

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

## Rusland, FN, menneskerettighedsgrupper og EU-grupper fordømmer aftale med Tyrkiet

9. marts 2016 – De Forenede Nationer og menneskerettighedsgrupper advarede i går om, at EU-aftalen om at tilbagesende alle ikke-regulære migranter til Tyrkiet til gengæld for politiske og finansielle belønninger til landet, kunne være ulovlig, rapporterer journalister fra Reuters, Stephanie Nebehay og Gabriela Backzynska, den 8. marts.

FN's flygtningehøjkommissær Filippo Grandi sagde til EU-parlamentet i Strasbourg i går: »Jeg er dybt bekymret om

ethvert arrangement, der involverer en almengældende tilbagevisning af nogen person fra et land til et andet uden, at man klart forklarer, hvad standarden er for beskyttelse af flygtninge under international lov.«

Grandi kom med denne udtalelse kun få timer efter, at de 28 EU-ledere havde udarbejdet en aftale med den tyrkiske premierminister Ahmet Davutoglu i Bruxelles, og som vil betale Tyrkiet flere penge (3,3 mia. dollar mere) for at holde flygtninge i Tyrkiet; som giver hurtigere rejsetilladelse uden visum til tyrkere i hele EU, og sætter skub i forhandlingerne om medlemskab af EU, der længe har været gået i stå, til den tyrkiske, ISIS-støttende præsident, Erdogan.

EU's feje ophøjelse af Tyrkiets status blev omgående fordømt over hele verden:

Amnesty International kaldte den foreslåede massetilbagevisning af migranter til Tyrkiet for »et dødsstød mod retten til at søge asyl«.

Den velgørende nødhjælpsorganisation Læger uden Grænser sagde, »I 'realpolitikens' navn syntes medlemsstater parat til at træde på deres principper for at slå en skammelig handel af med Tyrkiet.«

*Sputnik International* erklærede i dag, at, »med politiets voldelige beslaglæggelse i denne weekend af Tyrkiets største, uafhængige aviser, *Zaman* og *Today's Zaman*, har landet endelig overskredet stregen for at blive et fuldt udviklet diktatur ... EU-ledere lefler for Tyrkiet, efter at sidstnævnte har spillet en førende rolle i destabiliseringen af Syrien og udløsningen af flygtningekrisen ... Tyrkiet favner nu et fascistisk diktatur, og Washington og dets europæiske håndlangere er ramt af den samme omfavnelser.«

*Foto: FN's flygtningehøjkommissær Filippo Grandi holder sin tale under EU-parlamentets plenarforsamling i Strasbourg, Frankrig, den 8. marts 2016. (Foto: EPA)*

---

# **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 Føniks: En genopbygningsplan for Syrien) er blevet oversat af Hussein Askary (med færdigt layout af Ali Sharaf), og »Den Nye Silkvejs-lady«, alias Helga Zepp-LaRouche, har på smukkeste vis skrevet forordet, som følger:

## **En Fredsplan for Sydvestasien**

***Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche***

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

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

Den eneste måde, hvorpå en varig fred kan garanteres, er den omgående iværksættelse af en omfattende udviklingsplan for hele Sydvestasien, med en udviklingsplan for integreret infrastruktur; en plan, der ikke alene genopbygger krigens ødelagte byer og landsbyer, men som anviser en langt mere fundamental fremgangsmåde for atter at forvandle denne region, der engang var en af den menneskelige civilisations vugger, og som på forskellige tidspunkter i historien var hjemsted for

tidens mest fremskredent udviklede kulturer, til en af verdens mest avancerede. Målet må være at udløse regionens folks kreativitet og bringe deres produktivitet op på samme niveau som Europas, USA's eller Kinas.

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

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

På dette programs virkeliggørelse beror således hele menneskehedens skæbne.

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

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

EIR press release in English and Arabic on the 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)

---

# **USA og Europa må gå sammen med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig – Den Europæiske Union er færdig, med eller uden briterne**

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

# **LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 19. februar 2016:**

## **USA og Europa må samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig**

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

Engelsk Udskrift.

