth orbit, addressing the issue of travelling around the Solar System, and addressing the issue of utilizing and developing the resources of the Solar System – if we had leaps in all of those areas, the point here is not to detail exactly what those leaps will be. They can have various aspects to them; some of these breakthroughs are probably not even thought of yet, but those the three categorical areas where we need fundamental jumps in our capabilities there. With breakthroughs in these areas, we really have a new platform, a new physical economic platform; the kind of integrated infrastructure system that will enable mankind to be an active presence throughout the Solar System as a whole. And that defines a very useful set of boundary conditions that we have to focus upon if we want to pursue this type of perspective. And again, this is something that Krafft Ehricke spent a lot of time on and elaborated in great detail some of these aspects. The development of the resources of the Moon; he had extensive investigations into that himself already. Nuclear fission and fusion propulsion systems. So these are not new concepts I'm presenting to you; these are things that have been thought through by Krafft Ehricke and others. But together, they define the needed platform that we must develop now if we really want to be an active force, an active presence in the Solar System in a serious way.

But I think that just brings us back around to the more fundamental point, because what we want to do is bring mankind

into a higher role as a creative force and active presence in the Solar System. But then that becoming the platform to create the potential for the next higher leap. And one thing that immediately comes to mind, is Mr. LaRouche's work on this back in the 1980s; where he had designed his own proposal for a Moon-Mars colonization program. And in some of his presentations of this, and a particular paper he wrote on the subject, he organized the entire perspective from the standpoint of the most important being enabling mankind to make new fundamental scientific revolutionary breakthroughs. How do you want to do that? We need some really big and excellent and advanced space telescopes; things that cover the entire orbit of Mars with an interferometer system. From an integrated series of telescopes, you can integrate to operate as a single system. So, why don't we build something like that? What do we need to do that? Well, we need to be able to get into space. We need to develop the Moon; we need to develop Mars. We need mankind to be an active force throughout the Solar System to do that. But that whole perspective was unified around a mission of giving mankind the new capabilities to provide the human mind new generations of scientists with the new clues, the new anomalies that will lead to new fundamental discoveries. And this takes us to things like the galaxy; understanding the higher order principles organizing our galaxy and other galactic systems. Or, even higher than that, what organizes multiple systems of galaxies.

So, as Kepler through Einstein had defined, in a certain sense, an arc of fundamental creative discovery that brought mankind to the level of the Solar System in true scientific fundamental potential; as they did that, so too, must we today look to the development of the Solar System. Expanding mankind in the Solar System, from the standpoint of giving new generations of scientists the capability to have the opportunity and the indications and the evidence needed to make new, completely fundamental breakthroughs in basic

science; basic physics. The discovery of new physical principles; the types of things associated with our galaxy, other galactic systems, areas of science which are completely outside of our knowledge currently.

So, I think when we talk about the space program, people get excited about the rockets and the space suits and bouncing around in space – and those might be elements of it to some degree; to some degree not maybe. But the most fundamental thing is this issue of mankind; and this is really defining the necessary future common aims of mankind as pursuing the developments and the realization of our existence as a creative force in the universe. And that is something that unifies all of our nations; and it's something that we need to pursue today. So that is, I think, the positive perspective that we have to look forward to, and which will give us the inspiration to defeat these very ugly figures like Obama and his controllers. Because they're holding us back from that; and we shouldn't waste any more time.

ROSS: Thank you very much. That will be the conclusion for our webcast for tonight. I do want to let people know that there will be a live-streamed event on this website tomorrow, February 27, from Texas; where Kesha Rogers will be hosting an event on there being no limits to mankind's growth, and about the potential we have in space. I'd like to ask you to "like" this video, to subscribe to our Youtube channel; and if you have questions about things that were presented, or for future shows, leave them as a comment. Thanks for joining us.

Silkevejen kan få den syriske våbenhvile til at lykkes

24. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Da Israel og den Palæstinensiske Befrielsesorganisation (PLO) underskrev en aftale i 1993 om at afslutte drabene og oprette et selvstyre for palæstinenserne, sagde Lyndon LaRouche omgående, at traktorerne måtte køre, med det samme, hvis planen skulle lykkes. Den gensidige gavn, baseret på israelsk industrikapacitet og palæstinensisk faglært arbejdskraft, måtte lanceres uden tøven, insisterede han. Det skete ikke, eftersom IMF og Verdensbanken skulle lede processen. Treogtyve år senere ...

