

# **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

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

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

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

that discussion.

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

arising, especially from the powderkeg of Syria, Northern

Africa,  
and the Middle East. The area of Syria, where, despite the efforts of Secretary John Kerry to find common ground with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Obama's refusal to tell Saudi Arabia and Turkey to stand down is threatening to blow this entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert Parry, the editor of that publication, in which he says the risk that the multi-sided Syrian war could spark World War III, continues, as Turkey and U.S. neo-cons seek an invasion that could kill Russian troops, and possibly escalate the Syrian crisis into a nuclear showdown. What Robert Parry says in this article is that Barack Obama took questions from reporters on Tuesday, but he did not take the one that needed to be asked: which was whether he had forbidden Turkey and Saudi Arabia to invade Syria, because on that question could hinge whether the ugly Syrian civil war could spin off into World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown. Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in a strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the point of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff. So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many more of the details, and then we'll come back to our

institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also answer. So, Jeff?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Matt. Well, as we were going through the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he actually drew a distinction between the bluff, and what he said much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are up to. It's folly because they are caught in their own madness, and don't even realize the consequences of what they're doing in the real world. They don't have the capability to carry out the kind of provocations that they are threatening, and the danger, of course, is that that does not mean that they're not going to try to do it. Putin stepped into the Syria situation at a critical moment last September, and the entire situation has shifted radically since that point. The Russian intention is {not} to simply accomplish a military victory on behalf of the forces of President Assad. They're creating the conditions to force the intransigents, in this case Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, some of the other Gulf states, and always lurking in the background when you're dealing with Saudi Arabia and the Muslim Brotherhood is the British. So, Putin has established a clear sense of control over the situation. Undoubtedly part of Putin's configuration is that Obama has been greatly weakened by the actions of Russia; on the economic sphere, the actions of China; and there are sane military forces in the United States who recognize the folly of

what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing. This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region. Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see

nothing  
but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on  
the  
verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place  
where  
you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course  
Asia  
and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but  
relative  
to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and  
in  
the United States, we see a disintegration of the political  
and  
economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of  
course,  
Africa has been on the target list of the British and other  
European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time.  
But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and  
growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment  
of  
geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has  
called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis  
in  
Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire  
European  
financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly  
bankrupt  
under the present conditions and terms of thinking that  
dominate  
Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning  
to  
see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of  
the  
people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in  
the first place.  
So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance  
minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the

destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself,  
now  
saying there must be a Marshall Plan to rebuild Syria, to  
rebuild  
other parts of the Middle East, and only on the basis of a  
Marshall Plan, which gives people a clear incentive to go back  
to  
their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those  
circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee  
crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what  
applies  
to the Middle East applies doubly for Africa, where the  
U.S.-British-French overthrow of Qaddafi unleashed absolute  
hell  
throughout the African continent.  
And so the danger of a massive, even larger flow of refugees  
coming out of Africa into Europe, as well as the continuing  
crisis centered in the Middle East, means that Europe is  
absolutely doomed unless there is a fundamental change in  
policy.  
And for starters, that change means that the United States and  
Europe must reach out to Russia and China. You had the recent  
visit by President Xi Jinping of China to Saudi Arabia, to  
Iran,  
and to Egypt, and what Xi Jinping made very clear is that  
China  
is prepared to move towards the building of the Silk Road  
infrastructure, the New Silk Road land route, the Maritime  
Silk  
Route, which will come up through the newly expanded Suez  
Canal  
– China will do that. In fact, just this week, the first  
freight  
train from Eastern China arrived in Iran, and this is part of  
the  
entire European system of not just transportation corridors,  
but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the cornerstone of their foreign policy.

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

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

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

And

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

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

solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

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

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

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

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

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

process to happen almost overnight – then we have a history in



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

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

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries – you have clinical insanity and folly, which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized,

Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only way to solve this problem.

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

LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David

Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent

poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week

will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough

to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released

by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns. Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald

Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have

the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is

sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as

fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union

–

and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem.

So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union,

then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials

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

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

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

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

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

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

much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint

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

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

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

Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy.

So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission, are tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes up with its own version of shutting down the City of London and Wall

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

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

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

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

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

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

is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already established the rail links between central China and Germany. There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European

leaders are going to have abandon their folly. And that's a difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

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

discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a

new program of economic development for the Middle East and North

Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan

for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche

emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating

underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry.

The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan, and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the

Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek a

better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this is

a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China

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

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

century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

an astonishingly tiny change.

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

But what does all of this mean? What does it tell us about – what are the implications? Well for one thing, this means we really have an entirely new tool for looking at the universe that we live in. All of our knowledge about the heavens beyond us, comes from sight, or various forms of sight. You can't smell a star, you can't taste it; you can't hear it, you can't feel it.

You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we learn more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to Kepler when he determined how the planets moved; the use of telescopes in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen with the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that see what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes. Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the



electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hypotheses

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to

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

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

wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows

that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

said

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

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

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

no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's

no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a

concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had

with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and

Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God,

and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler.

Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and

felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing that.

Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a

good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or

wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include

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

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

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

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

He was right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what science really is?

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

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

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

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not

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

experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people are actually thinking about as citizens of this nation. "Wow! What are we going to send up there?" "What are we going to take to the Moon for the next trip?" We've got a lot of objectives that have been defined that we have just been sitting on for decades. And if we eliminate the source of this culturally, the frankly unscientific view of science, this anti-human view of humanity, we can do great things. And we can do it by removing Obama and giving this nation a future-oriented mission again.

OGDEN: Well thank you very much, Jason. I think that's certainly exciting; the idea to be able to directly perceive changes in space-time itself. So, I'd like to thank Jason for his presentation, and I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us remotely today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

## **Det Romerske Imperiums fald – du står midt i det!**

*Som Lyndon LaRouche omhyggeligt har påpeget, så var en side af denne britiske anførte fordærvelse og ødelæggelse af det 20. og 21. århundredes USA, det diktatur over videnskab, og dernæst som en konsekvens over tænkning generelt, som blev udøvet af Storbritanniens Lord Bertrand Russell. Russell dekreterede, at al fysisk videnskab måtte reduceres til blot og bar matematik,*



og han forfulgte aggressivt Albert Einstein som det geni, der erklærede sig uenig og aldrig ville acceptere dette diktat. Russell havde held med sig – et besøg til et hvilket som helst såkaldt »videnskabeligt« klasseværelse burde overbevise dig om det. Som Russell forstod, at den ville, har denne afskrælning af videnskab fremtvunget en fordummelse af al tænkning. Amerikanere er blevet gennemgribende bedøvede netop sådan, som vores tidligere store geni Edgar Allan Poe havde forudset disse virkninger. Dette er grunden til, at han kæmpede til sit sidste åndedrag imod det, han fordømte som matematisk tankegang, og imod hele den imperiekultur, der udstrålede fra London.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **Jacques Attali foreslår international fredskonference for at standse krigens 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/>

---

## **Historien udvikler sig til Ruslands og Kinas fordel, ikke Obamas**

*17. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Efter endnu et fejlslagent »topmøde«-forsøg på at vende ASEAN-landene imod Kina, brugte Barack Obama sin pressekonference den 16. februar på at fordømme og forsøge at nedgøre Rusland, og i særdeleshed den russiske præsident Putins succesrige forandring af situationen i Mellemøsten.

Obamaregeringen forsøger, gennem medierne, at hævde, at våbenhvilen i Syrien, som den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry forhandlede igennem med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, vil mislykkes! Dette, fordi Obama ikke kan tolerere de succesrige økonomiske og politiske

roller, som Rusland og Kina nu spiller i verden, og sine egne fiaskoer.

Det, som Putins succesrige rolle repræsenterer, er overførslen af indflydelse over menneskelige anliggender fra det britiske imperiesystem – for hvilket Obama har været en villig faktor – og over til de fremvoksende eurasiske nationer.

Det repræsenterer også en næsten 20 år lang succesrig kamp imod al jihadistisk terrorisme, både i Rusland og internationalt – et samarbejde, der uafbrudt er blevet tilbudt USA siden 11. september [2001], og som altid er blevet afvist af Bush og Obama.

Kina og Rusland og Indien er blevet de primære agenter for en ændring af civilisationens fremtid. De europæiske nationer og USA er for en nedadgående kurs, og de vil gå ned, med mindre de radikalt ændrer deres politik for den krise, der omslutter deres banksystemer.

Siden præsident Franklin Roosevelts død har USA befundet sig i en lang nedgangsperiode for økonomisk produktivitet; og siden mordene på JFK og RFK, for et accelererende tab af videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt, og for de fleste af sine borgeres livsbetingelser.

Spørgsmålet drejer sig ikke om, hvad Obama siger; det drejer sig om, hvad man skal gøre med ham. Vil USA være intelligent nok til at gå sammen med Rusland og Kina om samarbejde om rumprogrammer, i internationale kreditbanker, i store infrastrukturprojekter, i overvindelsen af terrorisme, der er fostret af briterne og saudierne? Hvis ikke, vil USA blive ødelagt som magt.

Præsident Putin udøver ikke stor magt, men effektiv magt, og han udøver den med intelligens. Rusland, Kina og Indien styrer i stigende grad planetens fremtidige historie.

Og USA har – Obama! Hvis han blev dumpet nu, så har USA en

historisk afprøvet politik for økonomisk genrejsning, der kunne genoprette dets fremtid: FDR's politik. Luk Wall Streets kasino-banksystem, der er ved at få fallit, ned, og skab dernæst statslig kredit til genindførelse af produktivitet og produktiv beskæftigelse. Det er det eneste alternativ, og det vil ikke ske med Obama i embedet.

*Foto: Præsidenterne Xi Jinping og Vladimir Putin mødes under G20-mødet i Tyrkiet i 2015.*

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

---

# Opdatering om krisen over Nordkorea: Kina forbereder sig til krig

## Kinesisk general kræver krigsberedskab over krisen i Korea

16. februar 2016 – I en meget tankevækkende artikel i den kinesiske udgave af *Global Times*, advarer general Wang Haiyan, seniorrådgiver ved Kinesisk Selskab for International Strategi, en tænketank, der ledes af Sun Jianguo, vicechef for den Centrale Militærkommissions Fællesstab, om faren for en krig på den Koreanske Halvø. General Wang advarer om, at, i betragtning af denne eventualitet, må Kina være forberedt og bør omgående tage forholdsregler i denne henseende, inklusive at forøge troppestyrkerne på grænsen, så vel som også at deployere en forøget flådetilstedeværelse i området. Kina bør også overveje, hvordan det skal håndtere et eventuelt radioaktivt nedfald, stammende fra en udveksling af atombomber på halvøen, samt håndtere en situation, hvor nordkoreanske soldater flygter fra krigsskuepladsen.

General Wang fremlægger situationen. På den ene side giver han den nordkoreanske regerings handlinger skylden for krisen, med den nordkoreanske regerings seneste atombombep prøvesprængning og dens raketaffyring. Dette har givet Japan og USA et påskud til at øge deres militære stilling på halvøen, som samtidig er et yderligere skridt i deres forsøg på at inddæmme Kina, siger han. Han kræver klar tale med det nordkoreanske lederskab for at advare dem om, at ethvert forsøg på at gøre fremstød for en militær konflikt vil gøre dem stor fortræd. Han siger også, at det bør siges tydeligt, at Kina ikke er indstillet på at yde de ofre, landet ydede under Koreakrigen, og han indikerede således, at en krig, fremprovokeret af Nordkorea, ikke ville

blive støttet af Kina, der ville handle for at forsvare sine egne, nationale interesser.

General Wang giver også udtryk for bekymring over de forøgede militære deployeringer i området og over verserende rygter om, at et angreb på Nordkorea måske er undervejs, ved månedens afslutning. Han siger, at der bør udøves pres på »fornuftens stemmer« i de vestlige lande for at forhindre dem i at begynde en krig på halvøen. Han appellerer også til FN om ikke at yde støtte til NOGEN SOM HELST nation, der har planer om at indlede en krig på halvøen, og at indkalde til en genetablering af Sekspartsforhandlingerne. Han appellerer til Rusland, som medlem af FN's Sikkerhedsråd, om også at spille sin rolle i at effektuere dette.

General Wang gentager opfordringen til USA fra tidligere på ugen fra Fu Ying, viceminister i Udenrigsministeriet, om, at USA må gøre mere på det diplomatiske plan for at bringe spørgsmålet om Nordkorea tilbage til forhandlingsbordet, inklusive en villighed til at påbegynde forhandlinger om en permanent fredsaftale med Nordkorea.

## **Sydkoreas præsident Park kapitulerer yderligere til Obamas krigsplaner**

*16. februar 2016* – Den sydkoreanske præsident Park Geun Hye, der har forladt sin tidligere, forsigtige balancegang mellem USA på den ene hånd og Kina og Rusland på den anden, har nu yderligere undermineret Sydkorea ved åbenlyst at true med regimeskift i Nordkorea – Obamas og hans ligesindede neokonservatives drøm om at levere gnisten til en krig med Kina. Park befinder sig i et humør for selvdestruktion over Nordkoreas prøvesprængning af en hybridbrintbombe i januar og en succesfuld lancering ud i rummet i denne måned, som Obama, i et nyt udtryk for teknologisk apartheid, fejlagtigt kalder en ballistisk missiltest.

Udover at gå med til opstilling af THAAD-missiler i sit land – en alvorlig, strategisk trussel mod Kina og Rusland – lukkede hun også ned for den i fællesskab udviklede Kaesong industripark i Nordkorea i sidste uge, der nedlukkede 124 sydkoreanske selskaber, og som rammer den sydkoreanske økonomi på et farligt tidspunkt, med kollapsende handel og investering.