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

International LaRouche PAC Webcast

Friday, February 19, 2016

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

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

Intelligence

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

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

that discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.



Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in a strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the point of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff. So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many more of the details, and then we'll come back to our institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also answer. So, Jeff?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Matt. Well, as we were going through the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he actually drew a distinction between the bluff, and what he said much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are up to. It's folly because they are caught in their own madness, and don't even realize the consequences of what they're doing in the real world. They don't have the capability to carry out the kind of provocations that they are threatening, and the danger, of course, is that that does not mean that they're not going to try to do it. Putin stepped into the Syria situation at a critical moment last September, and the entire situation has shifted radically since that point. The Russian intention is {not} to simply accomplish a military victory on behalf of the forces of President Assad. They're creating the conditions to force the intransigents, in this case Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, some of the other Gulf states, and always lurking in the background

when

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

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

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

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

what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash

point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear

sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of

trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's

a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to

an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how

to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy

Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia

of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that

this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically shifted to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see nothing but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on the verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place where you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course Asia and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but relative to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and in the United States, we see a disintegration of the political and economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of course, Africa has been on the target list of the British and other European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time. But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment of geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis in Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire European financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly

bankrupt

under the present conditions and terms of thinking that dominate

Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning to

see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of the

people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in the first place.

So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself, now

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

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

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

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

throughout the African continent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the

cornerstone of their foreign policy.

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

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

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

And

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

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

solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

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

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

the solution to the problems in the United States begins with

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

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

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

process to happen almost overnight — then we have a history in the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a

real economy.

All of that means the United States coming into alignment with what we see going on with China, with Russia, with India, with others. In other words, the United States becomes part of a

genuine trans-Pacific collaboration, and under those circumstances, Europe itself would have no choice but to get on

with the program.

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries — you have clinical insanity and folly,

which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized,

Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary

actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of

their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only way to solve this problem.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended

Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

much productive capacity that Europe from a physical



standpoint

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

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

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

Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether

Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part of that system of doom that's going to have to be changed in a much more fundamental – I'd say "revolutionary" – way. And the opportunities are there; they're presented there because Europe is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already established the rail links between central China and Germany. There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European leaders are going to have abandon their folly. And that's a difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

OGDEN: Absolutely. And, let me just elaborate a little bit what Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized, which is that if you just look at the refugee crisis, for example, and the absolute breakdown of Europe to even absorb and handle this under the current economic conditions. This has pushed people to begin to discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a new program of economic development for the Middle East and North Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry. The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan,

and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek a better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this is a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China and Russia to develop the Middle East and North Africa along the Silk Road routes. This kind of cooperation between China and the rest of the world is what China is seeking in inviting the rest of the world to engage in; and this is the only way to solve the crises and shift the geometry overall which is creating the existential threat which is now being faced by Europe. Now, this new paradigm; this is exactly what we have been talking about for quite a while, but I think the foundation for a new paradigm cannot be seen as merely some sort of extension of former or present geopolitical ideas about how the world works. This is not merely a rearrangement of political and economic and strategic alliances between countries that would still be dominated by the same axiomatic world view which is what has brought us to this crisis point to begin with. Rather, there needs to be a true renaissance; a new calibration, a re-examination of what our view of mankind is. What our view of man as a species is, and what mankind's role within this

galaxy

and his relationship to the entire universe; and indeed, what his responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this universe must be.

So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of the really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

JASON ROSS: Thanks. As I imagine everyone has heard by now, on September 14th of last year, a gravitational wave was detected by the interferometer experiments that we had set up in Washington state and in Louisiana. Over a few months, that signal was studied to make sure that that really was what had occurred; and a paper was submitted in January and published in February announcing the news that a gravitational wave phenomenon representing the merging of two black holes had been detected. This meant that a change in space-time had been experienced in that detector; where maybe we don't know how the experiment worked.

Very briefly, two tracks at right angles to each other, allowed light to move up and down those tracks. Those tracks reach 4 kilometers long. Due to some very clever engineering, the effect of length was 100 times that; and by the motion of these gravity waves – meaning a change in the shape of space due to

a  
varying intensity of gravity due to these two black holes  
spinning around each other – the length of the two tracks  
varied  
by an amount that was about  $1/10$  the diameter of a proton over  
a  
track length of 4 kilometers. This is equivalent to the star  
nearest to us getting closer and further away by the width of  
a  
hair. It's amazing that was actually able to be measured;  
that's  
an astonishingly tiny change.

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

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

more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to Kepler

when he determined how the planets moved; the use of telescopes

in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen with

the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that see

what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes.

Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

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

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

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

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

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

a scientific breakthrough; the science behind this – Einstein proposed this in 1916. He had some more thoughts and wrote

another paper in 1918; some more discussion about it.  
Hypotheses  
about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try  
to  
model these types of things; all of that took place. But what  
could be called the fundamentally scientific change occurred  
100  
years ago with Einstein's theory of relativity; with gravity  
waves being one of the implications. Being able to detect them  
is  
wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows  
that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of  
in  
Einstein's time, certainly, or even a few decades ago. The  
development that we've made has been tremendous.  
But I think it's fair to say this was not a scientific  
breakthrough in the real sense of science. It is a new  
sensation;  
it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at  
things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we  
look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis  
possible,  
we can compare it to the really awful influence of Bertrand  
Russell.  
So, first on Einstein. We've got to recall that what  
Einstein did in laying out his revolutionary theories was not  
something that he derived; it wasn't something that he proved.  
It  
wasn't something that he showed was true based on what was  
already known. What Einstein said about the universe  
contradicted  
the Newtonian view of space and time that had become dominant.  
Einstein said that that simplistic view of space and time,  
which  
went along somewhat intuitively with our senses, was in fact  
untrue; and that basic concepts like simultaneity, or knowing  
that two events happen at the same time, such a basic concept

as

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He was right.

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

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

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

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

geometry;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what science really is?

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

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

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

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being

more

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1)

it's an opportunity to really go back and really develop and understanding of who Einstein was. How did he think? Who was this man, who a century ago, put forth the hypothesis that was detected in this way only this year. Who was Riemann? How did he actually think? We can reflect on the opportunities that we have for the use of these kinds of instruments to provide us an entirely new window to understanding the universe around us. Not only are we seeing things in a different band, we're using a different sense all together. We're hearing the universe; we're able to listen in on a completely different kind of physical process than the electromagnetic ones that are the basis of all astronomy otherwise. Using light, radio waves, x-rays and that sort of thing. And I think it also demonstrates that the ability to develop new technologies, to rise to a challenge, certainly exists. And we saw this in the Apollo program, which similarly, going to the Moon itself did not involve as much new science as it did new technologies, new social organizations to implement those technologies. Which we saw with some of the breakthroughs of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these gravitational waves. But we have to have grand objectives. I mentioned the LISA experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar to ones which did this recent detection, which NASA had been a major player in and then pulled back on, as part of the Obama

destruction of a national mission, a natural future. NASA, as the leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

So, we have to have human objectives for the nation, for ourselves. We have to, as a nation, have objectives like what China's doing now; as represented by China's moves towards the Moon from the Helium-3 standpoint. From the sheer excitement of

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people

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

to the Moon for the next trip?"

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

a future-oriented mission again.

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

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

today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

# Italiensk finansminister: Jeg er for Glass-Steagall, men det er EU ikke

*13. februar 2016* – I et usædvanligt forløb sagde den italienske finansminister Gian Carlo Padoan i det italienske parlament den 4. februar, at hans regering går ind for en bankopdeling, men at andre EU-medlemsstater ikke gør det samme.

Padoan svarede på et spørgsmål fra senator Laura Bottici fra M5S-partiet (5-stjernebevægelsen) om, hvorvidt "regeringen ikke mener, det er afgørende vigtigt at gå frem så hurtigt som muligt imod en klar adskillelse mellem investeringsbanker og kommercielle banker, selv ved at komme de EU-reguleringer i forkøbet, der for indeværende diskuteres under retningslinje 43, 2014."

Bottici forklarede, "Denne adskillelse ville rent faktisk gøre det muligt at forebygge truslen om systemisk smitte, båret af krisen mellem indbyrdes forbundne banker, inklusive på grundlag af det faktum, at større banker beviseligt ikke altid er mere effektive, men at overdreven størrelse derimod, snarere end at nedsætte risici, har lagt større byrder på kreditinstitutioner.

"Adskillelse af bankaktiviteter ville gøre det muligt at beskytte almindelige menneskers opsparinger bedre, medregnet den kendsgerning, at det ville eliminere interessekonflikter inden for kreditinstitutioner, der både indsamler opsparinger og praktiserer investeringer, og ville dertil tilskynde mere til tildeling af ressourcer til realøkonomien, til ugunst for spekulative aktiviteter, der har været med til få finansielle markeder til at svulme op. En indsats for reguleringer er i gang i EU-kommissionen, men den har imidlertid mange

smuthuller, der kunne neutralisere dens sigte.”

Padoan svarede, “På det europæiske niveau, som den deputerede rejste i sit spørgsmål, diskuterer man en opdeling mellem investeringsbanker og kommercielle banker – hvilket i den ene eller anden form er blevet introduceret i andre lande uden for Eurozonen. Jeg må imidlertid sige, at en kortsigtet løsning ser ud til at være problematisk, fordi hver medlemsstat tenderer mod at forsvare nationale specificiteter, som ofte er vanskelige at forlige.

“Indenfor disse rammer går Italien ind for, at der skelnes mellem roller i banksektoren, men i modsætning til andre lande er Italien også karakteriseret ved et mindre pres, fordi vore banker ikke har en relevant investeringsdel, og også af denne grund udgør en lavere risiko sammenlignet med andre lande.”

Den italienske finansminister sagde med andre ord, at Rom-regeringen støtter et bankopdelings-regime, men at et sådant er umuligt inden for EU. Siden forskellen mellem opdeling og ikke-opdeling er lig med forskellen mellem overlevelse og selvmord, anviser Padoans udtalelse en klar kurs for handling for Italien: Ud af Eurozonen!

---

## **Bail-in-regel-rodet i EU-medlemslande**

*7. januar 2016* – Bail-in-reglerne vil tilsyneladende blive implementeret forskelligt i de forskellige EU-medlemslande. Små virksomheder er ekskluderet fra bail-in i den tekst, som Det europæiske Parlament har vedtaget og, f.eks., i den italienske lov for gennemførsel. Det er ikke tilfældet i

Tyskland, i hvert fald ikke ifølge et brev, som Post Bank har udsendt til sine kunder. Brevet siger blandt andet, at for »virksomhedskonti gælder grænsen på 100.000 euro pr. indskyder«. Med andre ord kunne selskaber, i tilfælde af bail-in, se alle deres penge, der overstiger 100.000 euro, blive konfiskeret.

»Men en konto, hvor to eller flere personer har adgang som medlemmer af et personligt firma, selskab eller sammenslutning eller lignende, uden juridisk personlighed, vil blive slået sammen under udregningen af den øverste grænse på 100.000 euro og behandlet som indskud fra en enkelt indskyder.«

Dette tilbyder et smuthul i den EU-tekst, der siger,

»de følgende har samme prioritetsorden, der er højere end den orden, som krav fra almindelige, ubeskyttede kreditorer uden præference har:

- Den del af kvalificerede indskud fra individer og mikro-, små- eller mellemstore virksomheder, der overstiger dækningsniveauet iflg. bestemmelserne i artikel 6 af Direktivet 2014/49/EU;«

Den italienske lov har vedtaget denne formulering ordret.

Det er imidlertid kun en prioritetsorden for teoretiske godtgørelser, der er fastlagt, og ikke beløbet. Det beror alt sammen på »menneskers, ikke lovens, skøn«, som prof. Paolo Savona afslørede, i Milano Finanza (se 6. jan., <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=11036>).

*Foto: EU-parlamentet i Strasbourg, eller Babelstårnet, eller det skæve tårn i P-eu-sa, måske?*



---

# Bevar fokus på Wall Street/London-nedsmeltningen

7. januar 2016 – Onsdag var endnu en dag med jordskred på aktie- og obligationsmarkedet, som medierne universelt har givet Kinas aktiemarked og valuta skylden for. Disse beskyldninger nåede grænsen for det absurde, da Kinas regering meddelte, midt på dagen i Europa, at den, fra og med 8. jan., ikke længere ville suspendere handel på markedet med »strømafbrydelser«, og ville lade markedsniveauet bevæge sig derhen, hvor det ville – og dette hævdedes i de amerikanske finansmedier at have standset den globale deroute på aktiemarkederne! Hvordan det skulle forestille at være gået til, blev ikke forklaret. Men i al fald, så tog derouten atter fat i løbet af den europæiske og amerikanske eftermiddag, med styrtdyk i aktierne i olie-, bank- og råvaresektorerne i spidsen.

Wall Streets, Londons og de europæiske bankers gæld, der er baseret på råvare- og ejendomsmarkedet, og som ikke kan indløses, fortsætter med at være drivkraften bag kollapset, der i realiteten er udløst af »bail-in«-reglernes ikrafttræden (1. jan. 2016), der nu er i færd med at sænke banker og deres indskydere i hele det transatlantiske område.

*Financial Times* havde den 7. januar en artikel, der afslørede, hvad bank-bail-in har udløst i Europa. Med den beskedne titel, »Investorer gør voldsomt indsigelse mod bank-bail-in«, rapporterer artiklen om en lidet bemærket kendsgerning. Banker i Europa (og også i USA) er nu blevet pålagt at rejse kapital for hundreder af milliarder af euro, i form af de såkaldte »bail-in-obligationer« i 2016 – obligationer, der kan eksproprieres efter dekret fra de europæiske

bankopløsningsmyndigheder i Bruxelles, når banken bliver insolvent eller nærmer sig insolvens. Men Europas banker rejste kun 196 mia. euro i alt i obligationer i 2015. Det var 10 % mindre end i 2014, og beløbet er faldet hvert år, siden 2009.

Disse banker kan således ikke rejse de hundreder af milliarder i »bail-in-obligationer« i 2016. Dernæst kommer *Financial Times* frem til pointen med det »sorte nul« på bankernes bundlinje. Mange hundrede banker vil forsvinde.

»Davide Serra, direktør for Algebris-fonden, der investerer i bankgæld, siger: 'Hvis man er en lille, europæisk bank, bør ens renteomkostninger ved udstedelse af seniorgæld (dvs. 'foranstillet' gæld, der har førsteprioritet mht. indfrielse ved en evt. konkurs i forhold til anden 'efterstillet' gæld, - red.), gå voldsomt i vejret. Dette bør også udløse en konsolidering af de mindre banker, da mange af dem kunne blive udelukket af obligationsmarkedet', advarer han.«

Faldet i udstedelsen af obligationer i 2015 er mere bemærkelsesværdigt, eftersom nationale finansmyndigheder forsøgte at få banker til at genkapitalisere og sælge »tabs-absorberende gæld« (bail-in-obligationer) i 2015, før Enhedsmyndigheden for bankopløsnings-fascisterne tog over. Men, som *FT* beskriver det, så konverterede banker i Italien, Grækenland og andre steder i stedet obligationsgæld til egenkapital – aktier – »med betydelig discount« eller tab for obligationsindehaverne. »Genkapitaliseringen« af de græske banker i efteråret 2015 skete næsten udelukkende på denne måde – gennem en delvis ekspropriering af indehavere af bankobligationer »med det formål at undgå at ekspropriere (bail-in) større indskydere«. Disse »større indskydere« ville have været forretningsforetagender, der ville være blevet – og i 2016 vil blive – udslettet over en kam.

---

# Den britiske Krone gør fremstød for krig og folkemord

*Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 7. januar 2016:*

*En omhyggelig undersøgelse af det britiske efterretningsvæsens operationer over hele planeten afslører et klart billede: Det britiske Monarki er i færd med at fremprovokere krig og kaos i hvert eneste hjørne af planeten i deres forfølgelse af den erklærede hensigt om at reducere verdens befolkning med 80 % eller mere på kort tid.*

*Den britiske hånd er mest synlig i den Persiske Golf, hvor Londons totalt ejede juniorpartner, det Saudiske Monarki, har anstiftet en ny, evindelig krig mellem sunni og shia, arabere og persere, der blev udløst af henrettelsen den 2. jan. af et ledende medlem af det shiamuslimske præsteskab fra den olierige, østlige provins, der har en majoritet af shia-muslimer. Talerør for MI6 Ambrose Evans-Pritchard sagde skadefro på Daily Telegraphs sider i denne uge, at henrettelsen af Nimr al-Nimr vil føre til voldelig gengældelse fra shia-demonstranter, der handler under ordre fra Irans Revolutionsgarde-korps, og vil inkludere angreb på de saudiske hovedolieledninger. Dette vil, erklærer Evans-Pritchard, føre til oliepriser på 200 dollar tønden og et globalt, økonomisk kollaps.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# EU's nye regler for kriseramte banker dræber

*15. december 2015* – En 68-årig italiensk pensionists selvmord i byen Civitavecchia, efter at han mistede hele sin opsparing gennem sin banks reduktion af gæld gennem bail-in (ekspropriering af kundernes indeståender), har rystet det italienske folk. Det har sat fokus på de brutale, nye EU-regler ved kriseramte banker, som træder i kraft i alle medlemslande den 1. januar 2016. Pensionistens bank var en af fire mindre, italienske banker, der havnede i krise og blev »rekonstrueret« af regeringen den 22. november 2015. Flere end 100.000 bankkunder mistede deres opsparing.

Italienernes ophidselse steg til kogepunktet, da det kom frem, at, mens almindelige bankkunder mistede deres livsopsparing, så fik store långivere og aktieejere forvarsel og kunne afvikle deres poster, der i visse tilfælde løb op i millioner.

Fra den 1. januar 2016 er alle EU-lande tvunget til at tilpasse sig de nye regler for bankrekonstruktion, indbefattet reduktion af bankens gæld (bail-in), for banker, der rammes af krise.

Reduktion af gæld er den bureaukratiske term for tyveri af bankkundernes midler. Men, som i tilfældet med rekonstruktionen af de fire, små italienske banker, der kun delvist tog de kundeindeståender, som EU-reglementet tillader, er dette et tveægget sværd. Denne bankredningsmetode kan snarere kæntré banksystemet end hjælpe det. Det var også, hvad LaRouche-bevægelsen og mange andre sagde, da Den europæiske Centralbank (ECB) og EU-kommissionen kom med forslaget til bankrekonstruktion. Vi advarede om, at det ville give bagslag

og skabe større ustabilitet, da det ville sprede panik blandt bankkunderne, der ville løbe storm på bankerne ved det mindste tegn på krise og trække deres penge ud.

I tilfældet med de fire mindre, italienske banker, Banca Etruria, Banca Marche, Carichieti (Sparekassen Chieti) og Carife (Sparekassen Ferrara), blev bankrekonstruktionen gennemført ved en regeringsbeslutning. Dette hastværk viser, at regeringen forsøgte at få det afklaret før 1. januar, for at undgå at være tvunget til at anvende EU's nye reglement til reduktion af bankgælden. Regeringen kunne derfor gennemføre en delvis gældsreduktion. Indeståender på bankkonti blev ikke rørt, men aktier og obligationer i bankerne blev inddraget. Ca. 100.000 ejere af opprioriterede obligationer (subordinate bonds) med høj risiko, men også et højt afkast, mistede alle deres penge op til 750.000 euro. De fire banker vil blive likvideret og opdelt i fire brobanker og en 'dårlig bank' (en 'rygsæk' for dårlige lån). Bankredningen (bail-in) er på 3,5 mia. euro, der vil blive betalt af en bankhjælpefond, som er en indskudsgarantifond, der ejes af banksystemet.

Men denne indskudsgarantifond har ikke penge nok. Derfor skal tre storbanker, Unicredit, Intesa og UBI, stille op med penge, mod at regeringen giver de tre banker skattelettelser på i alt to mia. euro. Dette er blevet afsløret af forbrugerorganisationen Adusbef og betyder, at det er skatteborgerne og bankkunderne, der skal betale regningen.

De mennesker, der har investeret i de opprioriterede obligationer, var ikke ordentligt informeret og var ikke klar over, at deres værdipapirer var ligestillet med bankaktierne, og derfor omfattet af en gældsreduktion. Da det dernæst kom frem, at de større fisk gik fri, så vendte raseriet sig ikke alene mod bankerne, men også mod regeringen, der ledes af Matteo Renzi. Han blev endnu mere presset, da det desuden kom frem, at både hans minister Elena Maria Boschi og hans egen familie har nære bånd til ledelsen af en af de fire kriseramte banker.

Regeringen er nu blevet tvunget til at støtte oprettelsen af en parlamentarisk undersøgelse, som er velkommen, hvis den får en uvildig formand. Det, der er påkrævet, er en dristig og uræd formand som Ferdinand Pecora, New Yorker-advokaten af italiensk herkomst, der var leder af den berømte amerikanske Senatskomité i 1933, som afslørede de mægtigste banker på Wall Street og banede vejen for Franklin Roosevelts finansreformer og genopbygningsprogrammet New Deal.[1] På lignende vis skulle den italienske undersøgelse kunne afsløre, hvordan bankerne har narret deres kunder, men også, hvordan de fire kriseramte banker er blevet lavet om til kasinoer og er gået konkurs. En sådan undersøgelse bør bevirke, at der genindføres regler for god bankpraksis og indskydergaranti gennem en bankopdelingslov (Glass-Steagall). Dette spørgsmål har i mange år ligget på bordet, hvor LaRouche-bevægelsen har ført en kampagne for bankopdeling[2] og direkte og indirekte har påvirket det italienske parlament, der har to kamre, således, at der nu foreligger seks (!) forskellige indstillinger til lovforslag om at indføre en bankopdeling.

Blandt initiativtagerne til disse lovforslag har både Marco Zanni og Alessandro Di Battista fra Femstjernebevægelsen i løbet af de seneste dage udtalt sig med krav om, at bankopdelingen nu må gennemføres for at beskytte bankkunderne! Zanni, der er medlem af Europaparlamentet, sagde her den 9. december, at forslaget om at indføre »en moderne Glass/Steagall-lov med en ren og tvungen opdeling af bankerne i traditionel lånevirkksomhed (kommerciel bankvirkksomhed) og så spekulativ investeringsbankaktivitet« nu er nødvendig for at »undgå en ny systemkrise«.

Alessandro Di Battista, medlem af parlamentet, genlancerede spørgsmålet om en bankopdeling i et TV-interview den 10. december:

– Lad os én gang for alle, sagde han, udskille kommercielle banker fra investeringsbanker, så en medborger kan vide, at, når han sætter penge ind i en bank, så er denne bank ikke

indblandet i spekulationsvirksomhed, spiller ikke på aktiemarkederne, men blot udsteder lån og bedriver normal bankvirksomhed.

*Ovenstående artikel er skrevet af Ulf Sandmark, LaRouche-rörelsen i Sverige.*

[1] Se 16. sep. 2015: »Wall Street er bankerot, og Obama gennemtvinger ved magt et termonukleart Armageddon. Foregrib! FDR's Første 100 Dage«  
<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=8147> Artiklen indeholder mange henvisninger til andre artikler på dansk.

[2] Se: Lyndon LaRouche: Fire Nye Love til USA's (og verdens) redning, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=1460>

---

## **På tærskelen til EU-Valget: EU fuldfører »Enhedsmekanisme for Afvikling« for selvmords-bailout og -bail-in af bankerotte banksystem**

21. marts 2014 – I går nåede EU frem til en »endelig løsning« på eurobanksystemets bankerot efter et møde, der varede hele natten. Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble blev involveret i forhandlingerne omkring kl. 05.30 for at underskrive aftalen. Enhedsmekanismen for Afvikling (Single

Resolution Mechanism, SRM) skal formelt godkendes af EU-parlamentet og de nationale regeringer, hvilket efter planen skal ske efter EU-parlamentssamlingen i Strassbourg midt i april, den sidste samling før EU-valgene i maj måned.

*The Irish Times* rapporterer, at det store gennembrud kom, da de enedes om, at bail-in vil blive ligeligt gennemført – selvmord for den ene nation vil være det samme som i alle andre nationer. SRM vil have en bailout-fond på 55 milliarder euro, som bankerne angiveligt skal bidrage til over 8 år, men som i mellemtiden skal bakkes op af regeringerne, og skal bruges, sammen med bail-in (konfiskering af bankindeståender), til at gennemføre EU's plan om at lukke et betydeligt antal af de 120 største banker, gennemføre en bailout (statslig bankredningspakke) og/eller en bail-in af den dårlige gæld, og optage disse bankerotte banker i Too Big To Fail-bankerne. Dette udtrykker en formodning om, at den kommende bankkrise vil blive relativt begrænset og en-ad-gangen, snarere end det virkelige, overhængende systemiske kollaps.

Fonden vil blive konsolideret fra nationale fonde til en fællesfond i løbet af de otte år. Ifølge det hollandske parlamentsmedlem Corienn Wortmann-Kool vil dette skabe en afviklingsproces, som behandler bankerne ens uanset størrelsen af det land, de er baseret i. »Vi ønsker, at bail-in af kreditorer og indskydere skal anvendes på samme måde over for alle banker, uanset hvilket medlemsland, disse banker befinder sig i«, sagde hun og brugte Irland som eksempel i en sammenligning med større stater som Tyskland og Frankrig.

*The Irish Times* rapporterer stolt: »Alt imens planen fra december ville have betydet, at en fransk eller tysk bank, f.eks., med en stor fond bag sig, ville kunne implementere en moderat bail-in, ville en irsk bank med en mindre national fond være tvunget til at gennemføre en mere dybtgående bail-in, som ville føre til højere finansielle omkostninger, sagde hun.«



Suverænitet bliver desuden bevidst undermineret: »Aftalen siger også, at EU-kommissionen, snarere end medlemslandene, vil vedtage SRM-bestyrelsens beslutninger om at afvikle banker, selv om finansministre stadig vil have ret til at intervenere i visse tilfælde. Medlemmer af EU-parlamentet har forsøgt at begrænse medlemsstaternes beføjelser til at blande sig i beslutningsprocessen, af frygt for politisk indblanding.«

Fonden vil også få ret til at optage lån, for det tilfælde, at der er nogen, der er bekymrede over den kendsgerning, at 55 milliarder euro ikke kan dække boblen, som er på 1,4 milliarder (15 nuller) dollars.

Wortmann-Kool beskrev processen som »demokratiet i funktion«.

**Læs også:**

**Hovedartikler:**

**Lyndon LaRouche: »Værre end Weimar!«** <http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1324>

**Lyndon LaRouche: »På randen af de store forandrings mulighed:**

**VI MÅ SØRGE FOR, AT DENNE MULIGHED BLIVER TIL VISHED«**

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1433>

**Lyndon LaRouche: »Uden Glass-Steagall vil hele Europa gå bankerot«**

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1220>

**Yderligere fordybelse:**

## Schiller Institut-Specialrapporter:

**»Dodd-Frank-loven dræber: Hvordan USA blev en del af det internationale bail-in-system«**

Schiller Institut-Specialrapport, juni  
2012: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/873>

**»Hvordan verdensøkonomien blev ødelagt under Obama«**, Schiller  
Institut-Specialrapport, december  
2013, <http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1213>

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche: »De europæiske nationers Almene Uafhængighedserklæring«**

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/drupal/node/1350>

---

# Helga Zepp-LaRouche: De europæiske nationers Almene Uafhængighedserklæring

Den følgende erklæring er skrevet for at udgøre det idémæssige grundlag for mobilisering af alle de kræfter, som i denne, for civilisationen så store krise, ønsker at genskabe Europas fremtid som et samfund, der er bygget på principper blandt suveræne republikker og på samarbejde med menneskehedens fælles interesser som mål.