Den dramatiske våbenhvile, som Ruslands og USA's udenrigsministre, Sergei Lavrov og John Kerry, hhv., aftalte den 22. februar i München, og som bekræftedes via en telefonsamtale fra præsident Vladimir Putin til præsident Barack Obama, har et umiddelbart potentiale til at transformere ikke alene Syrien, og ikke alene Mellemøsten, men hele verden. Den fremragende, strategiske intervention fra Putins side i Syrien sidste år i september demonstrerede, at terrorister kan nedkæmpes, men også, at USA under præsident Obama i realiteten havde allieret sig med terrorister for at opnå »regimeskift«, rettet mod ikke-samarbejdsvillige regeringer. Denne æra, med amerikansk underdanighed over for britisk imperietyranni, kan afsluttes – hvis våbenhvilen holder.

Ligesom med Oslo-aftalen vil våbenhvilen kun holde, hvis genopbygningen og udviklingen af Syrien (og regionen) omgående kommer i gang. Helga Zepp-LaRouche sagde den 23. feb., at den Silkevejsproces, som Xi Jinping har lanceret, kan og må bringes ind i regionen nu – ikke i næste måned, eller til næste år. Det udviklingsprogram for Sydvestasien, som EIR-rapporten 'Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen'

fremlægger, leverer fundamentet. Xi Jinping initierede projektet under sit besøg til Saudi Arabien, Iran og Egypten i januar. Der er ingen tid at spille.

Titelfoto: USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry i rådslagning med sin russiske modpart Sergei Lavrov og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin. (en.kremlin.ru)

Putin går frem med fredsinitiativ for Syrien; Det haster med at få Obama og briterne smidt ud

24. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin går frem i denne uge med det nye initiativ for en våbenhvile i Syrien, med dens fulde implikationer for at standse krigsmagerne. Elementer i denne proces i perioden 22.-23. feb. tøjrer Obama og hans London-kontrollers med flere og flere begrænsninger. Det geopolitiske slæng finder det stadig vanskeligere at gennemføre deres sædvanlige, beskidte tricks. Dette skaber en ny mulighed for os til at handle for at få Obama væk, og virkelig bryde med det britiske imperieparadigme, der er den oprindelig ansvarlige for ødelæggelsen i Mellemøsten/Nordafrika og Europa. De aktuelle omstændigheder udgør de perfekte betingelser for fornuftige kræfter i hele USA – og i hele verden – for at komme frem og præstere dette.

»Der er ingen mulighed«, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag og

understregede det som en presserende hastesag. »Med mindre der gøres noget særligt for at få Obama smidt ud af embedet«, er der ingen chance for succes. Det er vigtigt, sagde han, at »bryde det britiske overtag. Det er menneskehedens eneste chance. Obama må fjernes, på den ene eller anden måde. Det er den eneste mulighed.«

Den 22. feb. nåede de fælles formænd for ISSG (Den Internationale Støttegruppe for Syrien) – Rusland og USA – frem til en formel aftale om »Betingelser for Ophør af Fjendtligheder i Syrien«, efter en telefonsamtale mellem Putin og Obama, efter anmodning fra Kreml. Dernæst udstedte Putin en fuld og officiel »Særlig Erklæring«
<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/51376>

om den nye aftales betydning, der omfatter en gentagelse af principperne og en specifikation af deres gennemførelse. Med hensyn til overholdelse af kravene siger Putins erklæring: »For at opnå dette mål vil vi etablere en kommunikations-hotline og, om nødvendigt, en arbejdsgruppe til udveksling af relevant information ... «

Putin understregede yderligere, at der må skabes betingelser »for lancering af en politisk proces på lang sigt gennem en bred, inter-syrisk dialog i Geneve, under FN's regi«.

Moskva annoncerede dernæst, inden for 24 timer, mere implementering. Generalmajor Igor Konashenkov, talsmand for Forsvarsministeriet, udstedte i dag en erklæring, der sagde, at Rusland har forberedt logistikken for den 'varme linje' mellem USA og Rusland og overgivet det til USA til at blive igangsat. For det andet har Rusland etableret et »koordinationscenter til forsoning« af de krigsførende parter, på Kheimin-flybasen nær Latakia idet vestlige Syrien. Dets funktioner vil være at »yde maksimum assistance« til alle, der beder om det. Der vil blive oprettet hotlines for at overvåge våbenstilstanden. Centeret vil assistere indsatser for humanitær hjælp.