I dag holdt hun i parlamentet en tale, der blev udsendt over nationalt fjernsyn, og hvor hun forsvarede sin beslutning om at nedlukke Kaesong, imod stærk opposition fra oppositionspartiet og fra kræfter i sit eget parti, og Park sagde, iflg. *Korean Herald*: »Fra nu af vil regeringen gennemføre en række magtfulde og effektive forholdsregler for at få det nordkoreanske regime til at indse, at udvikling af atomvåben ikke vil sikre overlevelse, men kun fremme systemets ødelæggelse.« At referere til »regimeskift« på denne måde har været tabu i Seoul, eftersom planer om regimeskift netop udgør Nordkoreas retfærdiggørelse af at opbygge en atomvåbenkapacitet.

Park er tydeligvis bekymret for, at hendes handlinger skal splitte hendes land, og siger, »At pege sværdspidsen tilbage på os og splitte os er noget, der ikke må finde sted«, iflg. *AP*.

Situationens farlighed blev også demonstreret i mandags, da Nationalforsamlingens formand, fra Parks regeringsparti, åbenlyst krævede, at Sydkorea skulle udvikle atomvåben. Parlamentsmedlem Won Yoo-chul sagde: »I betragtning af Nordkoreas atomvåben- og missilkapaciteter, må vi tænke over vores egen overlevelsesstrategi og modforholdsregler, der inkluderer fredelige [sic] atomvåben- og missilprogrammer til brug for vores selvforsvar.«



## **Kolossal stor deployering af amerikanske, strategiske styrker til Sydkorea**

16. februar 2016 – *Yonhap* rapporterer i dag, at USA vil sende fire F-22 Raptor stealth kampfly til Sydkorea, iflg. officielle forsvarsfolk, der beskriver flyet som »et amerikansk, strategisk hovedvåben«. Pentagon udsendte et B-25 bombefly til Sydkorea kort efter Nordkoreas atomvåbenprøvesprængning i sidste måned. For nylig ankom angrebs-ubåden USS North Carolina til Sydkorea til fælles træning, og det atombevæbnede hangarskib USS John C. Stennis skal efter planen tilslutte sig de årlige, fælles sydkoreansk-amerikanske forsvarsøvelser, der begynder i marts måned.

I mellemtiden gentog det Sydkoreanske Forsvarsministerium, at det ville prioritere »militær effektivitet« ved valg af lokalitet for opstillingen af det amerikanske THAAD-missilforsvarsbatteri, sagde *Yonhap*. THAAD X-Band radarsystemet vil give USA radardækning over næsten hele Kina og en stor del af det russiske Fjernøsten, sammen med THAAD missilkapaciteten, der tilsigter at ødelægge Kinas gengældelses-angrebsstyrke.

## **Kina forbereder sig til krig over Korea**

17. februar 2016 – En usigneret lederartikel i Kinas Kommunistiske Partis officielle avis *Global Times* i dag, med overskriften, »Kina må forberede sig på det værste på den Koreanske Halvø«, advarer om, at USA's politik i Nord- og Sydkorea i høj grad øger chancen for krig. Med en påpegning af den massive opbygning af luftvåben- og flådekampstyrker i Sydkorea, og planerne om at opstille THAAD-missiler der, advarer lederartiklen: »Hvis Washington og Seoul overskrider den 38. nordlige breddegrad (der efter Anden Verdenskrig opdelte i Nord- og Sydkorea, –red.) og skrider til omfattende

militær handling, bør de tage risikoen for Kinas militære intervention med i betragtning. Vi støtter denne analyse.«

Artiklen kommer kun en dag efter en artikel i den samme avis, *Global Times*, hvor general Wang Haiyan krævede krigsberedskab som respons til den eskalerende Koreakrise, og dagens leder bemærker skiftet i tone og handling hos den sydkoreanske præsident Park Geun-Hye, inklusive hendes advarsel fra i går til Nordkorea om, at en fortsættelse af deres atomvåbenprogram vil føre til »regimets sammenbrud«. Artiklen siger: »Ud fra det store perspektiv om det asiatiske Stillehavsområde er fraværet af en løsning på den nordkoreanske atomvåbenkrise resultatet af USA's planer om at kontrollere det Nordøstlige Asien og blande sig i Kinas opkomst ... Hvis en krig finder sted, vil den offentlige, kinesiske mening støtte landets handlinger i betragtning af, hvordan Kinas sikkerhed er truet.«

I en anden lederartikel, der blev udgivet i går, fordømmer *Global Times* Nordkoreas »hensynsløse træk«, men advarer dernæst Seoul: »Når THAAD-systemet først er opstillet i Sydkorea, vil det kinesiske samfund være nødt til at støtte Folkets Befrielseshær i at respondere via en stærk, militær deployering i nordøst. I så tilfælde kunne Sydkorea forvandles til et særdeles følsomt område i spillet om militære deployeringer mellem Kina og USA. Det vil få det Blå Hus (officiel residens for det sydkoreanske statsoverhoved, -red.) til yderligere at miste sin nationale uafhængighed og blive en skakbrik i spillet mellem stormagter.«

Kina har gentagne gange advaret Filippinerne på en lignende måde med, at det at agere skakbrik for Obama kunne forvandle deres land til murbrokker, når USA aktiverer Prompt Global Strike-doktrinen imod Kina.

*Foto: Sydkoreas præsident Park Guen-Hye og USA's præsident*

*Barack Obama på vej ud af det Blå Hus. Foto fra april 2014.*

---

# USA: Obama foreslår forsvarsbudget for 3. Verdenskrig

17. februar 2016 – USA's forsvarsminister Ashton Carters foreløbige fremlæggelse af Obamas forsvarsbudget for 2017, der blev givet til Washington Economic Club den 2. feb., samt en lederartikel i *Washington Post* i dag, »En ny tids afskrækkelse«, indikerer begge Obamas plan om at starte en krig imod Rusland og Kina.

Obama præsenterer et budget for Tredje Verdenskrig for Kongressen. I 2013 blev Rusland knapt nævnt i Obamas budget, indrømmer *WP*. I sit budget for 2017 foreslår Obama udgifter til 3,4 mia. dollar til »Det europæiske forsikringsinitiativ«, en stigning fra 789 mio. dollar i 2013, og som skal finansiere flere roterende styrker i Europa; mere uddannelse og flere øvelser; mere udstyr, der forhåndsdeployeres; alt dette »vil ved slutningen af 2017 lade os hurtigt danne en særdeles kapabel styrke på jorden med kombinationen af våben, og som kan respondere over hele skuepladsen, om nødvendigt«.

»Skiftet kommer sent«, klager *WP*, »og er kun en udbetaling. Men erkendelsen af, at Rusland har udviklet sig fra at være en partner in spe og til seriøs trussel, hilses velkommen«.

Hensigten med de forøgede udgifter er at forsikre allierede, der er blevet nervøse over Ruslands nye aggressivitet, og »sende et stærkt budskab om afskrækkelse. Rusland og dets stedfortrædende militser besætter dele af tre tidligere

sovjetrepublikker – Moldova, Georgien og Ukraine – og dets militær har taget initiativet i Syrien ... I hele Europa fører russerne en ubehagelig informationskrig og bruger åbenlyse og fordækte metoder til at underminere NATO og den Europæiske Union«. *WP* kommer med den vilde påstand, at mange vestlige regeringsfolk mener, at Putin »med overlæg forværrer flygtningekrisen, der truer europæisk enhed, en taktik, som de refererer til som »at gøre migration til et våben«.

I løbet af det seneste årti »har Rusland gjort imponerende fremskridt inden for elektronisk krigsførelse og andre militære teknologier. Ligesom Kina har Rusland et lavere forsvarsbudget end USA, men de har hældt ressourcer ind i våbensystemer, der er 'asymmetriske', hvilket vil sige, at en relativ lille investering kan underminere en formidabel, konventionel amerikansk kapacitet ... Rusland har angiveligt udviklet en ny, ubemandet undervandsdrone, der kan medføre atomvåben, alt imens Kina forbedrer sin anti-satellit kapacitet. De har begge foretaget kæmpespring over teknologiske hurdler ... Hvordan skal man respondere?«

Opgradering af atomvåben, som Carter og *WP* ikke nævner, er afgørende for atomar aktivitet. Planen kræver 13 mia. dollar til en ny ubåd med ballistiske missiler over de næste fem år, til erstatning af den nuværende flåde af ubåde i Ohio-klassen. Af dette beløb vil 4 mia. dollar blive brugt til forskning og udvikling, og resten på anskaffelse af elementer, som har lang leveringstid, således, at konstruktion af de første nye både kan begynde i 2021.

Pentagons plan vil også understrege behovet for at finansiere alle tre ben af USA's afskrækkelses-»triade« – ikke blot de nye ubåde, men også nye, atombevæbnede interkontinentale ballistiske missiler og et nyt bombefly til luftvåbnet, sagde en unavngiven kilde til Reuters.

---

# **Det transatlantiske finanssystem er færdigt – Der findes kun en løsning med Rusland og Kina.**

## **Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

*14. februar 2016 – Det kan siges præcis så slagfærdigt: Europas og USA's finanssystem er allerede dødt, men begravelsen har endnu ikke fundet sted. Der finder bankkrak sted i hobetal, og centralbankernes berømte værktøj viser sig virkningsløse, eller også gør de katastrofen endnu værre. Det er på allerhøjeste tid at gøre en ende på kasinoøkonomien og virkeliggøre et Grand Design for opbygningen af verdensøkonomien, og først og fremmest i Sydvestasien og Afrika! Og samarbejdet med Kina om den Nye Silkevej er den bedste tilgang til dette!*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **En løsning på Wall Streets panik – uden Obamas**

# Verdenskrig

*15. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Den transatlantiske finansielle panik, der nu er ved at udvikle sig, er værre end den i 2008; den har bragt os helt ud på randen af et sammenbrud i økonomi og civilisation.

Selv om Wall Street insisterer voldsomt på, at »det kun er de europæiske banker«, så er dette en løgn, der afsløres af deres eget bjerg af dårlige værdipapirer, der løber op i billioner af dollar, og med deres derivater, der nu begynder at nedsmelte. Vi afventer det første krak af en storbank, måske så tidligt som i denne måned, eller i denne uge. Men den virkelige panik bliver det, der følger efter. En milliard dollar stor derivatmængde binder alle disse storbanker sammen, siden man afskaffede Glass-Steagall. De har allerede reduceret de transatlantiske og japanske økonomier til under nulvækst; deres kollaps vil tilintetgøre disse økonomier.

Vi kan redde USA fra bankerot og kollaps. Kongressen kan vedtage nødforholdsregler. Med en Glass/Steagall-reform kan Kongressen lukke Wall Street ned, og dernæst begynde at skabe statskreditter til investeringer i reel produktivitet i den amerikanske økonomi – for første gang i et halvt århundrede. Dette vil kræve en mission med en videnskabelig drivkraft, med et fuldt ud genoplivet amerikansk NASA-program, i samarbejde med især Kinas, Indiens og Ruslands rumprogrammer.

At redde USA fra bankerot vil kræve mere end Wall Streets betingelsesløse overgivelse; det vil også kræve, at Kongressen fjerner Barack Obama fra magten, eller også kunne Wall Streets panik ende med Obamas verdenskrig.

Vi står på randen af en invasion af Syrien fra tyrkisk-saudisk hold, der handler efter planer, som er lagt med Obamas forsvarsminister Ashton Carter, og som direkte sætter en krig med Rusland på spil.

Dette træk, som nu kunne komme over os, giver ingen mening. Det er vanvittigt for et i stigende grad bankerot og miskrediteret Saudi Arabien, samt et allerede destabiliseret Tyrkiet, at iscenesætte en illegal invasion og sætte planeten på randen af verdenskrig. Den russiske præsident Putins intervention siden september 2015 skabte ikke alene alternativet til ISIS/al-Qaedas overtagelse af hele Syrien; dette alternativ har også succesfuldt bevæget krigen tæt på en våbenhvile.

Disse truende angribere er irrelevante. Krigsfaktoren er Obama, og de britiske bankierere og kongelige, der kontrollerer ham. Hvis Obama åbenlyst går ind for tyrkiske og saudiske skakbrikker, der truer med en krig, der kan ødelægge civilisationen, så kunne denne handling give bagslag i form af at forårsage hans fjernelse fra præsidentembedet ved at anvende det 25. forfatningstillæg.

Den større krigsfaktor er det nu hastigt fremadskridende kollaps af Europas og USA's banksystemer og økonomier. Virkeligheden er Wall Streets panik. Vi skal holde os til jobbet med at lukke det ned omgående. Hvis vi gør det, har vi – sammen med Rusland og dets allierede Kina – midlerne til at forhindre Obamas verdenskrig.

*Billede: Han venter og håber på virkelig forandring. FDR-mindesmærke, Washington, D.C. Krediteret Norman Maddeaux.*

*(Skulpturen henviser til præsident Franklin Roosevelts ugentlige søndags-radioudsendelser, kaldet 'Fireside Chats', hvor han talte direkte til det amerikanske folk om den politik, han havde til hensigt at gennemføre.*

**Forslag til fordybelse:** et udvalg af FDR's vigtigste 'Fireside Chats' kan læses her: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/fireside.php> -red.)

---

# **General Kujat: 'Uden russerne ingen fred'; Hvis Tyrkiet invaderer Syrien, har vi en nedsmeltning**

*15. februar 2016* – General Harald Kujat (pensioneret), den forhenværende chef for NATO's Militærkomite (2002-05) og forhenværende stabschef for det tyske Bundeswehr (2000-02), talte igen den 14. feb. om behovet for at arbejde sammen med Rusland i Syrien for at afslutte krigen og således undgå en global konfrontation mellem NATO og Rusland. Søndag aften optrådte han på ARD-TV's Anne Will show, hvor han fortsatte sin helligelse til at fremprovokere en offentlig debat og sætte standarden for en strategisk evaluering.

