

# Et håb for USA og Europa: Asiens og Ruslands lederskab

*21. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC)* – Kollapset af de transatlantiske landes finanssystemer er nært forestående. Det er netop blevet signaleret i Den europæiske Centralbanks chefs meddelelse om, at de nu undersøger at kaste »helikopterpenge« ind i bankkonti i hele Europa; og i den tyske Centralbanks chefs eksplosive offentlige udbrud imod denne inflationsskabende plan. Centralbankerne har forsøgt enhver form for bailout i syv år, og finanssystemerne er nu ved randen af et gennemgribende kollaps.

Nationerne må nu dramatisk og omgående ændre deres politik for at redde deres økonomier og befolkninger fra Wall Streets og City of Londons kollaps.

Og der er kun én kurs for ændring, der vil lykkes: den politik, der er modelleret efter præsident Franklin Roosevelts politik – med nedlukning af Wall Streets kasinoer og udstedelse af statslig kredit til produktive formål – men koordineret på globalt plan.

Til at gennemføre dette kan lederskabet kun komme fra Asien: fra Kina, Rusland og Indien.

Kina er i færd med at bygge landbroer tværs over Eurasien og ind i det kollapsede Europa, og endda muligvis ind i USA via Beringstrædet. Inden for to år planlægger Kina at landsætte et rumfartøj på Månens bagside og observere og undersøge universet på måder, der hidtil ikke har været muligt fra Jorden eller fra fartøjer i kredsløb. Kina og Indien er nu verdens mest dynamiske rumnationer.

Kinas »Nye Silkevejspolitik« med udstedelse af kredit og opbygning af broer, der spænder over kontinenter, med ny, økonomisk infrastruktur, står måske også på randen af at

bringe økonomisk udvikling til Mellemøsten og Nordafrika. Dette er fundamentet for en varig fred og stabilitet. At føre den Ny Silkevejs udvikling gennem Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og erklære ørkenen krig, er det eneste udviklingsperspektiv for hele denne region. Og det er den eneste basis for at vende Europas »flygtningekrise« omkring.

Vladimir Putins initiativ i Syrien har vendt kursen for anliggender i Mellemøsten hen mod en forhandlet fred og stabilitet, for første gang, siden George W. Bush' katastrofale krig i Irak.

Dette er lederskab.

Den ganske lille styrke, der har katalyseret dette lederskab, har været LaRouchePAC og Schiller Instituttet. Hen over 30 år er Lyndon og Helga Zepp-LaRouches politik med den »Eurasiske Landbro« blevet Kinas politik, især over for Rusland og Indien. I et gennembrud i sidste uge i Cairo blev det offentligt Egyptens politik, gennem en konference med repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet Hussein Askary og Egyptens transportminister som hovedtalere.

Ved afgørende konferencer 23. marts i Frankfurt og 7. april i New York City vil denne politik blive forelagt europæiske nationer og USA: Gå med i Den nye Silkevej, tag lederskabet i Asien og samarbejd med det, eller gå ind i en håbløs bankerot. Alt afhænger af disse begivenheders succesfulde indflydelse.

*Foto: Begyndelsen af Silkevejen, Xian, Kina. Kinas nye økonomiske Silkevejs-udviklingspolitik, »Ét bælte, én vej«, er åben for tilslutning fra alle nationer. (CC BY-SA 2.0)*

---

# »Vi kan skabe et mirakel« Interview med Helga Zepp- LaRouche

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**Det** **egyptiske**  
**Transportministerium**  
**sponsorerer udgivelsen af den**  
**arabiske**

# version af EIR's Rapport om Verdenslandbroen

18. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Det egyptiske transportministerium sponsorerede en begivenhed for at lancere den arabiske version af *EIR's* Specialrapport, »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen« i dag i ministeriets hovedkvarter i Cairo. Transportminister dr. Saad El Geyoushi ledede personligt seminaret og præsenterede Hussein Askary, som *EIR's* specialist for Sydvestasien og repræsentant for Schiller Instituttet.



Både i sine indledende bemærkninger og kommentarer til Askarys præsentation gav dr. El Geyoushi udtryk for total overensstemmelse med ideen om Den Nye Silkevej og hans regerings planer om at integrere Egyptens transportnet i den Nye Silkevejsdynamik. Han erklærede ligeledes, at den egyptiske regering har til hensigt at investere en billion egyptiske pund (100 mia. US\$) i veje og jernbaner, ikke blot for at udvikle Egyptens transportnet, men også for at forbinde Egypten med Asien og, hvad der er meget vigtigt, med Afrika mod syd.

En pakke sal dannede rammen om topekspertes og rådgiveres fra ministeriet og andre institutioner, så vel som også flere egyptiske Tv-stationer og aviser. Det er interessant, at den kinesiske, arabiske

Tv-kanal, CCTV-Arabia, var til stede og optog et interview med Askary.

To andre Tv-kanaler interviewede også Askary.



I den [arabiske medierapport](#) sidder hr. Askary til venstre for ministeren.

Der er planlagt flere yderligere seminarer og Tv-begivenheder med hr. Askary i de kommende dage.

Se hele [EIR's pressemeddelelse af Helga Zepp-LaRouche her](#).

---

# Hvad betyder Ruslands militære tilbagetrækning fra Syrien for den fredsproces, der er begyndt i Genève? Fra LaRouchePAC Fredags- webcast 18. marts 2016

*Alt dette er et mål for det faktum, at det transatlantiske område er dødt; og det vil kun begynde at vende denne død omkring, hvis der finder en revolutionær, fundamental forandring sted i politikken. Denne alternative politik gennemføres i det eurasiske og asiatiske Stillehavsområde,*

*anført af Kina, af Rusland, og er reflekteret i den måde, hvorpå præsident Putin har navigeret den strategiske situation.*

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Det frydefulde ved at skabe overraskelser!**

## **LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast 18. marts 2016**

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

– DELIGHT IN CREATING SURPRISES! –

International Webcast March 18, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's March 18th, 2016. My name

is Matthew Ogden, and I would like to thank you for joining us for our weekly Friday evening broadcast, here, on [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jeffrey Steinberg from {Executive Intelligence Review}; and Jason Ross,

from the LaRouche PAC science team; and we're joined via video by

Kesha Rogers, multiple-time candidate for Federal office from the

state of Texas, and leading member of the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee.

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

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

allies. He said that the initiative in creating the future and shaping present global policy, lies with those two countries, strategically – in the case of Russia, as is very clear with what is occurring in Syria right now; and economically and scientifically – in the case of China.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LaRouche said that this mission to explore the "dark side" of the Moon, so-called, is a pathway in order to begin to

understand even the opening of the questions along these lines.

The dark side of the Moon, his hypothesis was, is where you can

find some of the shadows of this much larger system, have insight

into it, and also to begin to understand mankind's role as reflective of these broader creative processes which are involved

in these great astronomical systems.

This is the spirit of the United States at our best. Our republic was founded on these kinds of unique ideas, as we've discussed here in previous weeks. The role of the great



philosopher and scientist Gottfried Leibniz is a major contributor, a "founding father", or "founding grand-father" of our republic. This is something which I know Jason Ross has presented multiple times and is in the process of having a series of developing classes on that subject; and I'm sure we'll be part of his discussion later today.

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

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

KESHA ROGERS: Thank you, Matt. I think I'd like to start, first of all, by continuing to develop what has and must be the focal point by which we come to understand the necessity for the revival and the defense of, not just the American and U.S. space program, which I have continued to be a leader in championing

the development and the necessity of our space program and what it truly represents for the progress of all mankind. But just on the editorial that I wrote, I think, to understand it, it's not just from the standpoint of looking at the economic conditions of the United States and some practical applications to economics that the space program will provide; but we also have to look at it from the standpoint of is, the space program as a true conception of real economic value. This is what's actually missing from our thinking and what has been attacked by the current Wall Street/British imperial system, is that economic value is based, from {that} standpoint, on monetary value and not on the creative powers and progress of the human mind. The real question at hand right now, is to bring about – as we're seeing and will be developed further in these discussions today – a new conception of what is the identity and what is the purpose of mankind. I have continued to use the example and the works of the great pioneer of space flight, space pioneer Krafft Ehrlicke; and looking at his conception of mankind as a space-faring creature, as the understanding of mankind's "extra-terrestrial imperative," as that which must be identified and understood.

If you look at the conditions of the space program and why it's so important, you take the example, for instance, of what

China is doing now, as completely rejecting this monetarist policy; that the space program is not how much money you're going to put into pet projects and specific projects. It is creating something that's never been created before, to actually create a new conception and identity of mankind, from the standpoint of the idea of acting on the future. That's what this idea and what is being developed, for instance with China in their investigation of the far side of the Moon. People may look at this, "Well what is this going to benefit us? How is this going to improve the economic conditions, in terms of monetary value, or any of this?" But that is the wrong way to look at it; because the problem right now is that what you have seen is two different opposing conceptions of the view of mankind. One coming from the trans-Atlantic system, coming from a collapsing imperial system that has been based on money and monetary value that is dying; and the other is represented by what Russia and China are doing. And as Matt emphasized and what I developed in my recent writing, was that this was the mindset of the great leaders of our nation, represented by the ideas of Alexander Hamilton, of Franklin Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, [and] John F. Kennedy. It wasn't just on the creating of new projects per se, but on a whole new different conception of the identity of mankind. And so, you take for instance, the example of what we accomplished in the United States, of landing a man on the Moon – the idea that Kennedy put forward, that by the end of decade we would land a man on the Moon and return him safely to Earth. What was the vision and intention behind that? Was it just the

idea that we would go and plant our flag on the Moon? This would be some short-term gratification and so forth? Or, was it a forward-thinking outlook, in terms of the direction of mankind in recognizing what Krafft Ericke, the great pioneer of space flight, recognized, that mankind was not just a creature of the planet Earth. We were not just a part of, as he called it, a "closed system," and so it was our responsibility to go out and to do what no other animal had the capability of doing; of actually conquering and developing, coming to understand what is the purpose of mankind and what is the development of mankind in the universe as a creature of our solar system and of the galaxy as a whole.

One thing that I thought was very insightful, is that Krafft Ericke wrote about the understanding of the Renaissance, the Classical Renaissance, as an achievement of human progress. And also the Classical Renaissance is something that contributed to the development of what became our space program and what was the intention that guided the direction of space travel and the space program.

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

highest ideals."

So you look at this from the standpoint of Krafft Ericke understanding that the Renaissance that was guided by the scientific breakthroughs which I'm sure you'll hear a lot more from my colleague Jason there, of Brunelleschi, or the breakthroughs that came about from the works of Kepler. That the

idea of mankind, is to create something fundamentally new, something that had never been created before, and increasing the

relationship of mankind to the Universe.

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

But the reality is, as I stated before, we have to have, in the

defense of the space program, a new conception of the direction

of mankind. That means we're removing all limitations to progress, all limitations that are put on mankind's ability to continue to understand how to make new discoveries in the principles scientifically of what's out there. Why should we actually investigate the Solar System? What is our mission in doing so? And it's not about a money-making short-term gratification. And so, I think this emphasis that Krafft Ehricke

put on the renaissance as an ideal of looking at why we have, as

a human species, an extraterrestrial imperative, is really a continued expression of what you're seeing coming from China; not

just in their space program, but in the development of the win-win strategy of cooperation for all mankind, for every nation

to come to join together. And to further the progress of

addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition of the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not lie right here on planet Earth. So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across; and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue this fight to identify what is the real mission of the space program, and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current dead system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we should be.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Kesha; and I can recommend that people read what you've written in the current edition of {Executive Intelligence Review}. I also know that you're planning on making a video statement – which will be posted on the LaRouche PAC website and available for people – developing some of these ideas a little bit more in detail. So, if people have been watching this website, you know that Jason Ross has also been working very closely with Kesha to develop some of these ideas with their implications from the standpoint of a scientist, whom I hope you are becoming more familiar with by now – Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As we discussed last week on this webcast, I think if you begin to consider this question which Kesha just laid on the table for us, about how do you create a future for mankind. How do you initiate the creation of something which is completely new, as we move into the future? Now, this can never be done through the replication of the past; there's no precedent for a discovery.

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

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

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed.

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

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

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

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

willfully by developing new principles that if we were



animals,  
you would say this is a whole new type of life all together.  
Life  
moving from the oceans onto land; that's a totally different  
quality of life. Life having developed photosynthesis and  
using  
the Sun as a power source; that's a totally different kind of  
life. But we're still human beings after the discovery of the  
combustion engine, for example; the use of heat-powered  
machinery. We create in ourselves the change that's comparable  
only to large-scale evolutionary changes when we look at life  
in  
general. So, we're distinct.  
Now, how do we understand this? Both how do we understand  
that world around us that we act on and interact with; and how  
do  
we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to  
progress  
and use the practice of science itself? What sort of terrain  
is  
it? What sort of world is it? The physical world and the  
mental  
world.  
Well, here's where I'd like to take up some concepts that  
Mr. LaRouche has been bringing up recently about Bernhard  
Riemann  
and about Gottfried Leibniz, and a bit about Einstein, too,  
who  
got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves  
announced  
very near his birthday this year – which was on Monday. So,  
let's think about it. Is the terrain that we're operating on,  
one  
which is steady and indifferent to our actions? Or, is it one  
where what we do and what we discover and how we interact with  
it, changes that world around us in a way that the world is  
not

fixed; either in ourselves or in our understanding of it? And, that is the case; we transform the world in changing our mental understanding of it. The math that we use in understanding how we conceptualize that world; that changes our interaction with it, and we're a force of nature. We change the operation of the forces of nature by improving our understanding of the world around us and of ourselves and our ability to discover such things. How can we possibly think about that quality of change?

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

It's reddish brown, it's not terribly useful; but with the development of metallurgy, instead of being a deposit of some compound, it's now a resource. It's an ore from which we can create iron and steel. The substance itself, did it change chemically? It did in terms of the potential of what we could do with it. And remember, we're a force of nature; we changed what it was. It has to be thought of that way.

Or, what's the value of a technology? How does it change over time? In the 1400s, windmills were a great invention; they were somewhat new on the scene. They allowed pumping water, they allowed grinding grain. That's excellent; that's a breakthrough.

Are windmills valuable today for making electricity? I don't think so. Consider helium; helium is an interesting element. It was first discovered in the Sun, not on Earth. It was discovered

in the Sun by the kind of light that came from the Sun when that light was broken up into a rainbow with a prism, and certain bands of the absence or presence of color were the clue that there was a new element out there named helium, after Helios, the Sun. That element, what's it used for? You might think of it's being used to fill up balloons for children; you might think of it being used as a gas for cooling for physical purposes or for experiments. It's also, as Helium-3, an ideal fuel for fusion. So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our developing understanding. How can we think about this? Well, let's take the example of Bernhard Riemann. In 1854, Bernhard Riemann delivered a presentation and a paper on the subject of the hypotheses that underlie geometry. That might sound like a dry title; it might sound like it has nothing to do with physical economy or anything that we'd want to be doing right now. But this paper is very important in the view of Lyndon LaRouche for his own development and as a way of understanding economics. So, let's say why. Very briefly, Riemann points out that our conception of space itself and of the way things operate in space is taken for granted. The ideas that we use to understand it, they don't really come from experiments per se, or from physical theories; they come from our thoughts about space. For example, the idea that space has no particular characteristics of its own; that was the view of Isaac Newton. Newton said space is uniform, it's out there; things occur within space. Space is there first, it's just space; it has no

characteristics in particular. Newton said the same thing about

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

very explicitly. Einstein considered that light moved at the same

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

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

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

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

So, most people acknowledge that Einstein, OK, this is

physically important; this is a scientist, he discovered things.

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

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

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

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

we foster its social implementation through technologies that physically improve our power over nature and our ability to provide improving standards of living and promote the general welfare of human beings?" If this is our basis of economics, fostering that kind of outlook, then I think we can say that Gottfried Leibniz was the first physical economist in that sense.

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

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

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

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

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

the

basis of our economics.

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

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

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

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

and the consideration of getting out into space.

Today, this overall outlook is best represented by Russia, and especially at present, by China. So, this doesn't have to be

a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that we

can take up as a mission for ourselves to contribute to here in

the United States and in the nations around the globe. And we've

got very special and precious people in the past that we can look

to for insights in how to make the next breakthroughs in developing our understanding of what it is to be human, the basis

of human culture, and how best to advance human economy.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. Now, as Jason just mentioned, and as I said in the beginning, really right now you do see the initiative – the economic and the scientific initiative – being taken by China to lead mankind into the future; especially with the space program. You also see the initiative being taken by Russia; and this is very clearly illustrated this week with the actions that have been taken by Russia in Syria. The strategic initiative lies in Putin's actions there. As Mr. LaRouche emphasized, Putin is setting the agenda; he is constantly on the flank. You can see this going back to the chemical weapons, where Putin took the initiative to say fine, we will help Assad dismantle these chemical weapons. It can be seen with the decision to intervene, a few months back, by Putin into the situation in Syria; and then with the pull-out that happened earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the way, Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise; constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as Mr. LaRouche always uses the example, of Douglas MacArthur's actions in Inchon. You always, always act on the surprise. Now, this was illustrated I think just anecdotally very well in an article that was published March 15th – Tuesday of this week – in the {New York Times}, with a very apropos headline which read "Putin's Syria Tactics Keep Him at the Fore, and Leave Everyone Else Guessing". I just want to read the first



paragraph

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

vividly what we mean by this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEINBERG: Of course, we've taking up the bulk of this week's report with a discussion about man's extraterrestrial imperative; the need for man to get off of the planet Earth, because man was never an Earthbound creature. So, we're at a point right now where Mr. LaRouche was delighted in our discussion earlier today at the prospect of over the next two years, China going through the preparations for the launching of

an orbiter that will be hopefully landing on the back side of

the  
Moon. And will for the first time, give mankind a window into  
the  
Solar System and the Galaxy beyond. And this is something of  
enormous importance and enormous excitement, because it puts  
this  
nature of man as an extraterrestrial creature capable through  
creative discovery, of not remaining Earthbound, but of  
exploring  
the near Solar System and beyond. And it reminds me that  
virtually every astronaut and cosmonaut who has travelled in  
space, has remarked at one point or other, that having the  
vantage point of looking down on Earth, you become at one  
point  
overwhelmed with the fact that so much of what goes on, on the  
planet of Earth, is trivial relative to the challenges that  
are  
very obvious when you look at man from the standpoint of man's  
ability to explore the Universe and make these kinds of  
discoveries. And it was that approach that actually informed  
our  
discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt  
said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that  
he  
has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy  
is  
always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking;  
continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on  
this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at  
the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks  
were  
beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the  
Russian  
military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next  
morning  
– Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and

other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground, which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said, if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the infrastructure is in place for that to happen. But Mr. LaRouche wanted to make a larger and much more fundamental point about what is going on here. What he emphasized is that you can't lose sight of the fact that the war is still going on. We don't know how things are going to play out; what we do know, is that there has been a change of conditions. In fact, there was a major change of conditions beginning on September 30th of last year, when the major Russian military presence began. And when the situation systematically shifted from that point on, and yet at the same time, certain leading political figures around the world – the spokesman for the Jordanian government; Steffan de Mistura, the UN representative for Syria – they all said, "We're not surprised by President Putin's announcement this past Monday." In the case of the Jordanians, the chief of staff of the Jordanian military, the chief of staff

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

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

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

the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices

prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a strategic

fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria.

Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily

in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs. Look

what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is

waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway to destabilize the Zuman government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative.

So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed –

to a major confrontation between the United States and China. We

had a report earlier this week from David Ignatius in the {Washington Post}, who is very often a kind of reliable leak sheet for what's going on inside the administration. And the Obama administration is preparing for confrontation with China over the South China Sea; they're waiting for a ruling from the

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

So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China

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

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

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

the United Nations.

So, if you take all of these factors into account, and if

you think of them as a process, not simply as a series of discrete events, then you get a very clear idea of what Mr. LaRouche means when he says that the planet, in general terms, is in a state of war. Now, ultimately what this state of warfare comes down to, is the fact that you have a new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered future. It's defined by the economic initiatives of China, by the One Belt-One Road policy, and most emphatically by China's systematic plan for collaborating with other nations on the kind of space exploration that once was a hallmark of American policy; but has not been abandoned. President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and Kesha is leading the fight to reverse that process. Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney administration followed by the Obama administration, the United States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at the beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And as the result, the United States, really the entire trans-Atlantic region, is dead. Germany was once a great prospering economy; the result of the "economic miracle" that Franklin Roosevelt envisioned for the post-World War II period; no replay of Versailles, but a completely different approach. Germany has now been destroyed by the policies largely coming from the British Empire. All of continental Europe is hopelessly and irreversibly bankrupt; and Mario Draghi's announcement of an expansion of

quantitative easing and a zero interest rate policy is a reflection that certain people are desperate over the fact that

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

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

the strategic situation.

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

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

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

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

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

in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for

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

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

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

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

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

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

has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the 1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World

Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the

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

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

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

So, you can see that at the very highest levels of government around the world, this is what is shaping the



discussion; the initiatives that the LaRouche movement have taken for decades. And one final note along those same lines, as we announced last Friday, Mrs. Helga LaRouche just got back from a very important trip to India; at which she was one of the featured speakers in a very prominent, very high-level dialogue – the Raisina Dialogue. And if people have not seen it yet, a wonderful half-hour interview that Jason Ross conducted with Mrs. LaRouche was posted on the LaRouche PAC website earlier this week. So, if you haven't watched that yet, I would really encourage you to watch it; and to just think about everything that has been said here today. Think about these initiatives that are being taken by some of the world's leading countries to create the future; and think about the role that the LaRouche movement has played over years and decades in shaping the possibility of these initiative being taken today. So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would like to thank Jeff and Jason here in the studio. Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

**Se virkeligheden i øjnene:  
Den transatlantiske verden er**

# dømt til undergang – Og menneskehedens fremtid ligger i Eurasien

16. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Skribent på *Daily Telegraph*, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard, er blevet fuldstændig hysterisk over sin seneste »opdagelse«, nemlig, at det transatlantiske område nu går ind i en hyperinflationsnedsmelting. I realiteten burde enhver, der er ved sin fornufts fulde fem, for længst have indset, at USA og Europa allerede er dømt til undergang. USA's økonomi er håbløs, og intet, undtagen et totalt skifte i politik – der går bort fra troen på penge over menneskelig kreativitet – kan forhindre den totale ødelæggelse. Ingen økonomisk genoplivelse, eller blot økonomisk overlevelse, kan forekomme under den aktuelle politik. Det er et under, at USA stadig eksisterer på dette tidspunkt, da der ikke er nogen mekanismer til at redde økonomien.

Krisen kommer til udtryk på en mere grafisk måde, når man ser på de himmelstormende rater for selvmord, dødsfald som følge af narkooverdosis og den faldende forventede levealder i USA.

Vi står på randen af et globalt kollaps, som det transatlantiske område umuligt kan overleve. Krakket kan komme, hvad dag, det skal være, og det er denne realitet, der har udløst hysteriet fra sådanne som ECB-chef Mario Draghi og bladsmører for den britiske krone, Evans-Pritchard.

Eneste mulighed for det transatlantiske område er at annullere Wall Street og [City of] London – udslet dem totalt, og gennemfør så en total ændring af konceptet for det økonomiske system.

Der er to, uforenelige koncepter for økonomi. Der er det britiske/Wall Street-koncept om penge, penge og atter penge.

Penge i sig selv, har intet med virkelig værdi at gøre. Det alternative system, Hamiltons system, som FDR forstod og gennemførte, afviser penge; afviser Wall Street. Dette system bygger på menneskelige opdagelser, der omsættes i videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt, som skaber virkelig rigdom og fremmer menneskets vækst.

Præsident Franklin Delano Roosevelt havde disse koncepter og omsatte dem til praktisk handling som præsident – indtil FBI og Republikanerne lukkede Roosevelt-programmet ned, selv inden hans død i utide. Intet som helst system, der bygger på penge og finans, kan fungere, og dette var, hvad FDR forstod.

Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin opererer ikke ud fra et pengeorienteret system. Det kinesiske lederskab under Xi Jinping opererer ikke på basis af et pengeorienteret system. Eurasien er i færd med at blive organiseret på basis af helt andre principper, anført af Kinas bestræbelser for at realisere menneskets udenjordiske forpligtelse. Denne idé blev fremvist på den sidste dag af den Nationale Folkekongres, der netop er sluttet i Beijing, da en af de delegerede fra Folkets Befrielseshær, Kinas første, kvindelige astronaut, gav et magtfuldt interview til CCTC om udsigterne for Kinas rumprogram. Kina er også godt på vej til at bygge verdens første, kommercielle højtemperatur-gasafkølet reaktor. Det er realøkonomi – og ikke det vanvid med penge, penge og flere penge, der har plaget USA, siden FDR's død, med ganske få, momentvise undtagelser.

På en anden måde personificerer den russiske præsident Putin det samme princip: Nøglen til alt, hvad Putin har gjort for at vende situationen i Syrien, er, at han altid er i bevægelse, altid finder på en overraskelsesflanke – på det strategiske niveau. Putin er sig udmærket bevidst, at han ikke handler alene, men at han opererer på vegne af et partnerskab med Kina. Dette gjorde Li Kiqiang klart i sin afslutningstale til den Nationale Folkekongres: Ingen tredjepart vil få lejlighed til at ødelægge det strategiske partnerskab mellem Kina og

Rusland. I Indien har premierminister Modi lanceret en revolution i landbrugssektoren, som er fuldstændig afgørende for Indiens fremtid. I sit nye budget har han annonceret en 84 %'s forøgelse af investeringer i landbrugssektoren – oveni i relaterede investeringer i veje, jernbaner og produktion af kemiske produkter og gødning.

Putin drives af en dyb, personlig erfaring. En stor del af hans familie døde under nazisternes invasion af Sovjetunionen under Anden Verdenskrig. Denne erfaring former hans tankegang. Uden en erkendelse af, hvem Putin er som verdensleder, og hvor han kom fra, er det umuligt at forstå hans handlinger. Det er grunden til, at det store flertal af de såkaldte »strateger« i Vesten er forvirret over hans flankeoperationer.

---

## **EIR's interview med Irans ambassadør i Danmark, H.E. Hr. Morteza Moradian om Irans relationer med Rusland og Kina, og Irans rolle i Den Nye Silkevej efter P5+1 aftalen med Iran (på engelsk og persisk)**

Interviewet, som EIR's Tom Gillesberg lavede, fandt sted den 15. marts 2016 i København. Ambassadøren talte på persisk, som blev oversat til engelsk.

**English:**

Interview with Iran's ambassador to Denmark, H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian about Iran's relations with Russia and China, and Iran's role in the New Silk Road, after the P5+1 agreement with Iran. The interview was conducted on March 15, 2016 in Copenhagen, Denmark by EIR's Copenhagen Bureau Chief Tom Gillesberg. Ambassador Moradian spoke Farsi, and his statements were translated into English.

**Audio:**

Interview with H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian, the ambassador from the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Kingdom of Denmark, about Iran's relationship with Russia and China, and Iran's role in the New Silk Road, from a vantage point after the P5+1 agreement with Iran. The interview was conducted on March 15, 2016 in Copenhagen, Denmark by EIR's Copenhagen Bureau Chief Tom Gillesberg. Ambassador Moradian spoke in Farsi, and his statements were translated into English. Video and audio files are available at: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=12299>

EIR: Mr. Ambassador, thank you so much for agreeing to this interview, to give us an opportunity to hear what Iran's views are on some extremely important questions, not only for Iran, but, I think, for the whole Middle East region, and, also, for the world. When Chinese President Xi was in the Islamic Republic of Iran, there was a lot of discussion with President Hassan Rouhani, and others, and agreements signed, aimed at reviving the ancient Silk Road, which the Chinese call the "One Belt, One Road." Greek Prime Minister Tsipras was also in Teheran, and spoke about Greece's role as a bridge between Europe and Iran.

After years of war and lack of economic development, many countries in Southwest Asia are completely destroyed. What is urgently needed is the extension of the OBOR/New Silk Road policy for the entire region, as well as the Mediterranean countries – a Marshall plan, but without the Cold War

connotations.

Do you see a potential for that, and if so, what are your ideas about it?

H.E. Mr. Morteza Moradian: In the name of God, the compassionate and merciful, I would also like to thank you for arranging this session for me to be able to air my views on the issues of the region, and others. Both Iran and China have high ambitions regarding transportation issues. I think that there is extreme potential for economic development, arising from the idea raised by the Chinese president. Iran is situated at a very important juncture from a transportation point of view. This has nothing to do with the issues of today or yesterday, but it is an historical issue. Iran, and the region around it, are located along a very, very important corridor.

If we look at the important corridors in the world, there are three important ones. We can see that the North-South corridor, and the East-West corridors, all pass through Iran. The important thing is that transportation corridors necessarily need lead to the growth of economic development, and also, when economic development takes place, what follows that is peace and stability. Our country, and all of the countries of western Asia, are trying to find and develop these transportation routes. In this regard, the idea raised by China can have important consequences for the region. Just to sum it up, this idea of reviving the old Silk Road, would have a very positive influence on development.

As far as Iran is concerned, Iran enjoys a very good position in regard to all forms of transportation – air, sea and land. Iran has always followed up on the issue of reviving the old Silk Road, with China. We now see that the Chinese idea, and the Iranian idea, are now meeting at some point. I think that within the framework of two very important agreements, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), and, also, the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO), we can have very, very good cooperation. I will give more explanations later about the importance of the SCO and ECO cooperation. These are

both in our region, and they can have cooperation with each other.

EIR: You have personally been involved in your country's relations with, especially, Russia and China – two countries which are playing leading roles in today's world, with Russia taking leadership in the fight against Daesh/Islamic State, and China pursuing an inclusive, multi-national, economic development strategy, which is an alternative to the transatlantic monetarist policy leading to economic collapse. Now, starting a new chapter after the sanctions against Iran have been lifted, how do you foresee the future of Iranian relations with Russia, and China, and what benefits will that bring to Iran and the rest of the world?

Ambassador Moradian: As you pointed out, I think the conditions are now conducive for good cooperation and development. During the years of the sanctions, we had extensive relations with China. There is now about \$50 billion of trade between Iran and China. This has fluctuated some years, but it is between 50-52 billion dollars. China is the biggest importer of Iranian oil. We also had extensive relations with Russia during the years of the sanctions. It's natural, now that the sanctions have been removed, that the relationship between these three nations would develop further.

The important point that I would like to point out is that the three countries have common interests, and common threats facing them. We are neighbors with the Russians. We have common interests with Russia regarding the Caspian Sea, transportation, energy, the environment, and peace in the world. So, we have quite a number of areas where our interests coincide. Other there areas where we have common interests are drug trafficking, and other forms of smuggling, combating extremism and terrorism, and, also, our views on major international issues converge.

We also have quite a number of common interests with China.

They include energy, in the consumption market, reviving the Silk Road, combating terrorism, the transportation corridors, and, also, in the framework of the SCO -- quite a number of areas where we have common interests. China needs 9 million barrels of oil on a daily basis. As I said, our trade relations amount to about \$52 billion.

Iran enjoys some very important factors. First of all, it has enormous amounts of energy resources. Its coastline along the Persian Gulf runs up to 3000 kilometers. We are neighbors with 15 countries in the region. So these are very, very important points for Iran to be in the hub. I think that cooperation between these three powers, namely Russia, China, and Iran, can ultimately lead to stability and peace in the region. So the four areas – the combination of economics, trade, energy and transit – these are areas that can lead to the ideas that I mentioned. I think that effective cooperation between these three powers can lead to peace and stability, important in western Asia, and in the Middle East.

The revival of the old Silk Road, at this juncture of time, would be very meaningful. During the recent visit to Iran by the Chinese president, the two sides agreed to increase the volume of trade between the two countries, in the next 10 years, to \$600 billion.

Also, in the recent visit to Iran by President Putin, there was also agreement on Russian investment in Iran. It has to be said that our trade relations, economic relations, with Russia is not as much as it should be. But among the topics discussed when President Putin visited Iran, was to make sure that the volume of economic cooperation increases between Iran and Russia.

Just to sum up our relations with Russia and China regarding economic cooperation, we think that with Russia, it is not enough, and we want to increase that. With China, it has been very good, but we still want to develop that further. Overall the situation is promising.

You are well aware that from the point of view of stability, Iran is unique in the region, and that actually prepares the



ground for this cooperation to continue.

EIR: There is already progress on extending the New Silk Road from China to Iran. On February 15, 2016, the first freight train from Yiwu, China, arrived in Teheran. The 14-day-trip covered over 10,000 km. (about 6,500 miles), travelling through Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, saving 30 days compared to the former route. What are the plans to extend this line, and how will that improve economic relations along the New Silk Road? And what new agreements were just made between Iran and China to develop the New Silk Road?

Ambassador Moradian: President Rouhani has very clear views on the Silk Road. In fact, President Rouhani is a specialist in transportation routes and communication. He believes that the basis for development lies in the development of transportation infrastructure. He and the Chinese president have talked over the revival of the Silk Road on a number of occasions.

There was a discussion that deviated from the main subject of the Silk Road, being propagated during the past few years. That was the idea of the new Silk Road, or the American Silk Road, so to speak, and it was not based on an historical issue. Basically, they wanted to bypass Iran, and deviate the route to bypass Iran, in effect. No one can fight against economic and geographical realities on the ground. When the route through Iran is the shortest route, and the cost effective route, then nobody can go against that. And because the Chinese ideas were more realistic, then Iran and China were able to come to some sort of understanding on the development and revival of the Silk Road.

There is also emphasis on the development of sea routes. We witnessed good investment by the Chinese in this regard, in the recent years. China has invested heavily in Pakistan, in the Gwarder port.

If I want to just come to the issue regarding Iran, then I can go through the following issues. The railroad between Khaf in Iran, and Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif in Afghanistan, is an

important connection. The Khaf-Herat section has been completed, but the Herat-Mazar-i-Sharif section is still to be constructed. I think this is an important route that we believe, in my opinion, China would be advised to invest in. Also, within the framework of Danish development aid to Afghanistan, I think a portion of funds to the Herat-Mazar-i-Sharif railroad link would be an important factor.

If this route between Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif were to be completed, then from there, there are two routes – one leading to Uzbekistan, and the other leading to Tajikistan, and that can be an important connection. At the moment, China is making good investments in both Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, in order to establish the links. In fact, the link between China, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Iran, is one of the most important links of the Silk Road. And there is a missing link between Herat and Mazar-i-Sharif, as I said, and I hope that the countries concerned, especially China, can help establish that link. Over the past two years, the corridor between Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Iran has now borne fruit, and is now connected. In fact, the train that you mentioned, that arrived in Teheran, actually came through this route, and this corridor has extreme potential. I hear that quite a number of countries in the region are interested in joining this corridor. We have another corridor linking Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Oman, which is called the fourth corridor. And this has also come into operation over the past year-and-a-half.

We also have other corridors, which I call subsidiary corridors. All of these subsidiary corridors can actually enhance and complement the main East-West Silk Road. One very important corridor, that you are aware of, is the North-South corridor, and a section along this corridor is now under construction – the connection between the city of Rasht, and Astara on the Caspian coast. In fact, we have reached agreement with Azerbaijan on the connection between the two cities of Astara in Iran, and Astara in Azerbaijan. This corridor also needs some investment, and we hope that

countries like China can help us in developing this. Just to sum up regarding the corridors, there are two routes which need investment: Herat to Mazar-i-Sharif; and Rasht to the Asteras in Iran and Azerbaijan.

Regarding the third part of your question, about the agreements reached by Iran and China during the Chinese president's visit in Iran, 17 agreements were signed during the visit. The areas included energy, financial investment, communication, science, the environment, and know-how. Specifically, on the core of your question about the Silk Road, the two countries agreed to play a leading, and a key role, in the development and operation of this link. They agreed to have cooperation on infrastructure, both railroad and road. For example, electrification of the railroad link between Teheran and Mashhad, is part of this connection of the Silk Road that was agreed to. The other important thing is cooperation on the port of Chabahar in Iran. The two sides agreed to have cooperation in this, and the Chinese agreed to invest in Chabahar. Regarding industry and other production areas, they agreed that the Chinese would cooperate and invest in 20 areas. Regarding tourism and cultural cooperation, the two sides also agreed to develop cooperation in this regard, within the framework of the Silk Road. I think you can see that within the framework of the Silk Road, there are quite important agreements between the two countries.

EIR: Building great infrastructure projects is a driver for economic growth, and increasing cooperation among nations. Now, after suffering under the sanctions, Iran has an opportunity to build up its infrastructure, as is going on, in cooperation with other countries, to help create the basis for Iran to play in important, stabilizing role in the region.

The P5+1 agreement also cleared the way for Iran's peaceful nuclear energy program, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was just signed with China, to develop peaceful nuclear energy. What were the highlights of the agreement, and what are the plans for Russian-Iranian civilian nuclear

cooperation?

Ambassador Moradian: Between Iran, Russia, and China, there has been good cooperation through the years regarding the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

32:36

Because of the renegeing of the Western governments, the construction of the Bushehr nuclear power plant was left unfinished, and after the Russians agreed to pick up the pieces, we reached an agreement, and were able to develop, and make this very important plant operational. The cooperation between Iran and Russia on peaceful nuclear energy has been very constructive. All of Iran's atomic activities have been under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). As we have had no deviation from our peaceful nuclear program, after 10 or 12 years, the Western countries, the P5 + 1, finally came to the conclusion that Iran's nuclear program has always been peaceful. I believe that they knew this at the beginning, as well. This was just a political game. We have also had some kind of constructive cooperation with China over the past two decades on peaceful nuclear energy. During the recent visit to Iran by the Chinese president, an agreement was also signed in this regard. In the implementation of the cooperation agreement, China, Iran and America are also the three countries forming the committee for the implementation of the agreement. It was agreed during the recent visit that China will reconfigure the Arak heavy water plant. The Chinese and the Iranians have also agreed to have cooperation on the building of small-scale nuclear power plants. This, I think, is very important for Iran, in terms of producing electricity, and the Chinese welcome this. We have also signed a number of agreements with China on the construction of a number of nuclear power plants in the past. Iran, because of its extensiveness, has always welcomed cooperation on the development of peaceful nuclear energy for the production of electricity, and other things. In fact, based on the cooperation agreement between Iran and the P5+ 1, there will be agreements with a number of the members of the

P5+1 regarding the nuclear issue.

EIR: You already mentioned the International North-South Transport Corridor (INSTC), linking India, Iran, and Russia with Central Asia and Europe. Is there anything more you would like to say about this project, and the benefits that are envisioned?

Ambassador Moradian: I explained about the corridors in my previous answers, but the North-South corridor is one of the most important corridors in the world. If this corridor were completed, it would be very effective in three most important areas – it would be a contributing factor in security, speed, and cost. This corridor starts in Finland, comes through Iran, then on to the Persian Gulf, from there to India, and then towards Africa. If we look at the present route now, it takes 45 days, but if we use the North-South corridor that I just mentioned, this would reduce the time to 20 days. The route will be 3,000 kilometers shorter. This can be a very important factor from a world economic point of view.

We are faced with realities, with situations, that nobody can ignore. For this reason, during the past few years, Iran has made endeavors, extensive efforts, to actually complete what I call the subsidiary corridors. Right now, in Iran, we have 10,000 kilometers of operational railroad lines. For our present government, the further development of railroad links is very important. We have plans to build another 10,000 kilometers in the future. It is my view, that in the next couple of years, we will see a revolution in transportation.

There are some missing links, which we think should be completed as soon as possible. As I said, from our point of view, the section between Rasht and Astara is very important, and it has to be completed very soon. In fact, during the recent visit of the Danish foreign minister to Teheran, this issue was also brought up. The Iranians announced that if the Danes are prepared to do so, they would be welcome to invest in this section. And we have that link to the Chabahar port.

If this port is developed to utilize its full capacity, then this will serve as an important link in the North-South corridor. In the Persian Gulf we also have an island called Qeshm, which has an extreme potential. In fact, because Qeshm, itself, also has gas, and has a strategic location in the Persian Gulf, it can play an important role in the North-South corridor. We are seeing that various countries, like China, Japan, and South Korea, are interested in entering into these areas. In fact, there was a seminar on shipping in Copenhagen, a couple of weeks ago, and I said that to the Danish participants there, that this condition is conducive to involvement for mutual benefit. The benefits to be accrued from the North-South dialogue are global. Iran is making all efforts to complete this corridor.

A lot can be said about the North-South, and East-West corridors. Just to point out, very briefly, on the East-West corridor, some very important developments have taken place. We have had good negotiations with the Turkish side. One of the most important links in the East-West corridor, is the link between the cities of Sarakhs and Sero. Sero is located on the border with Turkey, and the Turks and the Iranians are now in very extensive negotiations to develop this route. The other route is the railway link between Iran and Iraq, and this is also being constructed on an extensive level. As I said, the subsidiary corridors – the one from Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan to Iran; and the one from Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Iran and Oman – are now operational, and we are also planning on development, and making other subsidiary routes operational.

EIR: What about cooperation on water desalination, and nuclear fuel?

Ambassador Moradian: Iran is faced with a shortage of water. We have quite a number of projects for water desalination in the Persian Gulf. In fact, one of the main reasons that we wanted nuclear power plants in the Persian Gulf, was to use

that energy to desalinate water. Currently, a number of Iranian companies are engaged in this. One of the very big projects came on stream during the past couple of years. Regarding the desalination plants, there is good cooperation between Iran and foreign countries. I think that this is another area where Danish companies can enter into the competition. President Rouhani made a trip to the city of Yazd, in the center of Iran, and he said there, that transfer of water from the Persian Gulf to the center of Iran, to the city of Yazd, is one of the important projects that the government has in mind.

Regarding nuclear fuel, within the framework of the P5+1 agreement with Iran, it envisages extensive cooperation between Iran and these countries on nuclear fuel. Iran is now one of the countries that have the legal right to enrich uranium, and this has been recognized. So, based on the capacities that Iran has, we can exchange nuclear fuel. Within this framework, we have exchanged quite a lot of fuel with the Russians, and we have cooperation plans with China on the heavy-water plant in Arak.

EIR: Can you speak about cooperation on fighting terrorism and drug trafficking?

Ambassador Moradian: On the issues of combating extremism and terrorism, and trafficking with drugs, and otherwise, there is extensive groundwork for cooperation. The development of extremism, and the instability that follows, is extensive in the CIS countries, and part of China. Iran has extensive experience and knowledge about combating terrorism, and in this regard, Iran can cooperate with those countries regarding this menace. Afghanistan is the world's biggest producer of narcotic drugs. In fact, unfortunately, after Afghanistan was occupied by the ICF coalition, led by America, the level of production of narcotic drugs in Afghanistan has increased extremely violently.

EIR: While the British in the Danish troops were in the

Helmand province, I think the production went up about 20 times.

Ambassador Moradian: Exactly. In that region, Helmand, in particular, there was an incredible increase in the amount of production. In fact, in combatting smuggling drugs to come to Iran, to this side, Iran has been a sturdy wall, and we have unfortunately lost quite a number of our security forces in that region, bordering on 4,000. Just something on the sideline which is very important. In fact, Iran is on the frontline in combatting drugs. When Europe talks about helping other countries stem the tide of immigrants to Europe, I think that stemming the tide of narcotic drugs coming to Europe, also requires the same sort of agreements. Iran is very active in combating and preventing drugs coming this way, and the death penalty, the capital punishment we have for the warlords of the drug traffickers, is, actually, in the pursuit of this policy of trying to prevent drugs from reaching outside of the region. Just imagine if Iran would stop cooperating, stop combatting these drug traffickers? The road would be an open highway, and just imagine how much drugs would then come across. There already exists very good cooperation between Iran, China, and Russia on combating drug trafficking. We have had multi-lateral sessions in the field of combating drug trafficking. I think that within the framework of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), Iran can play a leading role in combating drug trafficking, extremism and terrorism. In the recent session of the SCO, it was agreed that after the sanctions were lifted against Iran, that Iran's status would be lifted from an observer to a full member. In the next session, which is planned in Uzbekistan, I think that this issue will be raised.

EIR: I think we have covered a lot of very many essential things. Is there anything else that you would like to say to our readers?

Ambassador Moradian: I would like to refer to a few points in



this interview, which is about the cooperation between Iran, China, and Russia. The cooperation between Iran, Russia, and China is very important. The more this cooperation increases, the more it can help peace and security in the region. The revival of the old Silk Road is a very important issue. Within the framework of the revival of the Silk Road, the strengthening of the SCO cooperation, and the ECO cooperation is very important. In fact, the cooperation between ECO and SCO is also very important, and has to be developed.

Other very important issues that I would just like to briefly mention are – the first thing is that Iran's full membership in the SCO is important. In fact, in the area of security, SCO needs Iran's experience and influence in this regard. The next thing is that cooperation within the framework of the SCO, can enhance security and peace in the region.

The next thing, is that China must make more investment in Iran. In order to actually develop the Silk Road, it has to invest more in Iran. China must also make more investments in the port city of Chabahar, and also in the Iranian island of Qeshm.

The other point I would like to mention, is that the Eastern SWIFT (financial transaction network) is also an important idea. I think that the important countries in the East, like China and Russia, should have an alternative financial connection. And the other thing is, the monetary exchange between these two countries is important. What I mean by this, is that these countries can conduct their transactions in the local currencies of the Iranian Rial, the Chinese Yuan, and the Russian Ruble.

The other thing I would like to point out, is that China is the number one country in the world that needs energy, and Iran is one of the leading producers of such energy. But the important point to be born in mind here, is Iran's independence in its decision making regarding its energy resources – oil and gas. In fact, if you look at its record, Iran has never played games with its energy policy. Any country that wants to have economic cooperation with Iran,

must take this aspect into consideration, and it is an important consideration. Other countries in our region do not operate in this way.

Finally, I am very pleased that this opportunity arose for me to air my views on economic development in the region, and very important issues that will have global consequences. Thank you.

EIR: Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

End

---

# Tysk valg er en uforbeholden katastrofe for den vestlige verden

*»Dette er en uforbeholden katastrofe«, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, formand for partiet Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet (BüSo) i Tyskland. »Afd er et beskidt, afskyeligt fænomen. Det var sådan, det skete i 1930'erne«, sagde hun og bemærkede ligeledes, at sådanne ekstreme højrefløjspartier eller endda fascistiske partier eksisterer over hele Europa. Denne fare, sagde hun, er resultatet af den fejlslagne politik i Europa mht. både flygtningekrisen og den økonomiske krise, og markerer slutningen på EU, der ikke længere har nogen som helst enhed.*

*13. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Valgene i tre tyske forbundsstater søndag resulterede i en enorm kindhest til kansler Angela Merkel, iflg. meningsmålinger fra valgstederne, med det ekstreme højrefløjsparti Alternativ for Tyskland (Afd), der bygger på at fremme anti-flygtningehysteri, der*

kaprede 11 % og 12,5 % i hhv. Baden-Württemberg og Rheinland-Pfalz i vest, og ikke mindre end 23 % i staten Sachsen-Anhalt i øst. »Dette er en uforbeholden katastrofe«, sagde Helga Zepp-LaRouche, formand for partiet Borgerrettighedsbevægelsen Solidaritet (BüSo) i Tyskland. »Afd er et beskidt, afskyeligt fænomen. Det var sådan, det skete i 1930'erne«, sagde hun og bemærkede ligeledes, at sådanne ekstreme højrefløjspartier eller endda fascistiske partier eksisterer over hele Europa. Denne fare, sagde hun, er resultatet af den fejlslagne politik i Europa mht. både flygtningekrisen og den økonomiske krise, og markerer slutningen på EU, der ikke længere har nogen som helst enhed.

Ledende økonomiske og politiske personer i hele Europa, men i særdeleshed i Tyskland, har åbenlyst advaret om, at den sindssyge politik, der i sidste uge blev annonceret af Den europæiske Centralbanks, ECB's, præsident Mario Draghi, både er et tegn på total desperation og en garanti for et totalt kollaps i allernærmeste fremtid. Draghis 33 %'s forøgelse af den allerede massive pengetrykning under 'kvantitativ lempelse', op til 80 mia. euro om måneden, parret med lavere negative rentesatser, er, som Zepp-LaRouche sagde i sidste uge, simpelt hen mere af den samme medicin, der forårsagede sygdommen. Hele det transatlantiske finanssystem er håbløst bankerot, og intet som helst, undtagen en politik for genindførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling for at lukke »for-store-til-at-lade-gå-ned«-bankerne ned og afskrive den spekulative gæld, kan forhindre et ukontrolleret kollaps.

I USA er fascismens realitet endelig ved at blive tvunget ind i offentlighedens bevidsthed af den farlige hofnar Donald Trump. Men, som Tim Stanley fra det britiske *Telegraph* skrev i dag, alt imens det er sandt, at Trump gør fremstød for ulovlig og hadefuld demagogi: »Han tog ikke Amerika i krig i Irak på baggrund af usaglige beviser, etablerede Guantanamo i modstrid med menneskerettighedslove eller autoriserede tortur af fjendtlige kæmpere, stod i spidsen for den gigantiske NSA-

operation med indsamling af data, lancerede en beskidt krig med droneangreb mod både terrorister og dem, der havde det uheld at leve i deres nærhed, underminerede den religiøse frihed hos ansatte, der ikke ønsker at støtte deres arbejders sexliv, underkendte staternes ønsker mht. giftermål, tvang borgere til at købe sundhedsprodukter eller deporterede tusinder af illegale immigranter ved aggressivt at genne dem sammen.« Alt imens dette tydeligvis er en anklage mod Obama, så er det Trumps sandsynlige demokratiske modstander Hillary Clinton, der fører valgkampagne på baggrund af dette generalieblad med mord og kaos.

Hvor efterlader dette så USA? En ægte revolution af tankegangen kræves af dets borgere, omgående, hvis verden skal undfly det fremstormende helvede med global krig og økonomisk kaos. Lykkeligvis har Kina og Rusland søsat en redningsflåde og en mission for menneskeheden gennem BRIKS, Den Nye Silkevej, et internationalt rumprogram, en tilbagevenden til klassisk kultur, og »win-win«-relationer nationerne imellem.

Schiller Instituttets konference i Manhattan den 7. april må bringe verden sammen på baggrund af disse principper. Det er den opgave, som denne organisation kan og må gennemføre.

---

**Lyndon LaRouche:**

**»Vi må have en udvikling mod frihed;  
og udgangspunktet kan kun**

# være indsigt i, hvad der er det sande og gode«

**Lyndon LaRouche, 12. marts 2016:**

»Jeg ville sige, at, i USA netop nu, i den grad, hvor nogle af os bidrager med nye indsigter i, hvad USA kan blive til, at vi må have en udvikling mod frihed. For problemet er, at de folk, der ikke kan lide os, der ikke kan lide frihed, er problemet. Men spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvad er frihed? Nogle mennesker siger, »min idé om frihed er det her«, og deres idé om frihed er så ikke det.

Så pointen er, at der må være en sammenhæng, en aftale, baseret på fornuftig indsigt i den praktiske udførelse. Dette er, hvad der altid har fungeret i nationer. Dette er, hvad der har destrueret nationer! Napoleon destruerede nationer! Briterne har altid destrueret nationer! De specialiserer i det; og dette har været kun alt for sandt i historien.

Så man har altså det, at dannelsen af regering er baseret på ødelæggelsen af særskilte regeringer, på konflikt, mord. Jeg tænker på det, Tyrkiet nu gør, diktaturet i Tyrkiet. Men dette er ikke en karakteristik af tyrkerne; dette er en karakteristik ... for jeg ved noget om tyrkerne og deres historie. Jeg har været tæt associeret med nogle af heltene i Tyrkiet. Og lignende ting er sande for andre ting. Der er ingen grund til, at vi bør sige, at der er et naturligt had, en naturlig konflikt blandt folkeslagene i verden! Det er ikke naturligt. Det faktum, at der er konflikt, er ofte et u-naturligt produkt.

For, når folk ser, hvad det gode er, når mennesket ser, hvad det gode er, i praksis, så vil man finde, at de ikke ønsker at gøre den slags ting, som tyrannerne gerne vil frembringe.

Spørgsmålet er, vi opstiller argumenterne for, hvad bør det gode være? Hvad er det, vi bør gøre, som er det gode? Hvad er bedre? Det er, hvad det handler om.

Og alle de andre ting er nonsens. Mennesket er forpligt... Hvor står vi f.eks. nu? Bare for lige at afbryde mig selv. Hvor er vi nu? Vi er på randen af en generel atomkrig over hele planeten, og udover selve planeten. Og denne ting kan ske, lige nu, i den form for krig, som netop nu bliver planlagt, som kan ødelægge hele planeten, og planetens mennesker, netop nu! Og spørgsmålet bliver derfor, hvordan kan vi forhindre dette i at ske? Og hvordan gør vi det, uden at gå ud i en eller anden form for underkastelse under dette, eller underkastelse under hint? Nej! Det må komme fra en indsigt i, hvad sandhed er, hvad menneskeheden er, hvad menneskeheden må være. Og mange mennesker, ligesom – jeg tror, man kunne sige, at Putin er et ret godt eksempel på en model – forsøger at gøre præcis dette. Og der er mennesker i andre dele af verden, der har til hensigt at gøre dette.

Og det er, hvad vi må gøre. Vi ser dette med Kina, med Rusland og med andre dele af planeten nu. Vi ser, at disse nationale enheder kommer sammen, og de går ikke bare i seng med hinanden, men det er en proces af at erkende, at de må arbejde sig igennem det, ved hvilket deres fælles interesser fremmes, på en bevidst og progressiv måde.

Og det er, hvad vi forsøger at gøre. Se på, hvad Kina gør. Indien forsøger at arbejde sig igennem her. Andre dele af verden forsøger at arbejde sig igennem denne proces. Det er denne form for mål, denne form for proces, hvor man siger – og det udmunder i, når man begynder at tale om rumprogrammet. Man taler om Månens bagside. Hvad gør Kina? Kina har kig på Månens bagside, og Månens bagside er det, Kina forsøger at finde ud af: Hvad er den virkelige betydning af det her, Månens bagside? Og Kina er ved at mobilisere for de næste to generationer, blot for dette formål. Og det er ikke bare en hensigt, men det er et begyndelsessted for at forstå, hvordan menneskeheden,

jord-mennesket, kan spile en rolle i at udforme galaksen. Og galaksen er det mål, som menneskeheden bør have for øje netop nu.«

**John Ascher (mødeleder):** Jeg vil blot lige nævne her, at alle de temaer, du netop berørte, vil blive temaer for en meget vigtig konference, som bliver afholdt den 7. april i Manhattan, sponsoreret af Schiller Institutet, om spørgsmålet om, hvad det nødvendige begreb om menneskeheden er; og at få USA til at tilslutte sig Verdenslandbroen. Vi har en invitation, og forsøger at få denne konference, der kommer den 7. april, til at blive det store gennembrud. Og det, som hr. LaRouche netop gennemgik, er præcis temaet for denne konference, inklusive spørgsmålet om rumprogrammet og videnskab som drivkraft.

*Ovenstående er et uddrag af webcastet The Manhattan Projekt med Lyndon LaRouche, fra 12. marts. Hele videoen kan ses her: <https://larouchepac.com/20160312/larouchepac-manhattan-project-town-hall-lyndon-larouche-march-12-2016>*

---

**Den Europæiske Centralbank  
skruer op  
for pengehanen. Eksproprier  
spekulanterne, ikke**

# bankkunderne!

## Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

*Vi står på randen af det totale sammenbrud, og det er absolut utilgiveligt, at regeringerne giver mulighed for, at dette system, der er baseret på bedrageriske intriger og fusk, kan opretholdes så meget som en dag længere. Storspekulanternes kasinoøkonomi må øjeblikkeligt lukkes ned gennem en streng Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling! Der findes en løsning, men den kræver, at man på dramatisk vis går bort fra den nuværende, neoliberale model og genindfører realøkonomi og økonomisk genopbygning.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# Hele menneskeheden behøver Den Nye Silkevej nu! LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast 11. marts 2016

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



taler om Gottfried Leibniz og nødvendigheden af kreativ nytænkning, som Kina i dag legemliggør.

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

International Webcast for March 11, 2016

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

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

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

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

This

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

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

called the Raisina Dialogue Forum. This was a major conference which included international representation, former prime ministers, former heads of state, finance ministers, elected parliamentarians, and so forth.

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

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

to Egypt where he brought the development vision of the Chinese

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

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

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

Middle East and North Africa, and flooding into Europe.

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

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

So the question is as follows:

*"Mr. LaRouche, German Chancellor Angela Merkel has blamed*

*European nations for*

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

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

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

*For each Syrian returned, a Syrian in Turkey would be resettled in the EU. European Council President Donald Tusk has said that the plan would spell the end of 'irregular migration to Europe.' What is your view on the EU's new migrant policy?"*

So, Jeff.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: To put it very mildly, Mr. LaRouche was extremely blunt. You've got to start from the standpoint that this is a rotten deal; it's not going to work. And furthermore, that nobody has any business making any kind of backroom deal with President Erdogan of Turkey. Here's somebody who has been a principal sponsor of the jihadist terrorism, including the Islamic State and the Nusra Front; who has robbed his country blind; he's one of the most notorious thieves on the planet. He's killed his own people. He shut down the entire opposition newspaper, and, quite frankly, he's carried out a 6 billion euro extortion operation against the European Union. So the problem, in fact the disease that we're dealing with, is the tendency that's rampant in the entire trans-Atlantic world, to make these kinds of rotten deals with people who have no business being allowed to remain in power. You have an entire trans-Atlantic system that was really, in effect, characterized this week by two developments. Number One: this rotten deal with Erdogan, which should never be allowed to happen. And number two,

by the announcement by the European Central Bank head, Mario Draghi, that the ECB was going to replicate the insane policies

that were carried out in the United States under the Quantitative

Easing, bail-out, and Dodd-Frank bill, all of which are universally known to have been complete and total failures.

So,

Draghi announced zero interest rates, and announced that the QE

policy of the ECB would be extended up to \$80 billion euro a month, and furthermore, that the ECB would begin purchasing absolutely worthless private sector bonds to keep what one columnist called the "zombie banks" in business.

Now, there's been an absolute revolt in Germany, in particular, against this Draghi policy, because the net effect is

that, with zero interest rates, people are going to be pulling their money out of the actual savings banks and regional commercial banks, through which all of the lending into the real

economy takes place. And as the result of that, you're going to

see rampant bankruptcies on top of the already advanced complete

breakdown of the European real economy. All of the European too-big-to-fail banks are already hopelessly bankrupt.

So you've got these two examples of absolute policy insanity, of attempting to operate and make compromises and "reforms," within a system that is already dead. As Mr. LaRouche

said, you don't make deals with dead people; there's nothing in

it for you. There's no future in it. Yet that's exactly what we're seeing as the dominant phenomenon throughout the trans-Atlantic region.

Now the fact of the matter is that there are viable

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

So, by and large, when you talk to people in the political system at a relatively high level, you're dealing with a system that is absolutely paralyzed with fear, and overwhelmed by corruption. Because you press the issue, and you'll get widespread admission that the system is doomed, we're headed for another blow-out far worse than 2008; it could happen any moment now. It could happen Monday morning when you wake up. And furthermore, you could cancel this rotten debt, wipe out those cancerous aspects of the whole system, and you could go ahead to rebuild, but based on a completely different set of premises. Same thing with the arrangement with Turkey. There's no grounds whatsoever for paying 6 billion euros in extortion, knowing that a character like Erdogan is going to come back again and again and demand more, and will continue to threaten to unleash massive waves of migration, while at the same time Turkey is trying to sabotage the efforts of Lavrov and Kerry to bring an end to this five-year monstrosity of a war that's been going on inside Syria.

So, if you operate within a dead system, you are doomed to

go down with it. Now there are things that are working in the world today. Putin is functioning. Putin is carrying out very effective flanking operations in Syria. China is functioning, and is in fact functioning at a much higher level from the standpoint of real economic growth. And China is willing to invest in real physical economic growth all across Eurasia, down into Africa, into Latin America. And furthermore, China is leading a global science driver policy. The plans to actually land an orbiter on the dark side of the Moon have been discussed frequently in recent weeks on this broadcast. China is now the leading R&D nation on the planet, and they embody the principle of human creativity. They're not trying to draw deductive, pragmatic, practical conclusions from policies that have failed. You can never derive success by trying to scrutinize and analyze systematic failure. You need human creativity, and you see that in China.

Increasingly, there are nations that are grouping around these opportunities that are posed for real development, centered around China. Russia has taken certain measures to assure that Russia survives, and that Russia has the military and material resources to be able to conduct the kind of flanking operations that may very well save Syria and the Middle East, and major parts of Africa, from the genocidal destruction that will occur if the existing trans-Atlantic forces, led by the British Empire and stooges that they've got at their disposal like President Obama, with his Dodd-Frank madness; like Mario Draghi; like the corrupt Erdogan.

So, anytime that there's an offer to make a rotten deal with a rotten SOB like Erdogan, the obvious answer should be, run in the other direction. Don't do it. And so, in response to the question that's been posed, this is a rotten deal that is doomed to failure, but it's typical of a much larger problem, which is the tendency to be stuck thinking inside the deductive box when the only avenue for survival for mankind is to think creatively, and align with those people who've demonstrated that they've got a viable commitment to the future. You find that in China. You find that in many of the actions taken by Putin in Russia, and it's pretty scarce everywhere else. And it's certainly virtually nonexistent in the entire trans-Atlantic region.

**OGDEN:** Thank you very much, Jeff. I also neglected to mention in my remarks in the beginning that, coinciding with Helga's trip to India and these very important developments with Xi Jinping's visit to the Middle East. The Arabic version of the EIR Special Report, "The New Silk Road Becomes the New Land-Bridge," which was available in English and also has been translated into Chinese; has now been translated into Arabic. And I think Helga LaRouche's foreword or preface to that will put it very appropriately; that "either this is an extraordinary coincidence or an act of divine intervention" that this would be available at a time like this, when this is precisely what you

need. This sort of vision for a new Marshall Plan, the World Land-Bridge, to bring development to this part of the world which

is in such dire need of it.

Now, as Jeff summarized quite succinctly, what Mr.

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

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

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

On

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

And

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

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

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

dead system, when the alternative is immediately at hand?

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

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

is never a replication of the past; real creativity depends on new ideas that are new in a very real sense. That creativity is

always {ad novo}, he said; and it's not achieved through the reform of a bad system. But it is only achieved through the introduction of an entirely new principle which is truly new.

He

said, Einstein is a good example of this; the personality of Brunelleschi is an ideal example of this. But the goal is never



to deduce what the solution to a crisis must be from some sort of precedent; but rather, to ask the question, "What is it that we actually wish to accomplish for the future of mankind?" And, with that question in mind, therefore, what must be done? What must be done to achieve that future? And we tend to fail to ask that question, and we get too consumed by the details of the present; when we should be thinking from a total global standpoint about what we wish to achieve in the future.

Now, I think at a time like now, where it's very clear that the nations of Europe and the United States are imploding, socially, economically, politically; what brought us to this point? But also, more significantly, what must be done to save civilization now? And we discussed, I think very appropriately, that when a nation loses its {raison d'être}, when a nation loses its mission, it tends to implode and fall in upon itself. And we can learn a lot from the mission that China has, and the optimistic vision of the future which is shared by all of its citizens. So, with that said, I would like to invite Jason to come to the podium. As you know, Jason Ross has been conducting a many-part series of presentations, classes on the LaRouche PAC website on the unique genius of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz; this is a series which will continue. But I would like to invite him to the podium now.

JASON ROSS: Well, this year, 2016, is the 300th anniversary

of Leibniz's death in 1716. Leibniz lived from 1646 to 1716. And a number of the disputes that he was in, the discoveries that he made, are very freshly relevant for us today. Both historically from the standpoint of understanding where we came from, and because there are disputes that continue to the present. Disputes over the nature of the purpose of the nation, disputes over the nature of the Universe, disputes over the nature of mankind. To discuss one of those, I'd like to frame it by contrasting the views of Gottfried Leibniz and Isaac Newton. Many people are probably familiar, certainly if you've been watching this website, with the concept of the dispute over the calculus. That Leibniz plagiarized the calculus from Newton, as Newton and his friends said; no. Did Newton steal the calculus from Leibniz, who invented it first? Let's leave that aside; that's really not at issue for what I want to talk about today. Let's consider the dispute that was represented between the British outlook of Newton and the outlook of Leibniz in terms of the purpose for humanity, as seen in their views of creation and of the Universe as a whole. In the very last years of Leibniz's life, he was engaged in a dispute via letters with a follower of Isaac Newton, Samuel Clarke. And in this discussion, one of the primary topics that came up was the basis of considering God to be great. On this, the two differed in a very fundamental way. Newton, via Clarke, said that God's greatness came from his power;

Leibniz,

while not disputing that, said that God's wisdom is also one of

His perfections, and that in leaving this out, you have a total

misunderstanding about God.

Now, I'm not going to make a theological point about this today. I want to look at this in terms of the existence of the nation-state. While Newton said that because God can do anything,

that shows how wonderful He is; and while this same outlook – a

religious outlook – was applied to man and society by John Locke

and Thomas Hobbes, who said that a powerful ruler of society really exists for himself, and that people form a society through

a compact to not infringe upon each other, not with the idea to

have a mission together, but simply to get along as a way of putting under control the impulses of people to steal from each

other and this sort of thing. So, on the one side, you have the

notion that the state exists, the ruler exists and is justified

in existing to maintain power; that that is the basis of legitimacy of a ruler – holding power. It's a somewhat circular

reason.

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

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

nation,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the potential of developing new scientific breakthroughs in that way.

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

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

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

the United States in our most recent history, the time under the Apollo program, as launched in its strength by Kennedy to go to the Moon and back; this was in recent times, probably the most singly powerful example of a potential to reach that. That program didn't result in Einstein's per se; it didn't have that kind of effect. Amazing technological developments were made. The potentials that the space program has as a whole to make new scientific breakthroughs, however, is absolutely tremendous. So, consider China. China, which has brought hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in just the past few decades. China, which currently lends out more internationally in investments in nations than the whole World Bank does. China, which has played a major role along with Russia in setting up the BRICS; the Shanghai Cooperation Organization for Peace and Stability; the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, to address the \$5 trillion or more needs for infrastructure within that region of the world; offering loans that are without the conditionalities that are the hallmark of the World Bank. This ability to put into very specific practice a concept of "win-win" cooperation, as it was put by President Xi; these specific ways of cooperating with neighbors, with other nations for development projects. As for example, the railroad operating in Ethiopia at present, allowing the transport of food to the interior of the nation in a timely fashion; preventing the intensity of starvation that would otherwise be likely given the agricultural

disasters they've faced recently.

Take a look at space and science. China's East Tokamak, a super-conducting tokamak, recently had a 50 million-degree plasma

held for 100 seconds; a breakthrough for them on their way towards developing fusion. Their space program – that was the first soft landing on the Moon in decades – the Chang'e 3 with the Yutu rover. Planning to come out next year, Chang'e 5, a sample return mission to the Moon; again, the first time in decades, and they'll be only the third nation to have done this.

And then in a few years, a space first – not only for them, but

for the world – the Chang'e 4 mission, to land on the far side of the Moon. The first time ever; this is something new that mankind has never done before. It opens up new windows scientifically in terms of the potential the far side of the Moon

offers for different types of telescopes – such as radio telescopes. They'll be able to show us things that no other – it's the most convenient place to be able to do these things. It

simply is impossible from here on Earth, or in orbit; you need a

body to place these things on.

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

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

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

development

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

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

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

to play a very important role among other nations internationally

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the  
existence of the nation; and there's a purpose to be  
fulfilled,  
and that we're taking up that purpose in our future which lies  
beyond the Earth and out in the stars.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. And I think we can use  
that as a promotional to encourage you to tune in to all of  
his  
classes, which are available and will continue to be available  
on  
larouchepac.com. And I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us  
here  
as well, today. So, that's what we have to present to you here  
today; short and sweet. And we thank you for tuning in; and we  
encourage you to please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good  
night.

---

# **Flygtninge-aftale mellem EU og Tyrkiets Erdogan er korrupt!**

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)



---

# **NYHEDSORIENTERING**

## **FEBRUAR-MARTS 2016:**

### **Forlæng Den Nye Silkevej ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika**

*Tom Gillesberg til Folketingets Udenrigsudvalg den 1. marts:  
Vi står netop nu med en enestående mulighed for at sikre, at  
den langvarige mareridtsagtige proces med krig og ødelæggelse,  
der har præget Mellemøsten i årtier, og som har spredt sig til  
Europa og resten af verden i form af terror fra Islamisk Stat  
og en flygtningebølge, der er ved at løbe Europa over ende,  
kan bringes til ophør og erstattes af et nyt paradigme for  
fred gennem fælles økonomisk udvikling.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## **En genrejsning af USA's økonomi med rumforskning som spydspids,**

# og en international mission for menneskehedens fælles mål, som basis for en varig fred

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

## DOKUMENTATION:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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

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

Tilstanden for økonomien i USA – for ikke at tale om Europa –

er i en håbløs spiral for nedadgående og dræber millioner af mennesker gennem håbløshed, narko- og medikamentafhængighed og krig, som truer hele den amerikanske befolkning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Under en diskussion om det økonomiske program den 5. marts sagde chefen for Kinas største rumforskningslaboratorie: »Rumforskning er uadskilleligt fra Kinas innovationsdrevne

udvikling. Hvis Kina ønsker at være en stærk, global nation, bør det ikke kun varetage sine umiddelbare interesser, men også bidrage til menneskeheden. Kun dette kan vinde Kina verdens respekt.«

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

---

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

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

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

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

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Indien:**

**Forlæng Silkevejen til  
Mellemøsten**

**Sagen om Nykredit/Totalcredit**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**Økonomisk udvikling:**

**Kina vil bygge 30**

# atomkraftværker Silkevejen

## Langs

3. marts 2016 – Kina har sat sig et mål om at bygge omkring 30 atomkraftværker i lande langs med ruterne i Bælt-og-Vej-programmet frem til 2030, iflg. Sun Qin, præsident for Kinas Nationale Atomkraftselskab, CNNC, rapporterer *China Daily* i dag.

Sun sagde, at 70 lande i alt allerede er i gang med at planlægge eller udvikle deres egne projekter for atomkraftværker, og man skønner, at flere end 130 atomkraftværker vil være bygget frem til 2020.

»Men vi står også over for meget stærk konkurrence på det internationale atommarked«, sagde han. »Lande som Rusland, Sydkorea, Japan og USA udforsker alle aggressivt det globale marked for atomkraft.«

CNNC er en af Kinas tre store atomkraftgiganter. Selskabet håber at kunne bruge sin nationale erfaring som en løftestang for at øge sin eksport af atomteknologi, sagde *China Daily*. Det har allerede bilaterale aftaler om samarbejde om atomkraft med lande, der omfatter Argentina, Brasilien, Egypten, Storbritannien, Frankrig og Jordan, sagde Sun.

CNNC har allerede eksporteret seks atomkraftreaktorer – fem miniature neutron source reaktorer (MNSR), to atomforskningsfaciliteter og en eksperimentalreaktor.

*Foto: Atomkraftreaktorer under konstruktion i Sanmen, Zhejiang-provinsen, Kina. (Xinhua).*

---

# Tidligere fransk premierminister Raffarin promoverer Kina og Silkevejen

2. marts 2016 – Den franske senator, Jean-Pierre Raffarin, der var premierminister i Frankrig fra 2002-2005, roste Kinas Silkevej som »det eneste, betydelige, nye og globale projekt« og tilføjede, at dette var virkelige lederes rolle. I et skriftligt interview med avisen *Xinhua* sagde han, at Kinas projekt Ét bælte, én vej har gjort landet til en af verdens pionerer, der vil »spille dets rolle som forener og innovator«.

»Under et møde sidste år i Boao Forum for Asien[1] (BFA)«, sagde Raffarin, »fortalte den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping mig følgende: 'Vær forvisset om, at, i det 21. århundrede, vil intet land kunne opnå succes solo.' Hele verden har forstået hans budskab, med flere end 70 lande, der er engageret i Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB). Et fællesskab baseret på gensidig interesse er blevet skabt«, sagde Raffarin.

Raffarin sagde også, at multinationale projekter blev undersøgt inden for alle områder, inklusive industrielle, finansielle, landbrugsmæssige og videnskabelige felter, på en måde, der skal støtte »mere relevante og betydningsfulde, multinationale investeringer ... Kina kræver sine rettigheder, men påtager sig sine forpligtelser for verdensfred«. Han sagde, at Paris og Beijing havde den samme, fælles tilgang til global styring og win-win-løsninger på multilateralt, internationalt samarbejde.

»Vi har en fælles bestemmelse, fordi uordenen i verden svækker nationerne. Gennem en bedre indbyrdes forståelse, respekt for forskelligheder og analyse af alle truslerne vil en fælles bestemmelse blive dannet«, sagde Raffarin til Xinhua.

Raffarin roste de »fremragende relationer« mellem Kina og Europa og fremførte, at Kina havde hjulpet euro-området, da det stod over for finansielle vanskeligheder.

[1] En oversættelse af Xi Jinpings hovedtale på Boao Forum, 'Mod et samfund for vor fælles bestemmelse og en ny fremtid for Asien', [kan læses her](#).

---

## **Schiller Instituttet stiller spørgsmål til Jin Liqun, præsident for Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, efter hans tale i Danmark**

*København, 2. marts 2016* – På sin første udenlandsrejse efter sin udnævnelse til præsident for Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank, AIIB, kom Jin Liqun til Danmark og Finland. I Danmark talte han ved et offentligt arrangement, der var arrangeret af Københavns Universitet og Copenhagen Business School. Medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet deltog, stillede et af de to spørgsmål, uddelte materiale om *EIR's* Rapport om Den



nye Silkevej og rapporten over Schiller Instituttets foretræde for Folketingets Udenrigspolitiske Komite i går, samt fik en del kontakter.

En video med Jin Liquns tale, samt engelsk rapport, [kan ses her](#).

Formålet med AIIB er at fremme en 'win-win' økonomisk og samfundsmæssig udvikling gennem investering i infrastruktur. Jin sagde, at han ikke tror på reduktion af fattigdom i sig selv, og af sig selv. I 1980, da hovedlandet Kina erstattede Taiwan i Bretton Woods-institutionerne, havde Kina intet andet end en menneskebefolkning. Så begyndte Kina at låne for at bygge infrastruktur, og der var nogle, der var bekymrede for gældsskabelse. (Det var på det tidspunkt, hvor Mexico havde en stor gældskrise.) Men den gavnlige effekt af infrastrukturinvesteringerne viste sig 25 år senere, da økonomien begyndte at komme i gang. Denne politik gjorde det muligt for Kina at løfte 600 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom. Samtidig lånte andre lande for at opretholde forbrug.

I besvarelse af det spørgsmål, han selv stillede, om det var AIIB's formål at finansiere projekter under programmet for Ét bælte, én vej (One Belt, One Road; OBOR), sagde Jin, at banken ejes af de 57 medlemslande, og endnu 50 andre ønsker at gå med, hvor 30 af disse har truffet beslutning om at tilslutte sig. Dette er ikke Kinas bank; OBOR vil blot udgøre en del af bankens engagement, og der må være en balance mellem finansiering af projekter i hele regionen.

Formålet er at finansiere varig, økonomisk udvikling, skabelse af rigdom, samt skabelse af infrastruktur i Asien, der bidrager til forbindelsesmuligheder i den vidtstrakte, eurasiske landmasse, og ikke kun i selve Asien, med f.eks. højhastighedstog, der nedbringer omkostningerne for transport mellem Europa og Asien. Det er nu blevet lettere at rejse fra Beijing til Europa, end det er at rejse mellem de asiatiske nationer. Der er behov for at harmonisere politikken til

fordel for eksempelvis at krydse grænserne.

AIIB vil udrette ting, der ikke hidtil er blevet udrettet af Bretton Woods-finansinstitutionerne, inklusive Verdensbanken, fordi AIIB vil lære af disses plusser og minusser. Asien har likviditet i overflod, men i øjeblikket må disse penge først rundt om Europa og USA, før de kommer tilbage til Asien.

Investeringer i infrastruktur kan være pengespild, hvis der ikke foreligger gode, gennemtænkte projekter – som et kraftværk uden et moderne el-net. AIIB vil være med til at udtænke koordinerede projekter.

Vist er der uoverensstemmelser over det Sydkinesiske Hav, men de fælles infrastrukturprojekter mellem Kina og nationerne i ASEAN har opbygget en gensidig tillid og et win-win-samarbejde. Se på Syrien; vi ønsker ikke at se det ske andre steder; men vi må lære at mindske kaos og løse uoverensstemmelser.

Udvikling er også med til at forbedre miljøbeskyttelse. Man bekymrer sig jo ikke om miljøet, hvis ens bekymringer går på, hvordan man skal få morgenmad næste dag.

## **Tom Gillesberg fik lejlighed til at stille følgende spørgsmål:**

»Mange tak for Deres fremlæggelse. Jeg synes, det er meget spændende, at Danmark er medlem af AIIB. Jeg er formand for det danske Schiller Institut. Mit spørgsmål lyder: Hvis I arbejder så tæt sammen med Verdensbanken og disse institutioner, hvordan vil I så forhindre dem i at bruge, som det sker i dag, spørgsmål som f.eks. miljøhensyn, klimaspørgsmål osv. til at forhindre udvikling? Der er et stort behov for udvikling, og mange penge i verden, der kunne investeres i udvikling, men de siger, 'Nej, det kan vi ikke gøre. Vi har en truet frø-art her, og derfor kan vi ikke bygge denne dæmning, og I kan ikke få elektricitet'. Så hvordan vil

I sikre, at denne form for ideologisk korrupsion ikke kommer til at influere på AIIB således, at disse spørgsmål ikke anvendes til at forhindre udvikling?»

Som svar på spørgsmålet sagde Jin, at man undertiden må ofre noget i form af indvirkning på miljøet for at få udvikling, og at nettoeffekten vil være positiv. Udvikling er løsningen. »Vi er stadig ikke parat til at blive afvænet fra fossile brændstoffer ... Men pga. udvikling kan vi mennesker opfinde en teknologi, opnå teknologiske gennembrud. Vi vil sluttelig kunne tappe solenergi direkte, men man kan ikke med ét springe direkte til dette stadium ... Folk er bange for atomkraft [fission], men hvis vi kunne opnå et gennembrud inden for fusionskraft, kan vi måske løse problemet én gang for alle. Hvordan skal vi kunne opnå dette? Gennem udvikling! Lad os samarbejde« for at opnå gennembrud.

---

## **Helga Zepp-LaRouche taler ved Raisina Dialog i Indien**

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **Video: Den Asiatiske Infrastruktur Investeringsbank (AIIB) præsident Jin Liquns tale i København den 2. marts 2016**

Redrawing the Global Financial Map – Jin Liqun President of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank

“How Can the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank Contribute to Economic Development and Integration in Asia? What is in it for Europe/Denmark?”

Meeting arranged by Copenhagen University’s Asian Dynamics Initiative, Asia Research Centre, and Copenhagen Business School.

Question by Tom Gillesberg, chairman of The Schiller Institute in Denmark at ??

Link til København Universitets side om mødet.

---

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

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

*Hvis man derfor sluttelig ønsker, at den syriske fredsaftale skal blive en succes, altså holde, så må man, ud over det presserende nødvendige behov for en Marshallplan/Landbro-hjørneste for at sikre, at freden er varig, også fjerne Obama. Og man må bringe det britiske imperiesystem til fald.*

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 29.**

**februar 2016:**

**Kun Silkevejen kan få  
våbenhvilen i Syrien til at  
holde**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

**En Fredsplan for  
Sydvestasien.**

**Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche.**

**EIR Pressemeddelelse for  
udgivelse af**

**den arabiske udgave af »Den  
Nye Silkevej  
bliver til Verdenslandbroen«**

The English and Arabic version is below the Danish.

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

*vendes til det bedre. På et tidspunkt, hvor den transatlantiske verdens finanssystem står umiddelbart foran at krakke, er udviklingsperspektivet for en genopbygning af Mellemøsten og resten af Sydvestasien til at udgøre en bro mellem Asien, Europa og Afrika den eneste drivkraft for økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.*

*På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.*

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

## **En Fredsplan for Sydvestasien**

***Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche***

***Washington, D.C., 26. februar 2016***

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

standse kampene vil være for skrøbelig til at vare ved og overleve nye provokationer fra de samme kræfters side, der oprindeligt var ansvarlige for krigen.

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

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

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



økonomisk vækst, der kan forhindre Europa og USA i at synke ned i kaos.

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

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

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

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

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

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

28. februar 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Alle dele af planeten konfronteres nu med valget mellem to konkurrerende stemmer. »Spørgsmålet drejer sig om krisen«, erklærede **Lyndon**

LaRouche skarpt under sin dialog med Manhattan-projektet den 27. feb. »Vil du dø, eller vil du leve? Det er de to stemmer.«

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

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

Som et eksempel på denne begyndende renæssance står den særdeles succesfulde **Schiller Institut konference, der blev**

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

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

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

erklærede LaRouche til publikum ved Manhattan-projektet.

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

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