I modsætning hertil fulgte Obama op på telefonsamtalen og aftalen med Putin ved ikke at komme med en erklæring og blot frigive et udskrift på to afsnit, der blev udlagt på Det Hvide Hus' nyhedsside. Første afsnit bekræftede blot telefonsamtalen og aftalen; alt imens det andet afsnit rapporterede, at Obama revsede Putin for forseelser i Ukraine. Den britiske udenrigsminister Philip Hammond fulgte trop ved at rave om, at den nye aftale »kun vil holde, hvis der finder et betydeligt sindelagsskift sted i det syriske regimes og dets støtters opførsel. Især må Rusland honorere denne aftale ved at afslutte sine angreb på syriske civile ... « osv.

I realiteten udgør Putins fredsinitiativer i Syrien rammerne for den Silkevej/Marshallplan, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Schiller Instituttets mobilisering har foreslået, og som er indbefattet i præsident Xis nylige besøg til regionen. Dette er midlet til at afslutte striden og genoprette en fremtid i hele regionen.

Det, der blokerer for dette, er, at amerikanere stadig finder sig i, at Obama sidder i embedet, og i den britiske imperiebesættelse. Tiden til at komme af med dette er for længst overskredet.

Foto: Vladimir Putins tale efter Ruslands og USA's vedtagelse af en fælles erklæring om Syrien. (en.kremlin.ru)

**RADIO SCHILLER den 22.
februar 2016:**

**Knæk Det britiske Imperium
med en tysk-russisk
udviklingskorridor
og et kinesisk-koreansk-
russisk hurtigtog**

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

**Kerry og Lavrov når frem til
'Midlertidig principaftale om
Syrien'**

21. februar 2016 – De amerikanske og russiske udenrigsministre, hhv. John Kerry og Sergei Lavrov, nåede i dag frem til det, Kerry kaldte »en midlertidig principaftale om betingelserne for en standsning af fjendtlighederne [i Syrien], der kunne komme i gang i de nærmest kommende dage«.

Under en nyhedskonference i Amman sammen med den jordanske udenrigsminister Nasser Judeh sagde Kerry: »Betingelserne for en standsning af fjendtligheder er nu ved at blive fuldført. Vi er faktisk i dag tættere på en våbenhvile, end vi har været.« Kerry tilføjede, at han forventede, at præsident Obama

og den russiske præsident Putin i de kommende dage ville forhandle, for at fuldstændiggøre den midlertidige principaftale.

Irans PressTV og Reuters rapporterede, at det Russiske Udenrigsministerium bekræftede, at Lavrov og Kerry havde talt i telefon sammen søndag, om betingelserne for en våbenhvile. Rapporten sagde, at diskussionerne gik omkring betingelserne for en våbenhvile, der ville ekskludere operationer imod organisationer, »som af FN's Sikkerhedsråd var anerkendt som terrorister«. Dette inkluderer ISIS og Nusra Front.

Hvad den midlertidige principaftale vil føre til er ikke klart. Under pressekonferencen gentog Kerry Obamas holdning, at den syriske præsident Bashar al-Assad må gå. »Med Assad der, kan, og vil, denne krig ikke ende«, sagde han. Assad sagde i går, at han ville gå med til en våbenhvile på betingelse af, at terrorister ikke udnytter en standsning af kamphandlingerne til deres fordel, og at lande, der støttede oprørere, ophørte med deres støtte. Elementer af den syriske opposition havde tidligere indvilliget i »muligheden« for en midlertidig våbenstilstand på betingelse af, at der blev givet garantier for, at den syriske regerings allierede, inklusive Rusland, ville stoppe deres luftangreb, at belejringer blev ophævet og at nødhjælp ville få adgang over hele landet. Og Rusland har sagt, iflg. Associated Press, at de ville fortsætte luftangrebene i Syrien mod dem, de anser for at være terrorister, selv under en våbenhvile. Disse divergerende holdninger gør en holdbar våbenhvile til en monumental udfordring.