Mod showets slutning gik Kujat imod de andre gæsters anti-russiske ytringer med et realitetschok. Han lagde ud med at sige, at vi burde behandle Medvedevs tale den 13. feb. ved München Sikkerhedskonferencen som »en appel« til os om at tale sammen. Vi havde skåret alle vore bånd til Rusland over, såsom suspenderingen af NATO-Rusland Rådet, »som er et særdeles fleksibelt instrument ... Vi kunne på fremragende vis bruge Militærkomiteen i et arrangement med lederen af den russiske generalstab til at aftale forholdsregler i Ukraine, der opbygger tillid til militæret. Det er ikke blevet brugt!«

Over for afbrydelser, der sagde, at »det er alt for simpelt« fra gæsten Martin Schulz, præsident for EU-parlamentet (Tysk, SPD), påpegede general Kujat konsekvenserne af ikke at gøre



dette nu: »Den fare, som Syrien repræsenterer, er totalt undervurderet. Hvis Tyrkiet invaderer Syrien og render ind i russiske tropper, så står vi med et NATO-medlem i konflikt med Rusland. Vi er så alle i konflikt med Rusland ... Tyrkiet har igen og igen prøvet på at trække NATO ind i det, nøgleord Patriot-missiler, nøgleord AWACS. Jeg kan kun advare om, at man ser denne situation for at være så alvorlig, som den er, og lægger pres på vore allierede, og en af disse er Tyrkiet.« Tidligere i debatterne sagde han, at, hvis Tyrkiet invaderer, »så ville det blive en atomar nedsmeltning«, og vi må holde os virkeligheden for øje. Han brugte termen super-GAU (tysk: Grösste Atom-Unfall; det største atomuheld), et udtryk, der refererer til en atomar nedsmeltning.

Som svar til en schweizisk journalist-gæst, der opfordrede til at bevæbne den »moderate opposition« i Syrien med missiler til at nedskyde russiske kampfly, benyttede general Kujat lejligheden til at påpege, at vi for to år siden lå i forhandlinger med Rusland om at afslutte krigen, men lige præcis denne »moderate opposition« standsede det ved at insistere på, at Assad måtte gå som en forudsætning. Resultatet? »I denne periode har vi fået titusinder af døde og millioner af flygtninge.« Han fortsatte, lad os ikke gentage denne fejltagelse. Vi har brug for tre skridt for en fredelig løsning: afslutte borgerkrigen, fordrive ISIS og en demokratisk, legitim, parlamentarisk regering i Syrien, »der skaber forudsætningerne for en form for Marshallplan til genopbygning af dette land.«

<http://daserste.ndr.de/annewill/videos/Bomben-und-Elend-in-Syrien-Laesst-sich-der-Krieg-stoppen,annewill4508.html>

---

# Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov advarer, generel krig ville være USA's ansvar

14. februar 2016 – Under spørgsmål & svar-sessionen ved Sikkerhedskonferencen i München den 13. feb. udtalte den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov, at den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry, under sin forudgående tale i München, sagde, at militært samarbejde med Rusland er, hvad USA ønsker. Men, sagde Lavrov, han finder, at udtalelser, der kommer fra Ashton Carters Pentagon, modsiger ønsket om samarbejde. Lavrov nævnte USA's insistensen på at fortsætte sine egne militære handlinger i Syrien samtidig med, at det forlanger, at Rusland standser sin kampagne – til trods for, at begge kampagner har terrorgrupper som deres mål, rapporterede RT i dag.

Lørdag understregede Lavrov ved Sikkerhedskonferencen i München: »Nøglen til at afgøre både det humanitære problem og spørgsmålet om en våbenhvile er etablering af et dagligt, time-for-time samarbejde og ditto koordinering mellem det amerikanske militær, som leder af deres koalition, og Ruslands militær, eftersom vi [Rusland] arbejder i Syrien efter invitation fra den syriske regering.« Lavrov sagde, at samarbejde med den Russiske Føderation er vigtigt, eftersom Moskva »har en vis indflydelse i Damaskus«.

Lavrov sagde: »Diskussionen omkring våbenhvilen bevæger sig ud på et sidespor for at standse den russiske luftstyrkegruppering og rejser således mistanker og giver anledning til fortrydelige tanker omkring, hvad resultatet af alt arbejdet i München om [Støttegruppens kommunikation] vedtaget den 12. februar har været.« »Hvis der ikke finder ærlige, daglige kontakter sted mellem militæret – i regionen, på ethvert andet, passende sted, hvorfra det er muligt klart at se, hvad der foregår på

'jorden', og hvorfra det ville være muligt at styre det, der foregår på 'jorden', så vil intet blive gennemført. Kontakter mellem militæret er fastlagt i denne erklæring [Gruppens kommunikation]. Hvis USA 'bakker ud', påtager det sig et kolossalt ansvar«, sagde Lavrov.

»Det faktum, at diskussionen omkring denne våbenhvile er ved at glide over mod at prioritere standsningen af de russiske luftstyrkers operationer, får mig til kraftigt at mistænke, at vore anstrengelser for fred vil ende surt. Hvis militæret ikke opretholder en ærlig, dag-til-dag kontakt, kan intet opnås«, sagde Lavrov. »Hvis amerikanerne forsøger at spole tilbage nu, ville ansvaret være deres«, tilføjede han, iflg. RT's rapport.

---

## **Interviews fra München: General Kujat, Ischinger og Medvedev: Vil USA og Rusland samarbejde; eller gå i krig over Syrien?**

*Wiesbaden, 12. februar 2016* – Tidligere formand for NATO's Militærkomite (2002-05) og stabschef for Bundeswehr (2000-02), den tyske general Harald Kujat (pensioneret), gentog offentligt, hvad alle ved München Sikkerhedskonferencen den 12.-14. feb. ved: Rusland kan ikke ignoreres.

Som han i dag sagde til *Neue Passauer Presse*, der spurgte, om det var Putins plan, at operationerne omkring Aleppo skulle

øge konflikten i Syrien: »Nej. Rusland går frem efter en strategisk plan. Putins mål er at støtte de syriske tropper i deres offensiv i Islamisk Stats områder. Hidtil har Aleppo været et punkt, der blokerede for dette mål, idet byen har været kontrolleret af den syriske opposition. Man bør ikke glemme, at Rusland har foreslået en våbenhvile med start 1. marts. Dette er en chance.«

På spørgsmålet, »Argumenterer De for samarbejde med russerne?« svarede han: »For det første har russerne med deres militære intervention gjort fredsprocessen mulig. Frem til september 2015 befandt vi os i et totalt dødvande. Hverken amerikanerne eller europæerne havde en strategi for et fredeligt Syrien, og de var heller ikke rede til at blive massivt engageret. Vi må give denne proces en chance. Før den russiske intervention var situationen denne: Den syriske hær stod på randen af kollaps. Jeg ville kun have givet dem nogle få ugers eksistens tilbage. Men så ville Syrien være kollapsede, og IS ville have overtaget landet. Det næste mål ville have været Libanon – og derefter Israel. Det ville have haft vidtgående konsekvenser for os.«

Samtidig med, at Kujat blev interviewet i går, gav også formanden for München Sikkerhedskonferencen, Wolfgang Ischinger, et interview i går aftes, til ZDF-TV's aggressive nyhedsvært Klaus Kleber – dette efter, at det forlød, at den russiske premierminister Dmitry Medvedev gav interview til *Handelsblatts* globale udgave, hvor han advarede om, at udenlandske troppedeployeringer i Syrien ville udløse en permanent Tredje Verdenskrig.

Først gav Ischinger udtryk for Medvedevs ønske om, at alle skulle sætte sig ved forhandlingsbordet, men så kom Ischinger pludselig med, at russerne også måtte standse deres offensiv. ZDF's Kleber spurgte dernæst, men hvis russerne ikke standser, og Vesten massivt øger sin støtte til oprørerne, »Vil dette simpelt hen ikke betyde mere krig?« Ischinger svarede, at det ikke ville være godt, men hvis der ikke sker noget i denne weekend, her, så »må Obama og Putin tale med hinanden for at

komme sammen ved et topmøde, hvor de indgår en overordnet, strategisk aftale. Dette kan kun forhandles igennem af lederne af disse to magter. Det kan udenrigsministre ikke gøre; der jo i alle tilfælde er underlagt ordrer, især i USA's og Ruslands tilfælde. Dernæst mener jeg, at vi må have et topmøde af den art, som blev afholdt for 30 år siden mellem Ronald Reagan og Mikhail Gorbachov.«

Kleber, der skiftede emne, spurgte, Vesten kaster også bomber; findes der »onde russiske bomber og gode vestlige bomber?« Ischinger svarede, at, i en ideel situation, burde de to magter ikke blot have en fælles, strategisk løsning, men også, at de udefra kommende magter, der var involveret i Syrien, burde »sætte deres militære enheder, så at sige, under fælles militærkommando«.

---

# **NATO's Stoltenberg angriber Rusland ved München Sikkerhedskonference; Ruslands Medvedev: daglig amerikansk-russisk dialog nødvendig for at standse ny kold krig**

*13. februar 2016* – I en tale, der var fjendtlighedsindret over for Rusland, helligede NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg

hele sin korte tale ved Sikkerhedskonferencen i München til at angribe Rusland. Idet han hurtigt afviste truslen fra ISIL, sagde Stoltenberg i begyndelsen, »Vi har set et mere selvhævdende Rusland. Et Rusland, der destabiliserer den europæiske sikkerhedsorden.«

Idet han hyklerisk talte om at forhindre krig og om nødvendigheden af at åbne op for en dialog, meddelte han endda, at han havde talt med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov på sidelinjen af München, »for at udforske muligheden for at sammenkalde et møde i NATO-Rusland Rådet«. Men dernæst understregede Stoltenberg, »Politisk engagement betyder ikke en tilbagevenden til sædvanlige gøremål. Vi befinder os i en ny virkelighed mht. Rusland.«

Han pralede med den internationale enhed omkring sanktionerne, suspenderingen af Rusland fra G-8 og »voksende støtte til vore partnere i øst« som respons til »Ruslands handlinger i Ukraine«.

»Og NATO er i gang med den største styrkelse af vores kollektive forsvar i årtier«, sagde han, »for at sende et magtfuldt signal for at afskrække enhver aggression eller intimidering«, sagde han.

Denne »multinationale«, »fremskudte tilstedeværelse« i Øst er »for at gøre det klart, at et angreb på én allieret ikke kun vil blive besvaret af nationale styrker, men af styrker fra hele Alliancen.«

Den russiske premierminister Dmitry Medvedev, der talte hurtigt efter Stoltenberg, bemærkede NATO-chefens fjendtlighed. (Se nedefor)

**Medvedev: Amerikansk-russisk dialog er nødvendig hver dag for at standse en krise som den Kolde Krig i 1962**

13. februar 2016 – Den russiske premierminister Dmitry Medvedev sagde i dag, under den årlige Sikkerhedskonference i München, til USA, NATO og Europa, at de skulle stoppe deres krigspropaganda imod Rusland, fordi det kun reflekterer en farlig, ny kold krig.

»Vi mener, at NATO's politik imod Rusland stadig er fjendtlig og generelt set forstokket«, sagde premierministeren. »For at sige det ligeud, så er vi hastigt i færd med at glide ind i en periode med en ny, kold krig. Rusland er blevet fremstillet som så godt som den største trussel mod NATO, eller mod Europa, Amerika og andre lande (hvilket hr. Stoltenberg netop havde demonstreret). De viser skræmmende film om Rusland, der starter en atomkrig. Jeg er undertiden forvirret: er dette 2016, eller 1962? (Parentes tilføjet).

For at gøre det fuldstændig klart, at en sådan propaganda kunne føre til et atomopgør, nævnte Medvedev udtrykkeligt missilkrisen på Cuba. Men, understregede han, forskellen dengang var, at en dialog forhindrede en »atomar apokalypse«.

»Jeg vil gerne citere John F. Kennedy, der brugte meget enkle, men passende ord, 'Indenrigspolitik kan kun besejre os; udenrigspolitik kan dræbe os'«, sagde han. »I begyndelsen af 1960'erne stod verden ved indgangen til en atomar apokalypse, men de to rivalerende magter fandt modet til at indrømme, at ingen politisk konfrontation var tabet af menneskeliv værd.«

Men, med dagligt samarbejde mellem USA og Rusland, sagde han, »og jeg mener dagligt – hver dag«, kan krig undgås.

»Næsten hver dag henviser man til os som den mest forfærdelige trussel mod NATO som helhed eller mod Europa, Amerika og andre lande specifikt«, sagde Medvedev, [men] »vi er blevet klogere ... Og vi er ikke splittet af ideologiske fantomer og stereotyper. Jeg mener, at de udfordringer, som vi i dag står overfor, ikke vil føre til konflikt, men snarere vil opmuntre os til at komme sammen i en fair og ligeværdig forening, der

vil gøre det muligt for os at bevare freden i de næste 70 år, mindst.«

Han lagde ikke fingrene imellem mht. Syrien. »Terrorisme er en udfordring for hele civilisationen: vi må ikke opdele terrorister i venner, fjender, ekstremister eller 'moderater'. ... Jeg tror, at Daesh [arabisk for ISIS] bør være taknemlige over for mine kolleger, visse vestlige ledere, der umuliggjorde et sådant samarbejde« mellem Rusland og Vesten, sagde Medvedev.

»Det er vigtigt at bevare en forenet, syrisk stat og forhindre, at den falder fra hinanden i religions-baserede fragmenter. Verden har ikke råd til endnu et Libyen, Yemen eller Afghanistan.«

---

## **I disse dage træffes der skæbnesvangre beslutninger**

*11. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – De store strateger, såsom William Shakespeare, om hvem Lyndon LaRouche gennemførte skelsættende studier i januar 2014, forstod, at det nye gennembrud, der var nødvendigt for menneskehedens overlevelse, krævede, og man begav sig ud på veje, hvor intet menneske før havde gået; ja, på veje, hvis blotte eksistens ingen hidtil havde anet. Det var, hvad Douglas MacArthur gjorde i Stillehavskrigen under Anden Verdenskrig: han udtænkte en helt ny dimension for handling, ingen før havde forestillet sig, og som hidtil ikke havde været mulig, og som gav hans underlegne styrker mulighed for hele tiden at overvinde overlegne styrker.