»Jeg tror ikke på«, sagde Kerry, »at, i løbet af de næste par dage, hvor vi forsøger at få dette effektueret, der skulle opstå et 'magisk vendepunkt' med hensyn til det, der foregår på jorden ... Oppositionen har gjort det klart, at de er fast besluttet på at kæmpe tilbage«.

Hverken Kerry eller det Russiske Udenrigsministerium ville

frigive detaljer om den midlertidige principaftale.

Foto: USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry taler under en fælles pressekonference med Jordans udenrigsminister Nasser Judeh i Udenrigsministeriet i Amman, Jordan.

Gør Det britiske Imperium forbi, og sats på den eurasiske løsning

21. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Lyndon LaRouche gav søndag, den 21. februar en strategisk vurdering, der sagde, at verden nu har nået et øjeblik med et vendepunkt, hvor enten, det onde Britiske Imperium, med sit system for monetaristisk udplyndring, bliver knust, eller verden vil snart styrte ned i en atomkrigs rædsler. Alt imens der er legitim fokus på de sindssyge provokationer, som kommer fra Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien, der forsøger at gøre alt, hvad de kan, for at starte Tredje Verdenskrig på den syrisk-tyrkiske grænse, så er virkeligheden den, at det virkelige magtsæde bag disse manøvrer er den britiske krone.

Det transatlantiske, britiske system er totalt bankerot, og det virkelige centrum for global magt og stabilitet er skiftet over til Asien, hvor samarbejde mellem Kina, Rusland og Indien har skabt en relativ stabilitet, efter transatlantiske standarder. Der er trusler i Asien, men disse trusler kan overvindes gennem den form for politik for fysisk, økonomisk

udvikling, som Kina har fremmet gennem initiativet med 'Et bælte, én vej'. Asien er blevet centrum for menneskehedens fremtid, fordi briterne har ødelagt næsten hver eneste hvid af kreativitet i USA, Storbritannien og det meste af kontinental-Europa. Der er muligheder, men de begynder alle med udslettelsen af Det britiske Imperiums magt.

For kontinental-Europa er den eneste, produktive løsning, at Tyskland, den sidste, tilbageværende økonomiske magt i Europa, allierer sig med Rusland omkring en plan for fysisk, økonomisk udvikling, tværs over hele korridoren mellem Tyskland og Rusland. En russisk-tysk koalition for en genoplivning af de produktive kræfter ville være den form for forandring, væk fra Det britiske Imperiums monetarisme, som der er et presserende behov for. Glem Det britiske Imperiums bankerotte pengesystem. Det er fuldstændig færdigt, og kan aldrig genoplives. En tysk alliance med Rusland om opbygning af de produktive forbindelser hen over Eurasien, i partnerskab med Kina og Indien, er skriften på væggen for en dødsdom over de imperiekræfter, der gør fremstød for krig ved hjælp af skakbrikker som Erdogan, Obama og Mohammed bin Salman.

Samme fremgangsmåde er presserende nødvendig i Nordøstasien, hvor Koreakrisen kun kan løses gennem en genoplivning af Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbaneforbindelserne, der rent historisk har eksisteret, og som kan og må genoplives i dag. uden en fysisk-økonomisk dimension findes der ingen måde, hvorpå de britiske, geopolitiske svindelnumre kan overvindes. Afdøde general Douglas MacArthur forstod dette princip for asiatisk udvikling og stabilitet, som det ses af hans program for en genopbygning af Japan ved afslutningen af Anden Verdenskrig, og af hans fremragende lederskab i Korea. Genoplivningen af Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbanekorridoren er afgørende for stabiliteten i Asien, og dette bliver forstået af det kinesiske lederskab som et nøgleelement i hele »win-win«-udviklingsstrategien i Eurasien.

Der er ingen levedygtige alternativer til denne totale

sejr/totale fremgangsmåde med krig, til at overvinde briterne. En tysk-russisk alliance for en genoplivning af Eurasien fra den europæiske side, som det tidligere blev forudset af den franske præsident, general Charles de Gaulle, den sidste franske leder, der besad en vision om Eurasien, er den eneste, tilbageværende mulighed for Europa og hele det transatlantiske område. I USA betyder dette at dumpe Obama, der ikke er andet end en britisk brik, og at udslette Wall Street. I Asien er Kina-Korea-Rusland-jernbanekorridoren afgørende for en meningsfuld løsning til Det britiske Imperiums eskalerende krigsprovokationer, der i overvejende grad køres gennem Barack Obamas mund, og som er rettet, ikke mod Nordkorea, men mod Kina. Indien er en naturlig partner i denne asiatiske udviklingsbestræbelse, og er allerede med om bord og forlænger de eurasiske udviklingskorridorer ind i Det indiske Ocean.

Den russiske præsident Putin har gjort det godt med den russiske, strategiske intervention i Syrien, der har trukket tåberne i Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien ind i en fælde, de selv har skylden for. Denne fælde har taget det britiske imperie-slæng på sengen, og øjeblikket til at knuse dem fuldstændigt er nu inde.

Dette er den presserende, globale politik, der må tages i betragtning, og vedtages. Tiden er ikke til endeløse debatter, og til at trække tiden ud. Denne politik må vedtages nu, og gennemføres i praksis. Det er den faktiske gennemførelse, der er underkastet seriøs planlægning blandt seriøse verdensledere, af hvilke flertallet er i Eurasien, som et resultat af generationers britiske brutalisering af befolkningerne i USA og kontinental-Europa.

Hvis du fanger dig selv i at tænke, »Ja, men det her er altså ikke praktisk«, er du allerede dømt til undergang.

Bliver Ankara et nyt Sarajevo? Verden har brug for en fredsplan! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Løsningen er enkel: Kasinoøkonomien må afsluttes gennem realiseringen af Glass/Steagall-loven; en international gældskonference må afskrive bankernes giftige værdipapirer, og et nyt kreditsystem må finansiere investeringer i den Nye Silkevejs projekter. Og hertil har vi ikke brug for et oppumpet, overnationalt bureaukrati i Bruxelles, men derimod en alliance af suveræne stater, som er forpligtet over for den fælles mission for udvikling af de områder i verden, der har et presserende behov for vores hjælp.

Kun, hvis Europa finder tilbage til sin humanistiske tradition, vil vi kunne bestå.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

USA og Europa må gå sammen

med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig

– Den Europæiske Union er færdig, med eller uden briterne

Jeg vil begynde direkte med at diskutere den meget dystre trussel om en international konflikt, der nu er ved at rejse sig, især fra den krudttønde, der udgøres af Syrien, Nordafrika og Mellemøsten. Det syriske område, hvor, på trods af den fælles indsats fra udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov for at finde fælles fodslag, så truer Obamas afvisning af at give Saudi Arabien og Tyrkiet besked på at trække sig med at få det hele til at eksplodere.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

LaRouchePAC Internationale

Fredags-webcast, 19. februar 2016:

USA og Europa må samarbejde

med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig

Faren for en massiv, endnu større strøm af flygtninge, der kommer fra Afrika og ind i Europa, så vel som også den fortsatte krise centreret omkring Mellemøsten, betyder således, at Europa er absolut dømt til undergang, med mindre der finder et fundamentalt skifte i politikken sted. Og dette betyder, at USA og Europa indledningsvis må række hånden frem mod Rusland og Kina.

Engelsk Udskrift.

US & EUROPE MUST REACH OUT TO RUSSIA & CHINA TO AVOID WAR

International LaRouche PAC Webcast

Friday, February 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's February 19, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly, Friday evening broadcast here from [larouchepac .com](http://larouchepac.com)

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

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

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

that discussion.

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

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

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

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

entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert

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

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

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

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

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

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

World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

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

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

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

of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff.

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

answer. So, Jeff?

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

much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region. Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see nothing

but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on the verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place where you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course Asia and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but relative to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and in the United States, we see a disintegration of the political and economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of course, Africa has been on the target list of the British and other European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time. But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment of geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis in Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire European financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt under the present conditions and terms of thinking that dominate Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning to see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of the people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in the first place. So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself,

now

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

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

their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what applies

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

throughout the African continent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as