Dette ændrede historien for altid, men det var kun et enkelt



af flere sådanne gennembrud, som MacArthur skabte. Det samme er sandt for Lyndon LaRouche.

I hvert enkelt tilfælde gjaldt de beslutninger, de traf, ikke kun for en dag eller et år, men for hele fremtiden. I denne henseende var de alle et ekko af Prometheus' skæbnesvangre beslutning, der blev taget én gang for alle tider, længe før historisk tid. Den gik ud på, at han ville skærme menneskeheden mod at lide udslettelsens skæbne, som Zeus havde dekretet for vores art. Lige som præsident John F. Kennedys beslutning, der blev annonceret for Kongressen den 25. maj 1961:

*»Det er min overbevisning, at denne nation bør forpligte sig til, før dette årti rinder ud, at opfylde det mål at landsætte en mand på Månen og bringe ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden.«*

I dag må vi atter træffe en sådan beslutning; det er denne **kamp, som anføres af LaRouchePAC-leder Kesha Rogers fra Houston, Texas.**

I sit **webcast mandag, den 8. februar med LaRouchePAC Policy Committee** sammenlignede LaRouche USA's intellektuelle anskuelse i dag med Det romerske Imperiums nedgang og fald og omtalte Det britiske Imperiums indtrængen lige fra USA's første begyndelse:

*»Det skete omgående, i og med USA's begyndelse som en nation. Ødelæggelsen var massiv: de fleste af USA's præsidenter var i realiteten fjender af USA; det var de fleste af dem! Og det er derfor, problemet bliver ved med at dukke op. Og fortsat gør det: Dette er Det romerske Imperium, modellen for Det romerske Imperium.*

*Nu har man den eurasiske model, Kinas genoplivning; og det, som Putin på sin side har gjort. Denne ting inspirerede ham. Husk, som jeg har nævnt ved et par lejligheder, så kom Putins familie fra et område, der var en koncentration af død, på grund af de kampe, der fandt sted dér. Og Putin er lykkedes*

med at være en faktor, der har skabt en styrkelse af både Kina og Rusland, for at redde Rusland. Og hvad implikationerne er; det, jeg har set i de områder, hvor jeg tidligere har befundet mig, I ved, Indien osv., områder, hvor jeg arbejdede.

Det, vi ser, er, at dette område, dette eurasiske område i sig har elementer, der danner grundlag for at skabe eller genskabe et nyt system for menneskeheden. Og hvad resultatet vil blive, de karakteristika, der er indbygget i denne ting, denne karakteristika er rumprogrammet.

Hvad mener vi med rumprogrammet? Jamen, det er ikke rumprogrammet sådan, som tåben tænker på rumprogrammet, men det er derimod rumprogrammet som en refleksion af, at menneskeheden er ved at opnå forstand på den virkelighed, at menneskeheden på Jorden ikke er den magt, der hersker over Jorden; men snarere, at der findes en magt ud over dette, der kontrollerer realiseringen af rummet, og det betyder, at mennesket er et væsen, der lever i rummet. Og det er i dette område, dette domæne, og dette domænes aktiviteter og udvikling, at menneskehedens fremtid ligger.

Det vigtige her er lige at tage et lille, kort trip og tænke over det. Hvad betyder dette? Og det her med Månen lige nu, det nye Måneprojekt, er sandsynligvis nøglen til at bringe denne idé til ikke alene det, der foregår i Kina netop nu, men hvad det betyder for hele den menneskelige art. Men vi har kurs mod en ændring af, hvad der har været karakteristisk for vores art, fra det, der har været traditionelt og til det, der nu vil vokse frem, fra denne nye forandring.

Ideen er derfor, hvis man vil gøre noget godt, så se på dette. Spørg ikke, hvad en eller anden siger, 'jamen, jeg tror, det er dette; jeg tror, det er hint '. Det duer ikke! Problemet er, at menneskeheden har været en fiasko, men hvorfor har menneskeheden været en fiasko? Ikke på grund af menneskehedens iboende natur, men på grund af dens fordærvelse.«

I andre diskussioner i løbet af de seneste dage har LaRouche påpeget sine kontroversielle studier af Shakespeare i 2014, som der netop henvises til, hvor han fastslog den pointe, blandt andre, at den stort set universelle opfattelse af menneskets historie er et falsum. At historien i realiteten består af disse former for dristige, hidtil ukendte opdagelser, som vi netop har diskuteret ovenfor. Disse opdagelser udgør menneskets natur. Se på den fremragende og radikale opfindelse af fysisk rum-tid, der går i en bue fra Kepler til Leibniz, via Gauss og dernæst til Planck og Einstein.

LaRouches webcast fra 8. februar indeholdt flere forskellige, konvergerende tankerækker, der alle lå på linje med det presserende behov for handling. Her følger konklusionen på en af disse tankerækker:

*»Så spørgsmålet om kreativitet betyder, at hele systemet med Solsystemet og videre endnu grundlæggende set beherskes af disse begivenheder, de samme begivenheder, som er de begivenheder, der karakteriseres af systemet som helhed. Det er der! Spørgsmålet er, hvad ønsker man? Man ønsker at skabe mennesker, der er kreative, skabende. Man ønsker at kunne skabe spædbørn, der selv er skabende på en original måde. Man ser dette: Einstein var f.eks. et godt eksempel på dette. Hvis man tager det, vi ved om hans historie, at menneskelig kreativitet er en enestående ting; det er det, der i realiteten bør dominere og kontrollere menneskehedens historie.«*

*Titelbillede: Prometheus bringer ilden til menneskene, oliemaleri af Heinrich von Füger, 1817.*

---

# **Vi må genoptage denne søgen efter menneskets rolle i universet, og skabe fremtidige generationer af genier**

*Så her står vi. Husk på billedet af John og Robert Kennedy; og husk, at vi atter kan genoptage denne søgen efter menneskets rolle i universet, og skabe fremtidige generationer af genier. For det er menneskehedens natur; og det er en synd, hver gang, et barn nægtes evnen til at blive et sådant geni, som gør en opdagelse, der har indflydelse på hele menneskeheden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

*Titelfoto: Neil Armstrong, første mand på Månen, 1930-2012.*

---

## **LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 12. februar**

# 2016:

## Genopliv USA's rumprogram! Genopliv en vision for fremtiden!

*Dette fredags-webcast vil fokusere på LaRouches nødmobilisering for at genoprette det amerikanske rumprogram og gøre Barack Obamas ødelæggelse af rumprogrammet til det mest fremtrædende tema i spørgsmålet om nødvendigheden af at stille ham for en rigsret som præsident for USA. Engelsk udskrift.*

This Friday's LaRouchePAC webcast will focus on LaRouche's emergency mobilization to restore the American space program and make its destruction by Barack Obama the most prominent feature of his necessary impeachment as President of the United States.

**Transcript-**MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening! My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, from [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). This is our webcast for February 12, 2016. Today is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. I'm joined in the studio today by Jeffrey Steinberg from *Executive Intelligence Review* magazine, as well as Megan Beets and Ben Deniston from the LaRouche PAC science team. I'm also joined, via video, by a special guest again this week – Kesha Rogers, joining us from Houston, Texas.

We have all just come from a discussion that we had with both Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche. I think the content of the presentation that you'll hear tonight is directly informed by the tenor of that discussion. It's very clear that there are immediate problems, an immediate crisis, which must be addressed and must be resolved, that are right in front of

us as we speak. However, that will be the subject of the answer to our institutional question, which we have decided to leave to the end of tonight's broadcast.

To begin with, we have the responsibility to take a step back and look at the much bigger picture. We have a responsibility of leadership, as an organization, and as a movement which involves the viewers of this webcast tonight. That responsibility of leadership requires us to go far beyond these immediate challenges, to look into the future, and to imagine what mankind can be, what mankind must be, and to take the necessary action to bring that future into being.

The recent attention to the incomparable genius of Albert Einstein that has been forced upon us by a very interesting outcome of an experimental investigation that has just had results that were reported yesterday, forces us to consider, however, not just the outcome of that experiment, but forces us to consider what mankind as a species is capable of, and what the identity of mankind as a species must become in a self-conscious way.

This is something that we're going to take up in much more detail a little bit later in the broadcast tonight, but what we begin to consider, is that the space program as we knew it from President John F. Kennedy and others, is the necessary ingredient of a mission of any civilization which is worthy of representing mankind as a species on this planet. Mankind must not be a creature of the Earth. Man is not an Earthling. Mankind must be a creature of the stars! He must learn, both physically and mentally, how to navigate that wide ocean which is outer space. He must come to know what he does not know. He must come to understand the inner workings of the galaxy which he is an integral part of, and also other galactic systems. And, he must come to know his role as a species within that complex of galactic systems which comprise the Universe as we know it today.

In doing so, man affirms his nature as a species completely unique from all other species. Mr. LaRouche was emphatic that the insights of Vladimir Vernadsky and his understanding of the noösphere, and the uniqueness of the human mind and the human species as a whole, setting mankind apart from the animals, is something which very few people understand today, but was a very crucial investigation into the nature of the human race. Coincidentally, Vladimir Vernadsky and Albert Einstein were direct contemporaries.

We made great leaps, giant leaps, in this direction of man as a galactic species, not an earthbound species, with our landing of men on the Moon during the Apollo project of the 1960s and 1970s, and other great accomplishments of that era. To a certain extent, the legacy of that era has continued along certain trajectories. But since that time, when the mission of man leaving this planet was a professed mission of the United States government itself under the figure of John F. Kennedy, since that time, our progress in that direction has been moving backwards, compared to where we should have been, where we should have come by now, had we continued that directionality, and especially compared to what other countries, most notably China, have now accomplished and are committed to accomplishing further in the very near future ahead.

As President John F. Kennedy was wont to say in several speeches that he made, where he quoted Scripture: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." And that is absolutely true today. That is what the last 50 years of a "backwards progress" has brought us, as an American people – as we've presented repeatedly over the past several weeks in this webcast – and as a trans-Atlantic system, where face an absolutely dire crisis – economic, social, and military crisis today.

Our job here this evening, is to take the necessary steps to restoring that vision, and there's nobody more qualified to

that, in my opinion, than my good friend Kesha Rogers. Following the remarks that Kesha makes, we will have follow-up remarks from Megan Beets, who will elaborate much more on what China is doing in their ambitious space program and where that's come from in the recent years, and where that's going towards. Ben Deniston will follow up immediately after her, to elaborate a little bit more of what the necessary *insight* into the genius of Albert Einstein and Vladimir Vernadsky must be, from the perspective of this recent experiment that affirmed many of Einstein's hypotheses that he made nearly a century ago.

For those of you who may not know, or may need to be reminded, Kesha Rogers was the Democratic nominee for Congress in Texas's 22nd District *two years in a row* – the 2010 elections and the elections in 2012, which, I'm sure, was a real thorn in the side of the political hacks in that area. She established her campaign based on the idea that we must revive NASA, restore NASA, despite the attempts by the Obama administration to destroy what NASA was committed to doing.

In 2014, Kesha expanded on her successes as an electoral candidate in the previous two elections, and declared a state-wide race for United States Senate, which, despite the fact that she was massively outspent by the Democratic Party establishment and by their chosen candidate, she came so close in the preliminary primary elections, that she forced those primaries into a runoff election, and received not just national prominence, but international prominence as a very significant political figure.

So, without more said about Kesha's unique role in this mission to restore the vision to the American people, I'd like to introduce to you, Kesha Rogers.

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matthew! Well, I think what you've laid out, and also in the discussions we had from Mr. LaRouche, one thing that's important to point out is, this is



the level of discussion which is absolutely critical to revive the educational and human commitment that has been lost in our society. The real question is, when we're dealing with the space program – and this is what's not being discussed in any of the political debates or amongst the space community itself – is this question of what is the nature of man; what is the responsibility to the understanding of the mind of man as different from any other species, animal species, out there.

I've gone to a number of events in the NASA community with certain representatives of the space community. You have this discussion where people want to talk about innovation or something of that nature; but what's missing right now, is that there's no real discussion on the principle of true discovery, on the principle of true creativity. If you're going to get back to the foundation of what our space program truly represents, then that has to be the focal point of what is understood and what we're fighting for. Looking at the space program, one of the things that is extremely important right now, is that what has been a dividing line, is this very question of what is the nature of man. It's not about money, or it's not about what projects are more reasonable or will actually work better; but more so it is what is the destiny of mankind to discover and to do what has never been done before.

I love the remarks from Mike Griffin, former NASA Administrator, who I believe made them in 2006, working under the [George W.] Bush Administration, who demonstrated the idea that mankind has always committed itself to doing that which is going to leave something behind for the children, grandchildren, next generations – the building of great cathedrals. We think about Brunelleschi or Charlemagne, those individuals who played a significant role in creating something that they weren't going to be able to see themselves, that they may not be able to participate in; but knew that their responsibility was to actually create for the future. I think that's the ultimate question right now. What has been done in the

progress of the society of mankind has been with the intention of creating for the future.

When you take the conception of the future out, and that human beings have no ability to actually determine or act upon that future, that was the understanding of the fight between Zeus and Prometheus, [where] Prometheus had a higher conception that mankind can know, and not only know, can actually act on and create the future.

How do we do this? We do this through the basis of discovery. We do this through the basis of understanding that human beings don't have to live like their fathers and grandfathers before them, like the beavers, before them. We can create new discoveries! And that's what we're finding and which has been essential in understanding what the space program brings us, and the understanding of the new principles that were put forth in development of what you see in terms of the beautiful ideas that foster the creation of such wonderful and beautiful cathedrals; that mankind not only just enjoys, in terms of aesthetic beauty, but also which has created the ability for a mastery of science that had never been known before.

That's what the space program represents! The same idea is actually recognized, when you look at music, what great Classical composition truly represents. The fostering of our society has been, always, to take the discoveries of mankind to the next level, to a higher conception, to a higher principle of mankind. The space program represents not just a program itself, but is what is the destiny of mankind.

I want to reiterate the beautiful example, again, of Krafft-Ehrlicke, because I think this gets at the truly beautiful and fundamental idea of that conception, as to why we have to have a space program. It is only for those very reasons, on the conception of what is the destiny of mankind, what is our responsibility. This is what we should be addressing in our education systems; that, as [Krafft-]Ehrlicke explained, "The

concept of space travel carries with it enormous impact, because it challenges man on practically all fronts of his physical and spiritual existence. The idea of traveling to other celestial bodies reflects the highest degree, the independence and agility of the human mind. It lends ultimate dignity to man's technical and scientific endeavors. Above all, it touches on the philosophy of his very existence."

And what we have to address in terms of looking at what has been lost in the space program, is that very conception of touching on that which is human. And identifying that which only mankind has the ability, based on our creative powers based on the image of the Creator, to be able to actually participate in. And we have taken that away. We've taken it away through the actions of the last two administrations through a policy of capitulation to Wall Street and a bankrupt financial system. The idea that our mission, as China has clearly set forward, and the paradox in that is the fact that we have been denied access through the insanity of certain Congress members and people who have taken away the collaboration, for human beings to collaborate on discoveries that are going to impact all of mankind. By denying the access of NASA per se to work with China, this was known as a clear understanding that nations had to work together if we were going to actually address the problems on Earth facing mankind, that were going to be addressed through discoveries that were going to benefit all mankind.

So that's what we have to address right now. Can we get back to that understanding once again? What is going to be our direction? What type of future are we going to see – are we going to create, I should say, on the progress of where society and civilization are going. And I think what we are seeing coming down the pike in terms of a continued escalation toward war and chaos, we have a clear dividing line in front of us. And this is extremely important that the space program has – what it represents gives us a commitment again toward

restoring a new direction for mankind. And doing what it is that is our responsibility and intention to do.

OGDEN: Thank you, Kesha. Now let me ask Megan Beets to come to the podium.

MEGAN BEETS: So Kesha referenced German space pioneer Krafft-Ehrlicke. I'd like to reference another German space pioneer, who lived at the beginning of the 1600s – Johannes Kepler. And Kepler also identified the Moon as a very unique place, and a unique destination for mankind. In 1608, he authored a really beautiful, fanciful document called "The Dream"; in which he imagined a journey to the Moon, and described and unfolded in his imagination what astronomical observation would be like from the vantage point of the Moon. Taking man off of Earth, taking man's mind off of Earth and reconstructing the structure of the Solar System as seen from the vantage point of the Moon.

Now, very interestingly, he also discussed and imagined what the unique differences might be between the near side of the Moon – which we see every night when we look up into the sky and see the Moon – and what the differences would be with the far side of the Moon, and what those unique characteristics might be.

Now, 400 years after Kepler wrote this, man for the first time is finally planning to land on that far side of the Moon. Just a little over two years from today, China plans to send its Chang'e 4 lunar mission to go to the Moon, and for the first time in mankind's history, to perform a soft landing on the far side of the Moon. The far side of the Moon is a very unique place; it's unique in terms of the Moon itself. It presents geological characteristics which we believe to be quite different from the near side. It presents resources such as Helium-3, which might be in higher quantities than on the near side of the Moon. But it's also a very unique vantage point in terms of the Solar System itself; allowing us to

perform astronomical observations in wavelengths which we just simply can't see from anyplace near Earth or Earth's orbit.

So, as Kepler foresaw in a sense, the far side of the Moon is a beginning point for us to begin to exercise our creative play; and to begin to peer out into the Solar System and the galaxy beyond and reconsider the processes of that Solar System as something that might be different than anything we've known before. So this landing on the far side of the Moon will come precisely one year after China does something else; which is sending their Chang'e 5 mission as a sample return mission, to land on the surface of the Moon, sample lunar material, rendezvous with an orbiter, and send this lunar sample back to Earth. This is the first time this has occurred in over 40 years, and using entirely new and different technology. Now that 2017 sample return mission is coming roughly after three years after something which happened just one year ago; which was China's Chang'e 5T - for test - mission. Which sent an orbiter to the Moon which went around the back side of the Moon, sent back some beautiful images from its orbit around the Moon; sent a capsule from lunar orbit back to Earth orbit, which was able to make a successful re-entry onto Earth and be recovered by Chinese space scientists. Again, this is the first time anything like this has happened in over 40 years.

Now, an important element for China's space program is its quest for a very rare isotope for helium. Helium-3, which, as has been said by the father of the Chinese lunar program, Ouyang Ziyuan, is a unique fusion fuel which could power the Earth as far into the future as we could think. This is a fusion fuel which is very, very rare on Earth; but which exists in abundance on the Moon. Another promise of the Moon drawing mankind in to a higher level of power and a higher level of existence.

Those are the very recent and also immediate future plans and accomplishments of China in space. Going back to 2007, just

prior to the launch of the very first phase of their lunar program, the Chang'e 1, China's newspaper interviewed 10,000 Chinese youth. And of those 10,000 young Chinese, 99% were following the developments of the lunar mission; another 90% believed that they one day would travel to the Moon. This remarkable progress of China in their Moon program has been complemented by a very robust, in terms of the success of the accomplishments, manned space program – the Shenzhou program; which began in 1992, and is coupled with the Tiangong program, the space station program. So, it was in 2003 that China put its first man into space. It was five years after that that China put the first man into space to perform the first space walk of China; which was beamed back down to Earth in a live broadcast. In 2012, China sent a Shenzhou mission up into space to rendezvous and dock with the first component of their space station; the Tiangong I. The crew rendezvoused with the space station, opened the portal and entered the space station to beam photographs and video back down to Earth. Only one year after that, the next Shenzhou mission rendezvoused with the same component of the space station; the astronauts entered the space station, and one of the astronauts taught a simple physics class, performing simple physics experiments live to 60 million Chinese students in classrooms on Earth.

This year, 2016, the second phase of the space station, the Tiangong 2, will be sent up; shortly followed by the next manned mission to rendezvous with the space capsule. Now this is progress towards a full-size space station, which is expected to be launched in the early 2020s; which will permit long-term habitation and scientific work in space. Which is expected to be completed roughly at the same time as the International Space Station is decommissioned.

So, that's a very brief overview, but I want to make two points on this. Number one, the entire Chang'e lunar exploration program and the manned space program, including the space station, is vectored toward establishing mankind on

the Moon; not simply a mission to plant a flag and go home. The idea of China is to begin folding the Moon into mankind's sphere of influence; fold the Moon into the noösphere in the sense of Vladimir Vernadsky. But also, to allow the Moon to transform mankind; to allow the discoveries that we make and the secrets of the Moon to change and upgrade man's power in and over the universe. They also plan to use the Moon, very clearly, as a launch pad, a base for further expansion into deep space.

The second point to be made is, that while this progress is being made by China, these missions are being launched by China, this is an international program. This is not for the Chinese; and they've been very clear about that. China has nearly 100 agreements for space cooperation with over two dozen countries, which is part and parcel of their win-win cooperation vision for collaboration among all mankind.

Having said all of this, I think it's important to back up and look down on the whole thing. It's not the specifics of what China is doing here which are really the most important thing. What is important is the modality which China has committed itself to. The fact that the minds and the lives of the Chinese people are being engaged in the kind of creative play which we see in the manned space program, and the joy in the accomplishments of that. In the space station program. In their plans for the exploration of Mars and further out into deep space. And especially in their lunar program. This kind of creative play and progress is moving mankind as a species closer to what the German space pioneer Krafft-Ehrlicke called not homo sapiens, but "homo extraterrestris". Mankind becoming a new species which is not based on Earth, but which is based in the Solar System as a whole. It's in that sense that China today, with their commitment to their space program, with their commitment to involving people around to the world to participate in these kinds of accomplishments. It is in this sense that China today is leading the cause of humanity.

BENJAMIN DENISTON: Thanks, Megan and Kesha. Maybe just to pick up off directly what we were just presented with China's focus, I just wanted to highlight some of what Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing today on the importance of this for uplifting mankind to a new level. And as we discussed last week, we have some very important elements with the lunar far side, which Megan referenced. This is a unique capability mankind will have when accessing the far side of the Moon, to give us a completely new perspective on the universe. But I want to just – coming off of Mr. LaRouche's emphasis earlier today, and what Kesha was just bringing up, I want to emphasize that this is not just the ability to discover the currently unseen. We'll see new things, but the point is, this will give us the ability to discover what is currently unknown. What does that mean? What does the unknown mean? This requires a fundamental return to real science, is what Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing earlier today. A real, true scientific conception of mankind as a creative force in collaboration with a creative universe. And today, as was mentioned, we have the excellent standard of Einstein brought to us again today, with the confirmation of something he had forecast a century ago; which was the existence of so-called "gravitational waves", or waves in the space-time characteristics of the universe. This is getting all kinds of media headlines, media attention, coverage all over the place. I think it's a pretty remarkable thing to reflect upon; just the very conception of waves, changes in the structure of the very space-time fabric of the universe; which Einstein had forecast, and expected to be there. And we're finally with our technology, catching up to where Einstein had said we would be, over a century earlier; confirming what he had expected with his conception of gravity.

You can read plenty of media coverage about this particular confirmation of Einstein all over the place now. But take a look at Einstein himself; look at Einstein's conception of gravity as a curved space-time. And Einstein, as a scientific



thinker coming out of very specific scientific tradition, explicitly referencing back to the work of Riemann and Gauss. Riemann, somebody who overturned the entire chessboard of science, so to speak, with his calling for the ending of a priori notions of science, of geometry. Including conceptions about space and time, for example, which Einstein demonstrated. You see a direct reflection of orientation of this in Riemann's work, in Gauss' work earlier, who Riemann picked up on.

Look at this another way; what were they overturning? They were saying science, the process of mankind's understanding of the relation of the universe, that must completely rid itself of these a priori notions about space, time, geometry, or what became even worse, the mathematical approach pushed by Russell and his followers. That science must rid itself of these a priori conceptions. The kind of a priori sense perception, that type of a priori geometry of absolute space, absolute time, for example; which are really just a reflection of a sense perceptual reflection of the universe. That real science must rid itself of these conceptions.

What does that leave us with? If we are not going to base, premise science on these a priori notions – or I would say, sense perceptual notions, or you could maybe even say a kind of an animalistic notion, a biological notion of your interaction with the universe. Then what's the basis, what's the substance of mankind's ability to have science, to change his relationship with the fundamental nature of the universe? It's in human creativity; the human mind. The process of human discovery, is the substance of the ability of mankind to change his relationship to the universe; become a more powerful creative force in the universe. And that's what's primary; human creative thought is what tells something about the fundamental nature of the universe, because that's the basis of the ability of mankind to come into a higher degree of coherence with the fundamental organizing principles of

that universe. That it doesn't come from sense perception; it doesn't come from sense perceptual notions. It comes from a specific quality of the human mind, which we can define as human creativity; which is a non-logical, non-deductive process, a uniquely creative process which can't be explained away as a phenomenon of something else. It's its own capability, that Einstein knew; that Riemann knew. That this competent true current of scientific thought has been premised on the knowledge, the recognition, that this is the basis of science; this is the basis of our ability to understand the nature of the universe. This is the basis of the nature of the universe itself, if you invert it and understand it that way; that human creative thought is the key issue. Which means that mankind is a creative force in a creative universe. We're in a very real scientific sense, a co-creator in a process of creation.

And I think it's worth just highlighting another of Einstein's insights into this reality of the true nature of science, the true nature of mankind. Interestingly, this takes us away from the very large, as Riemann had discussed, into the very small. And if you look at Einstein's work on the very small, on the nature of atomic processes, sub-atomic processes; the activity in the very, very small, so-called quantum processes. And this was, as most people are familiar, this was the subject of a major scientific debate and fight at the time about what is the nature of causality? What is happening on these very small quantum scales? And Einstein was adamantly fighting against this hardcore reductionist approach that tried to just say everything on this level is purely statistical; there's no cause that can be known, it's just a statistical random process with no causality and no ability to know causality.

And people are probably more familiar with Einstein's famous quote that he doesn't think God plays dice; he doesn't think the universe is, in its essence, just organized around completely random randomness. That's the more well-known

quote. He clearly had more developed thoughts than just that. In another discussion, he had said, if we want to actually understand causality on this level, understand the nature of quantum processes, perhaps it's our own notion of causality which is what needs to be overthrown. It's not, is the quantum world, the very small, deterministic in the way we were thinking about deterministic causality before, vs. just statistically random; or is it that our idea of causality is too simple, is wrong? And he used the example of a Bach fugue, a musical composition; and he said, our current notion of causality is equivalent to a very beginner trying to play a Bach fugue on the piano by just going one note to one note to the next note to the next note, in a linear fashion. And he says, you ruin the piece that way; the conception doesn't come across, because a Bach fugue is not organized as a linear sequence of notes. There's a certain conception and intention governing the piece as a whole; and all of the individual components, the keys are organized in a completely different fashion than a linear causality.

So if you want to understand quantum processes, if you want to understand what's happening in the very small, we should reflect upon the ignorance of our own notions of causality; and look to insights to causality and organization which are coherent with the characteristics of human creative thought. That human creative thought and human creative discovery are what we know are the things that enable mankind to create higher states of organization; to make new fundamental scientific discoveries. And that is what therefore tells us something about the nature, the fundamental organization of the universe as a whole.

So, I think we look to the Moon, we look to mankind going into space; but we need to look to this prospective future from this proper standpoint of mankind having an obligation to be a fundamentally creative driving force in a fundamentally creative universe. That the only real science is a science of

mankind as a co-creator in a creative universe. And Einstein certainly understood that from his own perspective, and the future development of mankind requires the Einstein standard today to be applied.

OGDEN: Thank you very much. What we're going to do next is, I will read our institutional question for this evening; and Jeff Steinberg will deliver a more elaborated answer encapsulating some of Mr. LaRouche's responses to it. It reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche: The World Health Organization has declared the Zika virus a global public health emergency. The National Institute of Health calls it 'a pandemic in progress'. The infection is suspected of leading to thousands of babies being born with under-developed brains. Some areas have declared a state of emergency; doctors have described it as a pandemic in process, and some are even advising women in affected countries to delay getting pregnant.

"Mr. LaRouche, in your view, could the Zika virus become a major global pandemic; and in your opinion, how can the spread of the virus be stopped?"

STEINBERG: Thanks, Matt. I'll refer people to an article that's published in the current issue of *Executive Intelligence Review*, the issue dated February 12, 2016, which takes up some technical questions which I'm not going to get into here. There are serious questions about whether or not a British company produced a genetically modified mosquito, ostensibly aimed at curbing the spread of Zika virus and other mosquito-borne viruses; and that there were poor controls over it. There were other factors that may have contributed to this now becoming a very dangerous global pandemic.

But I think we've got to step back and take a different perspective on this. As early as 1975, Lyndon LaRouche directed a biological holocaust task force with the question on the table of whether or not the conscious policies of the British monarchy and other allied institutions, such as the

International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, were creating the conditions willfully for a new biological holocaust by virtue of austerity policies. Literally genocide policies that would have the effect of breaking down the systems that had been built up over centuries for dealing with and avoiding the spread of the kinds of diseases than can create mass-kill pandemics of the sort that we saw in Europe in the 14th Century, where one-third of the population and half of the parishes of continental Europe were wiped out in a relatively small period of time. In other words, the question is, are we dealing with the consequences of what can justifiably and fairly be called a Satanic policy coming from certain leading British oligarchical circles with their co-thinkers and allies around the world?

That biological holocaust project, that was directed by Mr. LaRouche, came as the result of the ending of the Bretton Woods system, and the shift of the IMF and World Bank towards policies of promoting population reduction, the fraudulent concept which you should understand as the result of what we've discussed here this evening, of limits to growth. And in particular, from that period of early 1970s moment onward, the advent of a fundamental assault against basic science, taking the form of various Green policies that repudiate the very nature of man as a creative species; whose very existence is based on the idea that mankind will make discoveries that will give mankind a greater understanding of how the universe works. Knowing that those discoveries will lead future generations to make even greater discoveries.

And that basically, within that possibility, every child born on this planet, should have the ability – through proper nurturing, proper education – to be able to make the kinds of discoveries that were made by people like Einstein, like Kepler, and others. This is the nature of mankind. And to the extent that there are policies that are put forward that deter mankind from realizing its true nature as the only known

creative being in the universe; this is, in fact, indeed, a Satanic policy.

So, we're dealing with a situation where there will be concrete initiatives taken to come up with an understanding of how the Zika virus has been spread; an understanding of what emergency measures can be taken; plus, the development of protective measures like vaccines and things like that. But on a much larger scale, we've got to look at the massive crimes against humanity that are being committed by virtue of the conscious assault against the kind of scientific education that leads to more and more people being actually able to participate in what it means to be truly human.

So, if you want to talk about a deadly virus that has to be stopped, let's talk about President Obama's policy; which has been to systematically shut down the entire NASA space program. Remember that at the beginning of the Obama administration, there were plans under way to replace the Shuttle program with the Constellation, which was to be a new rocket system for delivering man into space exploration. In his very first budget, President Obama canceled the Constellation program; knowing full well that with the cancellation and ending of the Shuttle program and the ending of Constellation, that there would be wide gap in the ability of the United States to even engage in any kind of manned space activity without hitching a ride from China or Russia, or one of the other nations that was going ahead with these programs.

Now we find that the rationale that President Obama used for canceling Constellation was that there was another rocket program called the Orion, which offered better prospects than Constellation. Well, what's happened systematically over the course of the Obama Presidency, is once Constellation was canceled and literally shut down, you had the cancellation through attrition of budgeting, to where now the Orion program has been canceled as well. Major projects for the kind of

exploration that Megan described; developing windows into the universe through the back side of the Moon have been shut down, and stripped or greatly reduced from the NASA budget in favor of "Earth science". Which means the spreading of the false propaganda about the causes of global warming.

These are the policies that kill. That's why the term "Satanic" can be appropriately used. If you take what's happened under the last 15 years, particularly under the last 7 years of the Obama administration; the take down and destruction of America's ability to participate as a qualified partner with nations like China, like Russia, like India in exploring mankind's next discoveries of the universe; you realize that the United States has been done a terrible injustice – it is literally a crime against every citizen of this nation, both current and future citizens – that this has been done, that these programs have been shut down. We know that President Obama, every Tuesday, relishes the idea that he holds a kill session, and comes up with a target list of people to be executed during that next 60-day period; but when you consider the killing of the space program, you've got to consider that this is an act of mass genocide, not just against the present generation, but against future as yet unborn generations that will be dependent on making these kinds of discoveries, branching out deeper into the universe.

And if you take that idea, that understanding of what has been done to us, particularly over this last 7-year period under Obama, and go back and remember; have a clear image in your mind of President John F Kennedy announcing the Apollo program, and announcing that we are going to do this because it represents the challenge to mankind to make great leaps of discovery and to better understand man's position in the universe. And if you consider that his brother, Robert Kennedy, would have revived and continued exactly that program; had Robert Kennedy not been assassinated, had John Kennedy not been assassinated, where would the United States

be today? Would there have been anyone who dared to shut down our space program, our scientific research?

So, this is where we are. Remember the image of John and Robert Kennedy; and remember that we can once again resume that quest for mankind's role in the universe, and to create future generations of geniuses. Because that's the nature of mankind; and it's a sin every time an individual child is denied the capacity to be that kind of creative individual who makes a discovery that impacts on mankind as a whole.

OGDEN: Thank you very much to everybody who participated tonight: Jeff, Megan, Ben, and especially Kesha. Mr. LaRouche, of course, has been very emphatic, as many of you heard him even in the discussion last night during the national activists' call – the Fireside Chat – that Kesha has a very special role to play in her ability to mobilize the American people to restore that vision of the future once again. So, I'd like thank Kesha very much for joining us here tonight. Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com), and good night.

---

**Uden et rumprogram er der  
ingen menneskehed –  
»Houston, vi har et problem:  
Det er Obama«**

*LaRouchePAC havde følgende lederartikler den 9. og 10. februar:*



# Uden et rumprogram er der ingen menneskehed

9. februar 2016 – Af alle præsident Obamas forbrydelser, fra den økonomiske redning af et bankerot Wall Street til permanent krigsførelse, der er i færd med at drive verden hen mod Tredje Verdenskrig, så er den mest modbydelige forbrydelse af alle den at ødelægge det engang så strålende amerikanske rumprogram. Rumprogrammet, især siden John F. Kennedys præsidentskab, var ikke alene en videnskabelig drivkraft for hele verdens økonomi, men også hele en vision for hele menneskeheden, der frembragte sand kreativitet i ethvert barn og flyttede mænds og kvinders intellekt ind i fremtiden, hvor kreativitet er. Ødelæggelsen af rumprogrammet ikke alene standsede menneskets fremskridt, men tvang det tilbage. Det omstødte historien.

Kravet om at genoprette rumprogrammet, og vores fremtid, for menneskeheden vil være temaet for LaRouchePAC's fredags-webcast den 12. februar. Lyndon LaRouche talte om det i dag som den handling, der kræves for »det menneskelige intellekts genfødsel«. Den 10. februar er Kesha Rogers særlig gæst på LPAC's videnskabelige udsendelse »New Paradigm«; hun fører an i den politiske indsats for et rumprogram i USA. Med dette perspektiv deltog hun i dag i NASA's »åbent hus« i Johnson Space Center i Texas.

En ting er nødvendigt for at bane vejen, og det er at konfrontere det faktum, at Wall Street er bankerot. Gør en ende på bail-out (statslige redningspakker), bail-in (ekspropriering af bankindeståender/-indskud), forbrydelser, svindel og mord.

Se på sagaen om Deutsche Bank – verdens største indehaver af derivater. I mandags faldt bankens aktier mere end 10 procent i forhold til den foregående fredag, og har således oplevet et fald i aktiernes værdi på 40 procent hidtil i år. Midt i

mandagens fald udstedte banken en erklæring, hvor den forsikrede om, at den har midlerne til at honorere sine forfaldne økonomiske forpligtelser. Tirsdag faldt bankens aktier så endnu mere. Så udstedte bankens meddirektør John Cryan en erklæring om, at banken er »bundsolid«. Dernæst sagde ingen anden end den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble, der var i Paris til en afslappet snak blandt finansminister, til medierne, at han ikke er bekymret for Deutsche Bank.

I realiteten viser Deutsche Banks kvaler og det voksende, finansielle kaos, at selve systemet er dødt og befinder sig i forrådnelsesstadiet.

I den amerikanske Kongres findes midlerne, i form af fremstillede lovforslag om en genindførelse af Glass-Steagall, til at påbegynde en udrensning af alt rodet og bane vejen for sund, økonomisk aktivitet, der kan give kraft til fremtiden, men handling er gået i stå. Ironisk nok vil der finde »reality-udstillinger« sted på Capitol Hill i denne uge: flere senatorer fremviser filmen »The Big Short« – om Wall Streets kriminalitet, den 10. februar; og den 11. februar vil der være en briefing i Senatet om den kendsgerning, at amerikanske landbrugs indkomster er faldet med 50 procent. Vil de, der har øjne, se?

Hvis vi er villige til at se virkeligheden i øjnene, understregede Lyndon LaRouche i dag, »så er ideen om, at man må gøre noget for at være med til at redde bankerne det rene ævl!«

Det haster også med at applikere kravet om den »bydende nødvendige virkelighed« på at se og handle imod den umiddelbare fare for atomkrig. Netop nu mødes NATO's forsvarsministre i Bruxelles, hvor de følger en linje med at satse på mere konfrontation med Rusland og truer med et totalt, atomart Armageddon. Det geopolitiske fremstød fra briterne og Det Hvide Hus går frem for fuld kraft.

I Rusland blev ved daggry den 8. februar en overraskelsesøvelse med militære styrker annonceret i det Sydlige Militærdistrikt, der strækker sig til Sortehavet og det Kaspiske Hav. Med involvering også af det Centrale Militærdistrikts kommando- og kontrolelementer har den fejende aktion tests om mobilitet, der strækker sig over 3.000 kilometer via jernbane, med flåde- og flytransport. Snapmobiliseringen involverer 8.500 tropper, 900 stk. militært hårdt isenkram, 50 krigsskibe og på til 200 fly.

## **»Houston, vi har et problem: Det er Obama«**

*10. februar 2016* – Som præsident har Barack Obama drevet USA hen imod krig med Rusland og Kina og berøvet USA for dets videnskabelige identitet ved helt at skrotte den amerikanske rumforskningsmission.

LaRouchePAC's kandidat for det Demokratiske Parti, Kesha Rogers, Texas, erklærede i dag en ny, national mobilisering for at omstøde Obamas ødelæggelse af det amerikanske rumprogram. I 2010 og 2012 vandt Rogers demokraternes nomineringsvalg til Kongressen (Repræsentanternes Hus) med udgangspunkt i banneret, »Red NASA; Stil Obama for en rigsret«.

I et webcast i dag sagde Rogers: »Obamas plan, der går helt tilbage til nedtagningen af rumprogrammet i 2010, er baseret på det faktum, at man fuldstændig har iturevet det, der under præsident John F. Kennedy var et visionært lederskabsperspektiv, som blev nedtaget under Obamaregeringen – og hvor planen var at fremme en nulvækst-politik.

*»I går deltog jeg i et arrangement ved navn »NASA's tilstand«. Mange mennesker så denne begivenhed, som blev transmitteret **live med NASA's direktør, Charlie Bolden**, såvel som også andre*

personer.

»Det, som simpelt hen forbløffede mig, var det faktum, at præsidenten skærer ned på hele budgettet, fortsætter med at skære ned på budgettet for Orion-missionen, den bemandede mission, fortsætter med at nedtage Månemissionen – faktisk er der ikke længere nogen Månemission; og samtidig skærer han ned på alle fusionsprogrammer, skærer ned på programmerne på visse universiteter, såsom Rice Universitetet her i Texas. Præsident John F. Kennedy fremlagde en vision, 'Vi rejser til Månen, og vi gør disse ting, ikke, fordi det er let, men fordi det er svært.' Og hvor man havde en reel vision, en inspiration for hele befolkningen.«

»Direktøren for rumprogrammet fremlægger, at 'Vi er nærmere end nogensinde til at komme til den Røde Planet'. Dette finder jeg paradoksalt ud fra det standpunkt, at vi har afskaffet alle missioner om at komme tilbage til og industrialisere og faktisk udvikle Månen.

Vi må gå tilbage og se på historien med hensyn til, at et visionært lederskab begyndte med de personer, der havde en idé om det menneskelige intellekt, der rakte langt frem i vores Solsystems bestemmelse. Og det var ikke blot en profitmekanisme, eller det drejede sig ikke blot om budgetter og om budgetnedskæringer eller om at forsøge at rejse ud i rummet på et 'discount'-program.

Men, vi gjorde det, der var nødvendigt – fiasko var ikke en valgmulighed – for at sikre, at menneskets fremskridt i rummet var prioritet nummer ét. Og et visionært lederskab er således det ultimative spørgsmål her, og det er, hvad vi faktisk diskuterer her. Det er det, der er blevet fuldstændigt forladt af vores samfund; det, der ikke længere eksisterer.

Jeg vil gerne her give et ægte eksempel på et visionært lederskab:

**Krafft Ehrickes store ånd og intellekt**, en pioner inden for

rumflyvning, raketvidenskab og ingeniørvidenskab; og Krafft Ehrlicke arbejdede sammen med, og var en student, der udviklede von Brauns ideer og det, der virkelig skabte vores rumprogram og den vision, der bragte os til Månen, med Apollo 11 og frem til Saturn V-raketten.

Men igen, han var udtryk for noget, der tilhørte en højere orden med hensyn til filosofien og tankegangen i det, som han forstod, var grundlaget for rumprogrammet, og som igen var forsvaret for det menneskelige intellekt, og dette menneskelige intellekts kreativitet. Men han siger det smukkere selv. I Krafft Ehrlickes 'Anthropology of Astronautics' fremlægger han disse tre, fundamentale love:

1. Ingen og intet under dette univers' naturlige love kan påtvinge mennesket nogen begrænsninger, undtagen mennesket selv.
2. Ikke alene Jorden, men hele Solsystemet, og lige så meget af universet, som mennesket kan nå ud til under naturens love, er menneskets retmæssige aktivitetsfelt.
3. Ved at gå ud i hele universet, opfylder mennesket sin bestemmelse som et element i livet, der er skænket fornuftens evne og den moralske lovs visdom inde i ham selv.'

»Som jeg sagde før, så advarede Krafft Ehrlicke om, at et samfund, der vendte sig imod ægte fremskridt og vedtog en kurs for nulvækst, grænser for vækst, der er i modstrid med det, han siger i sin første, fundamentale lov, at 'Ingen og intet under dette univers' naturlige love kan påtvinge mennesket nogen begrænsninger, undtagen menneskets selv', så ville man få et samfund at se, der var ophørt med at anerkende sit sande, menneskelige potentiale.«

Ehrlicke skrev: »Begrebet om rumrejser bærer med sig en enorm indvirkning, fordi det udfordrer mennesket på stort set alle fronter af dets fysiske og spirituelle eksistens. Ideen om at rejse til andre himmellegemer reflekterer den højeste grad af

*det menneskelige intellekts uafhængighed og adræthed. Det giver menneskets tekniske og videnskabelige bestræbelser ultimativ værdighed. Frem for alt drejer det sig om filosofien for enhver eksistens. Som resultat ignorerer begrebet om rumrejser nationale grænser, afviser at anerkende forskelle af historisk eller etnologisk oprindelse, og gennemtrænger ens sociologiske eller politiske overbevisnings struktur lige så hurtigt som den næste.»*

*»Og i betragtning af de omstændigheder, som samfundet netop nu befinder sig i, med den fortsatte optrapning af konflikt og spænding mellem nationer, med det, vi ser med det fortsatte fremstød for krig eller optrapningen imod Rusland, imod Kina; det er et angreb på selve dette begreb om det menneskelige intellekt.»*

Kesha Rogers har her sat fingeren på *forbrydelsen*, som Obama som præsident har begået: Berøvelsen af USA's mission, og derfor også af dets borgeres intellektuelle evner. Hendes kampagne har til formål at genoprette denne mission.

*Titelfoto: Præsident Obama, Michelle Obama og vicepræsident Biden ser på NASA's Lunar Electric Rover under indvielsesparaden i 2009. Af NASA/Bill Ingalls.*

## **DOKUMENTATION:**

### **Obama tilintetgør USA's fremtid i rummet**

*10. februar 2016* – Barack Obamas budgetanmodning for NASA for budgetåret 2017 markerer første gang, NASA nogensinde er blevet skåret ned til under 0,5 % af statsbudgettet – under årene med JFK's Apollo-program var dets andel af budgettet nær ved 5 %.

Ved at anmode om 19 mia. dollar til NASA skar Obama

Kongressens bevilling til rumagenturet ned med 300 mio. dollar. Men han krævede endnu dybere nedskæringer inden for udforskning af »det ydre rum« og »planeter«, det område af NASA's arbejde, hvorfra nationale missioner i fremtiden kunne vokse frem. Disse nedskæringer tilsammen var i størrelsesordenen 1 mia. dollar iflg. en gennemgang i *USA Today*.

I 2006 var NASA, på trods af års nedgang i ressourcerne, stadig i gang med at udarbejde planer for en Månebase med en fremtid med videnskabelig observation af universet og forberedelser til at udnytte Månen, inklusive som en potentiel fremskudt base for rejser til Mars. I nogle versioner af NASA's planer skulle Månebasen ligge på bagsiden.

Dette skrottede Obama i 2009-10 ved at aflive Constellation-programmet og således gøre Månen utilgængelig på ubegrænset tid, og med en formel afvisning af det som mål.

Nu er Kina og Rusland de nationer, der planlægger robot- og menneskelig landing på Månen – muligvis som et samarbejde – anført af Kinas netop bebudede plan om at starte en base på Månens bagside i 2018-20.

Da Obama aflivede Constellation, hævdede han, at USA i en eller anden fremtid kunne rejse direkte til Mars med et nyt Space Launch System (SLS) og »Orion«-program. Nu, i FY2017-budgettet, afliver han dem i realiteten; han ville have gjort det allerede, hvis ikke Kongressen havde insisteret på at investere omkring 10 mia. dollar i SLS/Orion siden FY2011.

For SLS, f.eks., var Kongressens bevilling i FY2016 omkring 2 mia. dollar; Obama anmoder om 1,3 mia. dollar i FY2017.

Det, som Obama ønsker at øge i NASA's budget, er »videnskaber om Jorden« – detektering af klimaforandringer, i hans syge grønne hjerne, til gavn for at drive menneskelig videnskab og teknologi tilbage til fortiden. Som *EIR's* stiftende redaktør, Lyndon LaRouche, beskrev det, »Ved at annullere rumprogrammet,

skruer du [Obama] historien tilbage i tiden.«

Formanden for Repræsentanternes Hus' Videnskabskomite, Lamar Smith (R-TX), fordømte omgående Obamas budget i en udtalelse til *Ars Technica*, som et »ubalanceret forslag, der fortsat binder vore astronauters fødder til jorden og gør en Marsmission stort set umulig.«

Men den virkelige kamp vil komme, ikke fra nedskæringsforvirrede Republikanere, men fra aktivister med ledere som LaRouche-demokraten Kesha Rogers fra Texas, der to gange vandt primærvalgene til Kongressen med planen: »Red NASA: stil Obama for en rigsret.«

---

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

---



# NATO vedtager militær oprustning i Østeuropa

10. februar 2016 – Ved NATO's forsvarsministtermøde i dag i Bruxelles vedtoges planerne for en militær oprustning i alliancens østlige medlemsstater, især i de Baltiske Stater (Estland, Letland, Litauen) og i Polen. Den militære opbygning vil tage form af yderligere roterende styrker fra USA og andre lande, med opbakning fra NATO's hurtige responsstyrke bestående af 40.000 troper. Den forstærkede, fremskudte tilstedeværelse vil blive »multinational for at gøre det klart, at et angreb på ét medlem er et angreb på alle allierede, og at alliancen som helhed vil respondere«, sagde NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg iflg. erklæring, udstedt af NATO. »Den vil blive roterende og støttet af et øvelsesprogram; og den vil blive komplementeret af den nødvendige logistik og infrastruktur for at støtte den fremrykkede opstilling og fremme hurtig forstærkning.«

Ifølge en Reuters-rapport forudser planen tilstedeværelsen af yderligere 1.000 NATO-tropper i hvert af seks lande: de tre baltiske lande, Polen, Rumænien og Bulgarien, for at imødegå den angivelige trussel fra Rusland. Ifølge budgetplanen, der blev udgivet af Obamaregeringen i går, vil omkring 5.000 af disse tropper være amerikanske.

»Rusland er en trussel«, erklærede den litauiske forsvarsminister Jouzas Olekas. »Det er Moskvas handlinger i Krim, deres støtte til separatister i Ukraine og deres snapøvelser, der bekymrer os.« 1.000 tropper vil imidlertid bestemt ikke tilfredsstille Polens højrefløjsregering. Forespurgt, om en troppetilstedeværelse på 1.000 mand var acceptabel, svarede den polske forsvarsminister Antoni Macierewicz, »Fra vores standpunkt er det klart for lidt.« Dette forventes at blive emne for »vanskelige forhandlinger« ved NATO-topmødet i Warszawa til juli.

NATO-generalsekretær Stoltenberg sagde, at han ville mødes med den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov ved Sikkerhedskonferencen i München senere på ugen. »Vi mener, at, især, når tiderne er vanskelige, som de er nu, så er det endnu vigtigere, at vi har en politisk dialog og åbne kanaler mellem NATO og Rusland«, sagde han.

*Foto: NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg (midten) stiller op med forsvarsministre under et NATO-forsvarsministermøde i alliansens hovedkvarter i Bruxelles, Belgien, 10. februar 2016.*

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

# Sammenbruddet af Det romerske Imperium – i dag

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 9. februar 2016* – Se på det transatlantiske finanssystem. Rapporter fra Europa og USA afslører et dødt finanssystem, med dukkeførere, der trækker i de tråde, der er påhæftet liget, for at få det til at syne levende. Mere kvantitativ lempelse, negative rentesatser, et Europæisk Finansministerium for at fjerne de sidste rester af medlemslandenes økonomiske suverænitet – der alt sammen skal forsøge at få den enorme mængde af værdiløs derivatgæld til synes at have nogen værdi, når den ingen har.

Se på den militære situation. Obamas nærmeste allierede i Mellemøsten, Erdogan, der ønsker at være Sultan, og den feudale potentat Kong Salman, der planlægger en invasion af Syrien på vegne af deres britiske herrer og febrilsk forsøger at standse den kurs hen imod sejr over terrorisme, som er i færd med at blive effektueret af den foryngede syriske hær med russisk støtte fra luften. Tyrkernes sidste forsyningslinje ind til deres al-Nusra- og ISIS-aktiver er næsten lukket af i takt med, at Damaskus-regeringen rykker frem for at befri Aleppo.

Se på det kulturelle sammenbrud i USA og Europa. Den største heroin-epidemi nogensinde fejer hen over USA, mens præsident Obama orkestrerer en aftale med verdens største leverandør af kokain, heroin og marihuana, Columbias FARC narkoterrorister, samtidig med, at han legaliserer narkotika i hele landet.

I dag fremførte Lyndon LaRouche den pointe, at de transatlantiske nationer i det 21. århundrede er i præcis samme situation som Europa i det 5. århundrede, da Det romerske Imperium kollapsede.

Lykkeligvis er der et nyt paradigme i verden, anført af Kina

og Rusland, og som tilbyder en vej til at undfly nedstigning i et økonomisk helvede og atomkrig – under forudsætning af, at Vesten vælger at tage ved lære af dem. Alt imens Obama har lukket Amerikas engang så storslåede rumprogram ned, så er Kina i færd med at opbygge en kapacitet til at kolonisere Månen og nå ud til Mars, og opfordrer alle verdens nationer til at samarbejde.

Mens Rusland konfronterer den terrorist-svøbe, som er blevet skabt af briternes/Obamas krige for regimeskift, så trues selve Rusland både udefra og indefra. Sergei Glazyev, en af Putins førende rådgivere, har åbenlyst udfordret monetaristerne i den Russiske Centralbank samt deres støtter, for ikke at forsvare den nationale valuta, og for at vedtage den politik, som City of London har krævet – og han er endda fremkommet med den anklage, at valutamarkedet befinder sig i udenlandske spekulanterers hænder. Glazyev opfordrer klogt Rusland til at følge den kinesiske model.

Vil befolkningerne i USA og Europa være lige så kloge? Det er et spørgsmål om kreativitet, fremsatte LaRouche i dag. Vestens nederlag skyldes ikke menneskehedens natur, men dens fordærvelse. Kreativitet kommer til udtryk i processen med at vække kreativitet i andre, i at fortsætte menneskets sande mission i hver generation – i at skabe en ny tilstand i universet. Hvis folk kan formås til at forstå den kendsgerning, at verden er ved at krænge over i kaos og atomkrig lige for øjnene af os, så vil de blive i stand til at rydde Det Hvide Hus for dets dræber, lukke spekulanterne på Wall Street ned og gå med i BRIKS om opbygningen af en ny verdensorden, der er baseret på menneskehedens fælles mål.

*Titelbillede: »Imperiets forløb – Imperiets fuldbyrdelse«; maleri af Thomas Cole (født 1801, Storbritannien, død 1848, USA): serie på fem malerier med titlen Imperiets forløb.*

---

# NATO-forsvarsministre forventes at godkende militær ekspansion i Polen og Baltikum

6. februar 2016 – NATO-forsvarsministre forventes at godkende planer om at deployere flere tropper i Polen og de Baltiske Stater under deres møde i Bruxelles i næste uge. Dette kommer i kølvandet på den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ashton Carters meddelelse den 2. feb. om, at USA ville fordoble sit budget for militærstyrker i Østeuropa. NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg hilste Carters plan velkommen og sagde, det ville betyde »flere tropper i alliansens østlige del ... en fremskudt opstilling af udstyr, tanks, pansrede vogne ... flere øvelser og mere investering i infrastruktur«. Antallet af amerikanske tropper, der flytter rundt i Østeuropa, forventes at stige fra omkring 600 i dag til omkring 4.000. En amerikansk embedsmand sagde til *Wall Street Journal*, at Obamaregeringen håber, at dens eksempel vil anspore andre NATO-medlemmer til at sende flere tropper til Østeuropa.

Ifølge nyhedsrapporteringer mødtes NATO-embedsmænd i Bruxelles i går for at begynde at sammensætte pakken, der forventes at inkludere et netværk af små, østlige poster, roterende styrker, regelmæssige krigsspil og lagerudstyr, klart til en hurtig responsstyrke, iflg. *Reuters*. Det inkluderer ikke permanente baser, som den polske højrefløjsregering har krævet, eftersom USA, Tyskland og Storbritannien er imod at krænke NATO-Ruslands-Akten fra 1997[1]. Det er ikke desto mindre planen, at disse roterende styrker skal være til stede i Østeuropa på ubestemt tid, og således opfatter russerne den

planlagte deployering. »Som vi hører disse meddelelser fra USA, så skaber alt dette grundlag for at rulle militære planer imod Rusland ud og tage reelle, praktiske skridt til at fremrykke militær infrastruktur tættere til Ruslands grænser«, sagde talskvinde for det Russiske Udenrigsministerium Maria Zakharova den 4. feb.

## **[1] Til eftertanke: Indledningen til Akten fra 1997: Grundlæggende Akt om gensidige forbindelser, samarbejde og sikkerhed mellem NATO og Den Russiske Føderation blev undertegnet i Paris, Frankrig.**

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation og dens medlemsstater på den ene side og Den Russiske Føderation på den anden side, i det følgende benævnt NATO og Rusland, vil, baseret på et varigt politisk tilsagn på højeste politiske niveau, sammen bygge en varig og altomfattende fred i det euro-atlantiske område på principperne om demokrati og kooperativ sikkerhed. NATO og Rusland anser ikke hinanden som modstandere. De deler målet om at overvinde levn fra tidligere konfrontation og konkurrence, og om at styrke den gensidige tillid og det gensidige samarbejde. Den nuværende lov bekræfter □□NATO's og Ruslands beslutning om at give konkret indhold til deres fælles forpligtelse til at opbygge et stabilt, fredeligt og udelt Europa, helt og frit, til gavn for alle dets folk. At denne forpligtelse indgås på højeste politiske niveau markerer indledningen af et fundamentalt nyt forhold mellem NATO og Rusland. De har, på grundlag af fælles interesse, gensidighed og gennemsigtighed, til hensigt at udvikle et stærkt, stabilt og varigt partnerskab. Loven definerer mål og mekanisme for konsultation, samarbejde, fælles beslutningstagning og fælles indsats, der vil udgøre kernen i de gensidige forbindelser mellem NATO og Rusland. (-red.)

*Foto: USA's forsvarsminister Ashton Carter annoncerer det nye forsvarsbudget 2. februar 2016.*

---

# Genialitet er i universet, og det er stærkere end det onde, vi er oppe imod

*Det tilkommer jer, det amerikanske folk, at forstå og handle på den moralske fordel, der nu er blevet fremlagt gennem Kinas og Ruslands handlinger, især Kinas, og som repræsenterer en ny fremtid for menneskeheden fremskridt i rummet og gennem en »win-win«-strategi om samarbejde mellem alle nationer. Den vision, som Kina og dets rumprogram har fremlagt, om at udforske Månens bagside, blive de første til at lande der og gøre, hvad ingen nation hidtil har gjort, vil ikke alene være en stor sejr for Kina, men for hele menneskeheden.*

*Det var den samme vision, som USA repræsenterede gennem præsident John F. Kennedys vision og lederskab, da han i 1961 for nationen og hele verden fremlagde forpligtelsen til at landsætte en mand på Månen og bringe ham sikkert tilbage til Jorden.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Et unikt vendepunkt uden fortilfælde i menneskets

# historie

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 4. februar 2016 – Vi står ved et unikt vendepunkt uden fortilfælde i historien; historien er gået ind i en ny fase, ikke i løbet af de seneste årtier eller de seneste par år, men i realiteten i løbet af de seneste dage. Endnu ved ingen, hvad det vil bringe, hverken til det bedre eller til det værre; vi må se til, at det bliver meget bedre.*

Selv de personer, der skaber spillene, ved ikke, hvad spillene vil blive, sagde Lyndon LaRouche i dag med henvisning til den beslutning, man har truffet, om at gå i krig med Rusland og Kina.

Som LaRouche tidligere udtrykte det, den 1. februar:

*»Vi er på vej ind i et forandringens område, som vi ikke har noget fortilfælde for. Vi må derfor overveje spørgsmålet om at undersøge, mht. vore egne meninger, at undersøge disse spørgsmål, der må udforskes for denne tid. For, det vil ikke blive det samme gamle, det samme gamle; det vil blive meget anderledes. Det vil uundgåeligt blive nyt.«*

Det eneste, vi virkelig kan forlade os på som retningslinje for vore handlinger i disse enestående skæbnedage, er de dybest kendte og mest fundamentale sandheder. De er ikke det, som det meste af den vrang-uddannede verden siger, de er – det, der på den mest intime måde kendes af hver eneste af os, er menneskets fundamentale natur. Ikke det »praktiske menneske«, men mennesket, som vi kun møder det, når det rejser ud i rummet.

Eller, når mennesket faktisk fungerer på en kompetent måde.

Lyndon LaRouche, 1, februar:

*»Vi stræbte efter at forstå, hvad der er ved mennesket; hvad menneskeheden er; hvorfor eksisterer menneskeheden? Hvad*



*betyder menneskehedens eksistens? Og vi opdager, at man må ud på galaktiske vande og sådanne steder for at opdage og erfare, hvad det betyder. Mennesket har for længst forstået, at mennesket er en unik skabning, en unik skabelse; processen er gået ud på at forsøge at udvide vores indsigt i, hvad dette vil sige. Og præcis dér må vi begynde med disse spørgsmål, under de nuværende betingelser. Hvis man ikke gør det, kommer man ikke til pointen; man vil gøre fejltagelser i forklaringerne og så videre, og de er forkerte. Pointen er, at mennesket er en skabende kraft i universet; men menneskeheden må lære, hvordan det skal opføre sig, for at kunne virkeliggøre rollen som en kraft i universet.»*

Dette er ikke menneskeskabte, men universelle principper – de principper, vi får tilgang til gennem rumprogrammet.

*»Udviklingen af rumprogrammet var udviklingen af menneskets evne til at forme planetsystemets skæbne. Med menneskehedens intelligens, dens intelligente rolle i håndteringen af mulighederne og udfordringerne, som det ydre rum repræsenterer; alle de galaktiske principper, som er vendepunkter, og sådanne ting. Alle disse ting er ikke menneskeskabte; de er ikke menneskets skabelser. De involverer potentialet for menneskelig skabelse; men de gengiver faktisk principper, der skaber og forbedrer universet. Det er derfor udviklingen af intellektets skabekraft af denne art, der definerer menneskehedens virkelige betydning som sådan. Uden det er der intet; der er ikke noget, der er os givet automatisk; som noget, der er kastet ned på gaden. Disse ting, der er skabende, blev skabt af personers, enkeltindviders intellekt; og disse individer skabte adgangen til at forstå, hvordan universet fungerer. Så genialiteten ligger i universet; ikke i enkeltindividet. Det ligger i den rolle, som enkeltindividet spiller i arbejdet med at opbygge universet.»*

John F. Kennedy sagde engang:

*»I sin søgen efter viden og fremskridt er mennesket determineret og kan ikke afskrækkes. Udforskningen af rummet vil skride frem, hvad enten vi deltager i det eller ej, og det er en af de allerstørste eventyr nogensinde, og ingen nation, der har forventninger om at blive leder for andre nationer, kan forvente at falde bagud i kapløbet om rummet.«*

Den kendsgerning, at det transatlantiske område, der domineres af Det britiske Imperium, nu ikke er andet end en bunke rustent jern, opsummeres i det faktum, at det er ingen anden end Barack Obama, der annullerede USA's rumprogram, kort tid efter sin tiltrædelse i embedet. I mellemtiden er Kina gået frem med sit rumprogram og inspirerer netop nu sine 1,4 mia. mennesker med udsigten til i fremtiden at foretage den første landsætning af en månerobot på Månens bagside – af hvilken mennesket hidtil kun har nogle få, stjalne glimt – i hele menneskehedens historie. Amerikanere vil nu ikke lykkes med noget som helst, med mindre de følger inspirationen fra Rusland og Kina – uanset, hvad folk måtte sige om dette.

*»For det første, så er spørgsmålet her, at vi har en kontrast mellem på den ene side Putin, der er en ledende personlighed i verden som helhed, samt det, der er sket for så vidt angår Kina. Hvis man ser på et kort over verdenssamfundet, vil man sige, at det samfund, vi mest taler om, det transatlantiske samfund, befinder sig i en tilstand af kollaps. Det er en fiasko. Det har været en fiasko. Og det fortsætter i nutiden med at være en fiasko. Og vi forsøger at sparke det tilbage til en form for faktisk eksistens. Men kendsgerningen er den, at vi må forlade os på Ruslands og Kinas ledende rolle. Rusland og Kina er en anden del af hele planeten, end de andre dele, generelt. Indien er en del af denne interessegruppe.*

*Men det transatlantiske samfund er virkelig nedbrudt. Det har ingen iboende overlevelses-duelighed. Det kan kun vinde, eller genvinde, overlevelse ved at følge Putins og Kinas lederskab. Og det, der er sammen med dem; Indien er ved*

*hurtigt at komme frem med deres arbejde, og der foregår andet arbejde i Asien.*

*Planetens transatlantiske område er derfor et falsum. Det er en fiasko. Det må fuldstændig genopbygges. Det eneste sted, hvor vi kan hente denne genopbygning, er sammen med Kina og Rusland. Uden disse nationer har vi ingen fremtid. Det, vi har, er i realiteten noget, der allerede er dødt. Det hedder Det britiske Imperium. Og Det britiske Imperium er dødt. Det er desværre endnu ikke begravet. Og det vandrer stadig rundt og stiller krav.*

*Jeg mener, er det netop er temaet i vores aktuelle situation. Vi har to ledende elementer, der er tætte allierede, nemlig Rusland og Kina. Derudover har vi Europa, som er en katastrofe; og en stor del af USA er en absolut katastrofe.*

*Vores job er derfor i realiteten at samle en myndighed lig den, Kina og Rusland, og deres allierede, repræsenterer. Og vi må ligesom smide det skidt ud, der til overflod findes i salene i vores Kongres. Jeg mener, at Wall Street er en sot, men denne sot har overtaget USA's regering.«*

Problemet er, at det, som det transatlantiske samfund foretager sig, er, at de er ved at begå selvmord! De siger, »Ved at begå masseselvmord, og ved i øvrigt at forsøge at slå så mange mennesker som muligt ihjel – så vil vi opnå en stor sejr!« Det her er det rene vanvid. Man må kalde det ved dets rette navn; vanvid. Folk siger, »Jamen, det er da ikke vanvid – det er med fuldt overlæg! Derfor er det ikke vanvid!«

Og Månens bagside begynder at komme inden for synsvidde.

Vi har ingen andre muligheder: vi må acceptere de midler, som kunne udgøre muligheden – og det er menneskehedens eneste håb.

## Supplerende materiale:

### Tyskland: Teltschik og Seehofer insisterer på, at dialog med Rusland er uundværlig

I et **interview med Ruslands Sputnik Tyskland** sagde Horst Teltschik, tidligere chef for kanslerkontoret i Tyskland:

*»Europæerne og amerikanerne har alt for længe afvist at tale med præsident Putin om Syrien.«*

Der er afvigende synspunkter, sagde Teltschik, men der burde have været en diskussion med Putin om, hvordan en reglementeret fred kunne være mulig. »De umiddelbare konsekvenser i Europa er disse utallige flygtninge. Det vil sige, at vi har maksimal interesse i at få denne konflikt afsluttet, så folk ikke flygter. I det stykke spiller Rusland en hovedrolle.« Teltschik sagde, at det store flertal af tyskere ønsker en dialog med Rusland, inklusive et økonomisk samarbejde, og mener, at EU/NATO-sanktionerne har gjort skade på begge sider.

Premierministeren i delstaten Bayern Horst Seehofer sagde ved en pressekonference efter et møde med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin i går aftes, at

*»vi har brug for nogle ideer til at komme ud af sanktionerne, enten i et enkelt skridt eller over flere trin«.*

Rusland må også tænke på mulige veje, for eksempel ved at gøre sit »hjemmearbejde« mht. det ukrainske spørgsmål, tilføjede Seehofer. Putin sagde, at de 1.600 selskaber, der har bayersk deltagelse i Rusland, er aktive

*»inden for praktisk talt alle sektorer – inden for elektronik, ingeniørvirksomhed, byggeindustri og mere endnu. Halvtreds procent af Tysklands investeringsprojekter i Rusland stammer fra Bayern. De er derfor en særlig gæst her,*

*og vi er meget glade for at se Dem.«*

Seehofer svarede:

*»Det vigtigste for os er at uddybe vore relationer, først og fremmest selvfølgelig, vore økonomiske relationer, men det er ikke vores eneste mål. Jeg mener, at vi må gøre det samme inden for kultur og videnskab. Disse ting vil vi også diskutere. I nutidens globaliserede verden er vi i Bayern, med vores befolkning på 13 millioner, selvfølgelig meget bevidste om, hvad der foregår hver dag i vores verden, hvad enten det er Syrien eller Ukraine, flygtninge eller kriminalitet. Og vi mener, at, kun ved, at vi handler i fællesskab, og ikke i konflikt med hinanden, kan vi løse disse problemer. I dette vores ønske søger vi ikke at handle i modstrid med vores forbundsregering, men sammen med den, og vi handler ikke imod Rusland, men håber at samarbejde med Rusland.«*

Her til aften mødtes Seehofer også med de russiske regeringsministre for industri og økonomisk politik, delvis som en forberedelse til endnu et besøg til efteråret sammen med en magtfuld delegation af tyske industri- og bankfolk.