the
cornerstone of their foreign policy.
So, they're presenting a win-win alternative. And in the
case of Europe, there is no alternative. Europe is so
politically
and psychologically bankrupt – the leadership of Europe is so
bankrupt that China, through this Middle East development
portion
of the One Belt, One Road policy, offers the only viable basis
for this Marshall Plan idea to actually be put into practice.
And
were it not for the Putin intervention, beginning last
September,
we couldn't even be contemplating the possibility of that kind
of
solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle
East.
Now, Mr. LaRouche emphasized in this context that Europe is
completely gone; it's completely bankrupt, and there are
solutions, but the present leadership is unprepared to
consider
that kind of level of rethinking. In the United States, we're
very close to the edge, but the United States {can} be saved
and
the solution to the problems in the United States begins with
removing President Barack Obama from office immediately, and
moving to wipe out the thoroughly bankrupt Wall Street system.
Because until that system is put through basically a
bankruptcy
shutdown, then none of the viable and available solutions are
going to be there. But, if you were to get rid of Obama, if
you
were to wipe out Wall Street,—and, for example, immediately
passage of Glass-Steagall would be one critical element for
that
process to happen almost overnight – then we have a history in
the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin

Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a real economy.

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

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

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister

David

Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns. Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union – and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the

problem.

So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union, then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials in Europe, even including Schäuble at the Davos Conference earlier this month, said that if the Schengen agreement, the open borders agreement in Europe is broken, then the European Union will cease to exist. And already in Poland, in Hungary, in other countries on the edge of Europe but within the European Union, they're already building those walls. So in effect, the European Union, as it's presently constituted, is a dead letter; it really doesn't exist. And the countries of Europe, either collectively or individually, are going to have to come to face the reality that their banking system is thoroughly bankrupt; they've lost so much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint is no longer capable of self-reliance, self-preservation. So, the whole thing is going under; and of course, there's a certain irony in the British threatening to leave the European Union, since the bankruptcy of the entire trans-Atlantic system is largely the result of policies that were created in London, and were then spread about Europe and the United States. You could almost say that Europe was doomed from the moment that Margaret Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into

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

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

tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes
up

with its own version of shutting down the City of London and
Wall

Street, a genuine full-scale Glass-Steagall separation of
legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the
gambling,

then Europe is completely doomed. And the only hope that they
will have is that some sane future leaders, who emerge out of
this political rubble, recognize before it's perhaps too late
that aligning with China and Russia – which is exactly the
opposite of the policies that are being pursued in Europe
right

now – is the only answer. So, I think that that's the context
in

which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely
that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether
Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part
of

that system of doom that's going to have to be changed in a
much

more fundamental – I'd say "revolutionary" – way. And the
opportunities are there; they're presented there because
Europe

is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already
established the rail links between central China and Germany.
There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One
Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European
leaders are going to have abandon their folly. And that's a

difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

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

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

So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the
LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a
somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of
the
really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a
century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in

the

form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

an astonishingly tiny change.

And it says something about the difficulties and why it's been – as Matt said – it's been a century since Einstein had proposed the existence of these gravity waves; and now they've been detected. So, the recent upgrades to these detectors here in the US made this possible; there are other detectors around the world. Some of them are being upgraded; new ones are being brought on line. There is a proposal for a space-based interferometry experiment – the Lisa experiment; which NASA had been a part of, and has now left it to the European Space Agency, currently scheduled to launch in 2034. Perhaps it'll be sent sooner than that, based on this news.

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

telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

side of the Moon, where China is going to be within just a few years sending a lander. The potential to do long wavelength

radio telescope work from that location; this represents something new.

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

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

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

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

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to

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

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

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

in

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

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

it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

include

those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power.

Now between the lines, what these two were also saying was a view of government and a view of society. Implicit in this is Leibniz's view that the legitimacy of a ruler or of government is

not simply from having gathered power; but from using it in a wise way to achieve good ends. That may seem a little bit far afield, but it's true; and this is part of the background on this

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

He was right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

for Einstein; and those concepts lie outside of space. They

aren't geometrical concepts in the way Euclid's concepts were geometrical. Light is a real thing; gravity is a real principle.

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

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

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

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

what science really is?

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

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that.

Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

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

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

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

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

what

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

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

Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was

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

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

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

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

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

1)

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

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

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

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

Not

only are we seeing things in a different band, we're using a

different sense all together. We're hearing the universe; we're able to listen in on a completely different kind of physical process than the electromagnetic ones that are the basis of all astronomy otherwise. Using light, radio waves, x-rays and that sort of thing. And I think it also demonstrates that the ability to develop new technologies, to rise to a challenge, certainly exists. And we saw this in the Apollo program, which similarly, going to the Moon itself did not involve as much new science as it did new technologies, new social organizations to implement those technologies. Which we saw with some of the breakthroughs of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational waves. But we have to have grand objectives. I mentioned the LISA experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar to ones which did this recent detection, which NASA had been a major player in and then pulled back on, as part of the Obama destruction of a national mission, a national future. NASA, as the leading representative of that future orientation of the nation. So, we have to have human objectives for the nation, for ourselves. We have to, as a nation, have objectives like what China's doing now; as represented by China's moves towards the Moon from the Helium-3 standpoint. From the sheer excitement of the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that

people

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

to the Moon for the next trip?"

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

a future-oriented mission again.

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

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

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

Jacques Attali foreslår international fredskonference for at standse krigenes trommehvirvler

Paris, 18. februar 2016 (Nouvelle Solidarité) – Vi har ikke meget tilfælles med François Mitterands tidligere 'grå eminence' Jacques Attali, men ligesom mange af den ældre

generations elite, kan han genkende lugten af atomkrig, når han møder den. I sin ugentlige blog fra 15. feb. i avisen *l'Express*, med titlen »Lyden af Krigstrommer«, gennemgår han de hårrejsende taler ved den nyligt afholdte Sikkerhedskonference i München. De følgende, oversatte (til engelsk, -red.) uddrag er taget fra hans egne, engelske oversættelser af hans blog, »Samtale med Jacques Attali«.

»Ved konferencen skændtes Vestens og Ruslands topledere med hidtil uset voldsomhed om et bredt udvalg af spørgsmål: Frem til et punkt, hvor den russiske premierminister [Medvedev] vovede at sige, at der var mulighed for en ny verdenskrig, og at Rusland stadig var 'verdens stærkeste atommagt'; at USA's udenrigsminister [Kerry], der havde ansvaret for diplomati, truede med massivt at forstærke NATO's aktiver i Europa; at den russiske premierminister svarede ved at spørge, om amerikanerne stadig troede, de befandt sig i 1962 med Cubakrisen; at den polske premierminister [Szydło] sammenlignede Ruslands militære tilstedeværelse i Ukraine med de russiske flys bombardementer i Syrien; at lederne af de baltiske stater forklarede, at russerne bør modgås i Centraleuropa på samme måde som i Mellemøsten; og sluttelig, at George Soros forsøgte at demonstrere, at den russiske præsident var begyndt at destabilisere den Europæiske Union på en brutal måde med det formål at ødelægge den, før faldende oliepriser tvinger hans eget land i knæ.«

»München-konferencen er ikke en café, hvor ord er uden betydning: det har været den mest betydningsfulde lokalitet i verden mht. strategisk debat i over 50 år. Der er ingen, der taler overfladisk her. Og i sidste uge hørtes skræmmende trommehvirvler, der, hvis de følges op af handlinger, i de kommende måneder kunne føre verden frem til det værst tænkelige scenario.

Og dog konfronteres verden med ekstremt alvorlige risici, der er langt mere reelle end disse verbale forvrængninger ... Hvorfor tilføje til alt dette en dum og ikke retfærdiggjort

tilbagevenden til en konflikt mellem Øst og Vest? ...

I alle tilfælde er det presserende nødvendigt at standse situationens tragiske, nedadgående spiral. For, siden München-konferencen, er det værste nu muligt, imod befolkningens ønsker, og når vi i stedet kunne gøre så meget sammen, hvor alle har interesse i de andres succes.

Til dette formål er det nødvendigt, med henblik på at sikre, at alle europæere – dem fra Vest og dem fra Øst – som en hasteforanstaltning mødes ved en storstilet konference for fremtiden, og væk fra München-konferencen, med det formål at udvikle fælles strategier og projekter, roligt og uden hastværk, imod deres fælles fjender.

Hvorfor ikke i Paris? Hvorfor ikke om en måned? Hvem vil tage initiativet? Vil vi gå glip af denne chance for at komme tilbage til fornuft?«

<http://blogs.lexpress.fr/attali/2016/02/15/beating-the-drums/>

**POLITISK ORIENTERING 18.
februar 2016:
Rusland tager strategisk
lederskab/**

Bail-in ikke holdbart/ Gennembrud for Fusionskraft

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd: