

# Det Britiske Imperium står for fald

## – Obama skal væk først

31. juli 2016 (Leder) – Det Britiske Imperiums oligarker, både dem i London og dem i Washington og på Wall Street, er i panik. Obama begynder at smuldre, alt imens forsøget på at skabe et præsidentvalg i USA ud af lort har skabt en sådan stank, at hele partisystemet er ved at falde fra hinanden. På den anden side har Vladimir Putin bevist, at han er en sand leder for mennesker og nationer, og som er i stand til at handle på en måde, som den store tyske digter Friedrich Schiller, der engang var kendt i Amerika som »Frihedens Poet«, identificerede som, at vi på én og samme tid må være patrioter for vores nation og verdensborgere.

Obama, så vel som Bush, Cheney og Tony Blair, er blevet afsløret som krigsforbrydere og kolleger til det britisk/saudiske terrorapparat, gennem en kombination af Chilcot-kommissionens rapport i Storbritannien og offentliggørelsen af det hidtil hemmeligholdte, 28-sider lange kapitel af den Fælles Kongres-efterretningsrapport om terrorangrebet i USA den 11. september [2001].

I dag sagde Lyndon LaRouche, at »vindesiden allerede er blevet afgjort – ikke fuldstændigt, men i det væsentlige – under Putins ledelse. Putin har udført den opgave, han havde forpligtet sig til at udføre, og nu, hvor et voksende antal andre personer, især i Tyskland, støtter ham, er sejren bogstavelig talt for hånden. Putin har fortjent den«.

Ikke sådan, at Obama-klonerne ikke gør deres bedste for at starte en atomkrig. Tidligere forsvarsminister i Obamas regering og chef for CIA, Leon Panetta, sagde i sidste uge til det Demokratiske Konvent, at Putin var en »diktator«, som

Hillary Clinton vil vide at håndtere. Panettas stabschef i både CIA og DOD, Jeremy Bash, en toprådgiver til Hillary Clinton, gik direkte til selveste 'Babylons Hore', i et eksklusivt interview med Londonavisen *The Telegraph*, hvor han grundlæggende set erklærede krig mod det i stigende grad succesfulde samarbejde mellem Ruslands præsident Putin, den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry om at besejre terrorisme i Syrien og på globalt plan, og således yderligere demonstrerer den totale splittelse i Obamaregeringen. Bash sagde, at Clinton vil arbejde for at tvinge præsident Bashar al-Assad »ud derfra«, og at en præsident Hillary Clinton som første punkt på sin dagsorden ville gennemføre en total »revidering af politikken over for Syrien«. Planen er her at sabotere Kerry-Lavrov-initiativet *nu og her*, ikke engang i fremtiden i løbet af den næste regering, ligesom også den nuværende forsvarsminister Ashton Carter i sidste uge modarbejdede Kerrys indsats sammen med Lavrov og med bestemthed erklærede, at en fjernelse af Assad er hans (Carters) første prioritet, og at han først derefter vil bekymre sig om ISIS, al-Nusra eller andre terroristgrupper.

Men dette er alt sammen et svindelnummer, understregede LaRouche i dag. Hillary Clinton-krigsholdet har slet ikke den nødvendige kapacitet til at gøre det – som kun lige undlader at indlede Tredje Verdenskrig – som de truer med at gøre. Deres plan er simpelt hen at ødelægge alle skridt henimod et nederlag for de saudiskkontrollerede terrorister, samtidig med, at de desperat prøver at ødelægge det nye paradigme, centreret omkring det kinesisk-russiske partnerskab og den Nye Silkevejsproces med global udvikling. Det transatlantiske banksystem, der blev underkastet falske »stresstests« kl. 22 om aftenen sidste fredag, for at gøre det muligt hen over weekenden at sammenklistre en facade, bestående af en ny bailout, står over for en eksplosion mandag morgen, eller snarest derefter. Imperiet stoltserer rundt i den bare skjorte.

De er ved at gå bankerot. I Kina i den forgangne weekend ko-sponsorerede flere førende institutioner, som forberedelse til G20 stats- og regeringschef-topmødet, der skal afholdes den 4. – 5. september i Kina, et T20 (Think-20) Forum, med 500 akademiske eksperter fra 25 lande, omkring temaet om »at opbygge nye, globale relationer – nye dynamikker, ny vitalitet og nye udsigter«. Blandt talerne var Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der talte om det presserende nødvendige i at »Opbygge nye, globale relationer« på basis af den Nye Silkevejs perspektiv om en »win-win«-udvikling for alle nationer, som det nødvendige grundlag for at afslutte den fremstormende trussel om global krig og i stedet implementere en ny æra med ægte fred og udvikling internationalt.

Lyndon LaRouche fremførte i dag med bestemthed, at vi må inspirere folk til at forstå deres eget intellekts kapacitet til at skabe en vision om fremtiden, til at se, hvor betydningsfulde deres liv er for menneskeheden mht. at opnå det, som vi ellers måske ikke vil opnå. »Vi er nu meget tæt på at vinde krigen imod det Britiske Imperium«, sagde han.

Han bemærkede også, at folk må opgive denne dødbringende mentalitet med at »være praktisk« (pragmatisk) i dette øjeblik, hvor civilisationen er i krise. LaRouche vil ikke stille op som præsidentkandidat, men han vil gøre alt, hvad der står i hans magt, for i den kommende periode at udforme en regeringspolitik.

*Foto: »POTUS møder Rembrandt. Præsidenten kigger på 'Rembrandts selvportræt som apostlen Paulus' under en rundvisning i Æresgalleriet på Rijksmusæet i Amsterdam, Holland.« 24. marts, 2014 (Officielt foto fra Det Hvide Hus af Pete Souza)*

*(POTUS = **P**ræsident **O**f **T**he **U**nited **S**tates)*

---

# Russerne er forsigtigt optimistiske mht., at den humanitære indsats i Aleppo kan fungere

30. juli 2016 – Den russiske viceforsvarsminister Anatoly Antonov gav udtryk for forsigtig optimisme i forbindelse med den russisk/syriske, humanitære indsats i Aleppo, i bemærkninger, som i går blev offentliggjort af det russiske Forsvarsministerium. Han understregede, at det russiske militær gjorde alt, hvad der stod i dets magt, for at afhjælpe den humanitære situation dér, efter at de havde omringet byen. Dette er faktisk operationens eneste mission, og Ruslands Udenrigs- og Forsvarsministerium havde allerede udsendt appeller til udenlandske modparter og organisationer om at tilslutte sig denne indsats. »Den indledende respons er ganske positiv«, sagde Antonov. »Organisationerne 'Læger uden Grænser' og ICRC, så vel som også FN's generalsekretær for kontoret for Syriens særlige udsending, Staffan de Mistura, har vist interesse for operationen.« Antonov bemærker samtidig, at »reaktionen fra visse medieagenturer og politiske personer, der har set en forklædt plan i de russiske handlinger, er overraskende«. Operationen er udelukkende af humanitær art, men det russiske militær, sagde han, »vil ikke på nogen betingelser tillade indstrømningen af våben til de regioner, der kontrolleres af de militante oprørere«.

De Misturas respons var imidlertid lidt mere kompliceret, end Antonovs fremstilling kan have indikeret. »Det er vores job«, sagde de Mistura om planerne om en korridor, under en pressekonference i Geneve, rapporterer Associated Press. Han

gav udtryk for støtte »i princippet« til humanitære korridorer, men sagde, at det skulle finde sted »under de rette betingelser«. »Hvordan kan man forvente, at mennesker – i tusindvis – skal gå igennem en korridor, mens der stadig finder beskydning, bombning og kampe sted?« sagde de Mistura. Russerne ønsker imidlertid tydeligvis, at FN skal være involveret på jorden. »Vi vil grundigt analysere de Misturas initiativer, af hvilke mange fortjener støtte, og vi vil komme med vore kommentarer«, sagde Antonov. »Vi er parate til et tæt og konstruktivt samarbejde med alle internationale, humanitære organisationer og, naturligvis, med kontoret for FN's særlige udsending til Syrien.«

Pentagons pressesekretær Peter Cook sagde i går, at den russiske operation i Aleppo gennemføres uden nogen koordinering med USA. Den tyske udenrigsminister Frank-Walter Steinmeier sagde imidlertid, at den situation, der nu hersker i Aleppo, kræver, at USA og Rusland kommer til en eller anden form for gensidig forståelse. Han tilskyndede Rusland til at »få Assad-regeringen« til at samarbejde med FN og gøre det muligt at levere humanitær hjælp til Aleppo. »Situationen i Aleppo gør en gensidig forståelse mellem USA og Rusland endnu vigtigere«, sagde han, iflg. TASS. »Jeg håber, at de aktuelle forhandlinger mellem Washington og Moskva vil give resultater«, afsluttede han.

Alt imens det ikke står klart, hvad der sker på jorden med korridorerne – vestlige medier hævder, at ingen civile tager væk, og ingen militante kæmpere overgiver sig, mens alternative medier, såsom Al Masdar og Fars, rapporterer om det modsatte – så står det klart, at operationen fortsat er en indsats, der gør fremskridt. Russiske militærekspertter, som blev konsulteret af Sputnik, »advarer imod at være for optimistisk. Omringning, bemærker de, betyder ikke sejr«. Den form for by-krigsførelse, som et angreb på de tilbageværende dele af Aleppo, der kontrolleres af oprørerne, ville medføre, er vanskelig, farlig og absorberer en temmelig stor, militær

indsats og en hel del militære ressourcer. Det er derfor, fremsatte en ekspert, at Damaskus og Moskva i stedet forsøger at overtale de militante kæmpere til at forlade Aleppo. »Hvis dette sker, vil en organiseret modstand ikke være mulig, og byen vil kunne indtages.« Tilbage står dog at se, om dette vil ske.

*Foto: Det smadrede Aleppo, omkring første uge af juli.*

---

## **Kriserne i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika resultat af Vestens 'Elefant i en porcelænsbutik'- handlinger, siger russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov**

22. juli 2016 – I et gennemborende angreb på vestens igangværende politik i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, der har resulteret i endeløse krige, ødelæggelse af institutioner og tab af hundreder tusinder af liv, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov: »Det, der foregår i Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, er et direkte resultat af en meget inkompetent og uprofessionel holdning til situationen.« Som TASS i dag rapporterer, sagde Lavrov: »I deres ønske om at bevare deres dominans, handlede vore vestlige partnere som en elefant i en porcelænsbutik. I Irak blev den voldelige afsættelse af regeringen annonceret under falske påskud. Partnere siger, 'lad os løse problemet med Libyen, Syrien og Irak, arrangere valg og udradere terror'. De siger, 'Først må

vi fjerne Assad [den syriske præsident Bashar Assad], og så tager vi kampen op mod terror bagefter.’«

Idet han bragte katastrofen i Libyen på banen, påpegede Lavrov, at »der var en autoritær leder der [i Libyen], der også var ilde lidt, men der var ingen terrorister overhovedet under hans regime«. Lavrov fortsatte: »Og da han blev fjernet, blev Libyen forvandlet til et udklækningssted for terrorisme, og det i et land, gennem hvilket militante kæmpere og våben passerer mod syd [Afrika], mens de selvsamme migranter, der er et problem for Europa, rejser mod nord.«

Med et udfald mod amerikanere, der siger, »hvis det ikke er gået i stykker, så lad være med at fikse det«, bemærkede Lavrov, at Vesten gjorde det modsatte. »Irak var ikke knækket, Libyen var ikke knækket og Syrien var ikke knækket. De begyndte at fikse det og fik det, der nu foregår der«, sagde Lavrov iflg. TASS.

---

## **Lyndon LaRouche om kuppet i Tyrkiet: Se til den tjetjenske vinkel, og man vil finde briterne**

*20. juli 2016* – I en kommentar til det nylige tyrkiske kup sagde den amerikanske statsmand Lyndon LaRouche, at ideen om, at den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan skulle have iscenesat et falsk kup for at retfærdiggøre en udrensning af oppositionen imod ham, er vanvittig. I stedet sagde LaRouche, at man skulle se på den tjetjenske vinkel, hvor de afgørende britiske forbindelser skal findes. En gennemgang af de nylige

begivenheder peger præcist i denne retning. LaRouche nævnte sit eget, direkte samarbejde med den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin om bekæmpelse af de tjetjenske terrorister.

Den 27. juni sendte præsident Erdogan et brev til præsident Putin, hvor han undskyldte for Tyrkiets nedskydning af et russisk kampfly den 24. november 2015, hvor det blev påstået, at kampflyet krænkede tyrkisk luftrum. Dengang meddeltes det også, at Putin og Erdogan kunne mødes i den nærmeste fremtid, i august eller september. Inden for 24 timer, den 28. juni, blev Istanbuls Atatürk-lufthavn mål for et tredobbelt selvmordsbombeangreb, der dræbte flere end 40 mennesker og sårede flere end 200; bombemændene var tjetjenere, der hørte til Islamisk Stat (ISIS/ISIL), og de havde opereret i Syrien fra baser internt i Tyrkiet. Dette var første gang, at en tjetjensk ISIL-terrorcelle havde udført et selvmordsbombeangreb i Tyrkiet. I betragtning af timingen havde bombeangrebet tydeligvis forbindelset til den tyrkiske regerings plan om at normalisere relationerne til Rusland. Og siden dette bombeangreb er denne proces fortsat: Tyrkiet, der arresterer lejesoldaten fra de Tyrkiske Grå Ulve, der skød og dræbte en af piloterne fra det russiske kampfly, der var sprunget med faldskærm til sikkerheden på syrisk jord. Og nu, efter kupforsøget, har den tyrkiske regering arresteret de tyrkiske kamppiloter, der nedskød det russiske kampfly, og fremført deres involvering i kuppet.

I en diskussion over telefon mellem Erdogan og Putin blev det ligeledes besluttet, at de to ledere skulle mødes i august. Det skal understreges, at det tyrkiske militære efterretningsvæsens rolle, samt også de organisationers rolle, der har tilknytning til tyrkiske efterretningskredse, længe har haft forbindelser til russiske og tjetjenske terrorister – siden 1990'erne, hvor de tjetjenske krige imod Rusland blev forsynet og støttet fra tyrkiske og saudiske baser. Der er nu 1.500 tjetjenske flygtninge i Tyrkiet, hvoraf de fleste findes i en flygtningelejr uden for Istanbul og har udgjort en



rekrutteringspulje til ISIL-kæmpere i Syrien.

Det er ligeledes en udbredt opfattelse, at den tyrkiske militære efterretningstjeneste har støttet tjetjenske jihadi-grupper, der opererer i Syrien. Der findes en enorm mængde af åbent kildemateriale herom, som vi ikke behøver gennemgå her; ikke desto mindre rapporteres det, at tjetjenere, der har været loyale over for Aslan Maskhadov, er den gruppe, som tyrkiske efterretningskredse foretrækker. Maskhadov var anfører for tjetjenerne i den første tjetjensk-russiske krig og blev dernæst præsident for den halvautonome Tjetjenske Republik efter en fredsaftale med den russiske regering. Dette brød hurtigt sammen og førte til endnu en krig, i hvilken Maskhadov også deltog. Han døde i 2005.

Som *EIR* har rapporteret det, så besøgte Maskhadov London i 1998, mens han var præsident for den kortlivede republik. Hans vært var den daværende finansminister fra det Konservative Parti, Lord McAlpine; han dinede sammen med tidligere premierminister Baronesse Thatcher, og han talte for det Kongelige Institut for Internationale Anliggender/Chatham House. Han dinede også med rektoren for Oriel College, Oxford, og han besøgte det Imperiale Krigsmuseum, med feldmarskal Lord Bramall som vært. Hans besøg blev arrangeret af Timothy Bell, også kendt som Lord Bell, der var rådgiver til Thatcher. Det siges, at Bell hyrede soldater, der ikke havde tjeneste, til at fungere som æresgarde, som om Maskhadov repræsenterede en suveræn stat.

---

# Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov og USA's udenrigsminister Kerry enes om køreplan for samarbejde i Syrien

16. juli 2016 – Den amerikanske udenrigsminister John Kerry og den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov lukkede sig inde til møder fra morgenen den 15. juli og til langt ud på aftenen, kun afbrudt én gang kl. 18 for i fællesskab at tage til den franske ambassade i Moskva for at underskrive kondolencebogen til ære for ofrene i lastbilsangrebet i Nice, Frankrig. Da de omsider dukkede frem til en fælles pressekonference, skete det for at rapportere, at de var blevet enige om en ramme for amerikansk-russisk samarbejde imod terrorisme i Syrien.

*»I modsætning til tidligere møder, hvor vi plejede at opremse problemer i vore relationer, så enedes vi denne gang om at udarbejde en køreplan for muligvis små, men praktiske skridt, der tilsigter at rette op på en temmelig usund situation i vores bilaterale samarbejde«, sagde Lavrov. »Vi har bekræftet målet om at eliminere trusler, som udgøres af Islamisk Stat, Nusra Front og andre terrorgrupper, og at standse tilstrømningen af støtte til terrorisme fra udlandet «, tilføjede han.*

Kerry sagde, at disse skridt, *»hvis de blev gennemført i tillid, kan behandle to alvorlige problemer, som jeg netop har beskrevet, omkring afbrydelsen [krænkelser af våbenhvile fra både regeringen og al-Nusra]. Det er muligt at være med til at*

*genoprette stilstanden af fjendtligheder, betydeligt reducere volden og hjælpe med at skabe rum for en ægte og troværdig politisk overgang.« Ingen af dem ville beskrive, hvad det er for skridt, de er enedes om, men Kerry understregede, at de ikke er baseret på tillid. »De udstikker specifikt definerede forpligtelser, som alle parter i konflikten må påtage sig, med den hensigt totalt at stoppe den tilfældige bombing af Assad-regimet og at optrappe vores indsats imod al-Nusra.«*

Lavrov istemte og tilføjede, at FN's Sikkerhedsråd og den Internationale Gruppe til Støtte for Syrien enstemmigt har identificeret ISIS og al-Nusra som terroristgrupper. »De har tidligere historiske eksempler på, at visse regeringer forsøgte at kurre behageligt til terrorister, bejlede til terrorister og brugte dem til deres egne formål, med den hensigt at vælte regeringer i andre lande«, og at denne indsats aldrig har fået gode resultater, som det ses i Afghanistan i 1980'erne, der førte til angrebene 11. september 2001 i USA, og i Libyen 11. september, 2011.

*Foto: Udenrigsministrene Lavrov og Kerry lægger blomster ved den franske ambassade i Moskva, for at ære ofrene for terrorangrebet i Nice.*

---

## **PRESSEMEDDELELSE:**

**International Schiller  
Institut-konference  
i Berlin, 25. – 26. juni**

# 2016:

## »At skabe en fælles fremtid for menneskeheden, og en renæssance for klassisk kultur«

*28. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets internationale todages konference samlede flere end 300 gæster fra 24 nationer og fire kontinenter til en intens og dybtgående dialog om, hvorledes den umiddelbare fare for en verdenskrig kan standses ved i stedet at skabe et nyt paradigme for globalt samarbejde og udvikling, baseret på en dialog mellem civilisationer og den menneskelige arts enestående kreativitet. Konferencedeltagerne var ekstremt opmærksomme på optrapningen af den vestlige, geopolitiske konfrontation mod Rusland og Kina og faren for atomkrig, og en resolution vedtoges, der krævede den omgående afslutning af sanktioner mod Rusland og Syrien. At gøre en ende på krigen og genopbygge det krigshærgede Syrien og hele det sydvestasiatiske område var et hovedfokus på konferencen, hvor dr. Bouthaina Shaaban, medlem af Syriens præsidentskab, talte til konferencens tilhørere og deltog i en bevægende, Spørgsmål & Svar-live stream.*

Download (PDF, Unknown)

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 6. juni 2016: Krigstrusslen kommer fra NATO, ikke fra Rusland**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **USA og Europa har mere brug for samarbejde om Den Nye Silkevej end Asien har – Interview med Helga Zepp- LaRouche**

*Onsdag, 1. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der i Kina har fået tilnavnet "Silkevejsladyen", og som, sammen med Lyndon LaRouche, er den fremmeste promotor af denne politik i Europa, blev interviewet af TASS den 31. maj 2016 om at træffe valget mellem enten en ny, global krig, eller økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde.*

**TASS:** Hvordan vurderer De det aktuelle, internationale samarbejde?

**Helga Zepp-LaRouche:** Der er to radikalt modsatrettede bevægelser på planeten netop nu. På den ene side mødes kombinationen af præsident Putins meget succesrige militære flanker, såsom hans intervention i Syrien, der skabte potentialet for fred, og så hans forskellige diplomatiske interventioner i Asien, parallelt med Kinas initiativer for Den Nye Silkevej.

Disse indsatser repræsenterer allerede et win-win-perspektiv for flere end 70 lande.

På den anden side finder der en ekstremt farlig konfrontation sted fra USA's, Storbritanniens, EU's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, der har bragt verden ind i multiple kriser, der er farligere end på højden af den Kolde Krig.

**TASS:** På hvilke områder er dette mere aktivt, og hvor er det ikke?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Med hensyn til Syrien, så er samarbejdet mellem [den russiske] udenrigsminister Lavrov og [den amerikanske] udenrigsminister Kerry, såvel som også Genève-samarbejdet mellem Rusland og USA, meget positivt. Men så længe USA imidlertid ikke opgiver sin politik for 'regimeskift', er situationen fortsat farlig. Præsident Putin har vist sig at være en fremragende strateg.

Dette giver tiltro til, at det ikke vil lykkes krigshøgene i NATO at lokke Rusland ind i en fælde og give NATO et påskud til at lancere et førsteangreb.

**TASS:** Omkring hvilke spørgsmål må vi optrappe samarbejdet mellem Vesten og Rusland, og hvorfor?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Kendsgerningen er den, at hele den transatlantiske sektor er bankerot og tæt på at eksplodere på en større måde end i 2008. Den japanske premierminister Abe understregede, efter et meget vigtigt besøg i Rusland, klart dette ved det nyligt afsluttede G7-møde, men blev afvist af

præsident Obama, der hævdede, at "den økonomiske genrejsning går fremad", hvilket er absurd i lyset af centralbankernes negative rentesatser og debatten omkring "helikopter-penge" (ubegrænset pengetrykning, -red.).

Vesten har derfor mere end Asien brug for den form for økonomisk samarbejde, som samarbejdet om Ét bælte, én vej/den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union byder på, og som integrerer Eurasien fra Vladivostok til Lissabon, men som også inviterer USA til at deltage i dette perspektiv. Vi kan kun undgå en katastrofe, hvis det lykkes os at overvinde geopolitik og nå frem til et nyt paradigme, baseret på et partnerskab for global udvikling og menneskehedens fælles mål.

**TASS:** Hvorfor forhindrer Vesten i den grad samarbejde med Rusland, på trods af den åbenlyse terrortrussel, cyberkriminalitet og andre internationale udfordringer?

**Zepp-LaRouche:** Næsten alle betydningsfulde konflikter stammer fra det anglo-amerikanske imperiums indsats for at bevare en unipolær verden, på et tidspunkt, hvor denne verden de facto allerede er ophørt med at eksistere. Flere og flere kræfter i verden indser, at de må træffe eksistentielle beslutninger, og at deres nationers interesser er meget bedre tjent med at standse sanktionerne og konfrontationen imod Rusland og Kina.

Den kendsgerning, at Rusland og Kina har skabt et meget stærkt, strategisk partnerskab, med Indien som en tredje partner, har flyttet den strategiske balance i verden. Flere og flere lande ser det som langt mere gavnligt at samarbejde om fælles udvikling end at befinde sig under åget af en militær konfrontation. Vi befinder os på et punkt i historien, hvor der må vælges, og det, der tæller, er lederskab af den art, som vi har set komme fra præsident Putin.

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 23. maj  
2016:**

**Tættere samarbejde mellem  
Rusland og Japan,  
mens Obama nægter at beklage  
atombombningen af Hiroshima**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---

**1. del: POLITISK ORIENTERING  
den 12. maj 2016: Forvent det  
uventede. Se også 2. del.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

2. del:



Lyd:

---

# **Russisk orkesterkoncert i det klassiske amfiteater i Palmyra – et magtfuldt fingerpeg om håb for fremtiden**

Den 5. maj, 2016 – Torsdag gav det russiske Mariinsky Teater Orkester i det klassiske amfiteater i den syriske by Palmyra en smuk koncert, betitlet, "Med en bøn for Palmyra – Musik genopliver de klassiske mure". Indtrykket af koncerten opløfter allerede millioner af mennesker verden over. Begivenheden var dedikeret til mindet om dem, der har mistet deres liv til terrorister.

Koncerten var i særdeleshed til minde om Dr. Khaled al-Assad (1934-2015), den syriske arkæolog, der var kustode for Palmyra-antikviteterne i 40 år, og som blev offentligt halshugget sidste august af IS, efter at have nægtet at give dem adgang til at ødelægge stadig flere statuer. Og ikke mindst til minde om den unge russiske specialstyrke-officer, Aleksandr Prokhorenko, der blev dræbt i midten af marts, efter at have tilkaldt russiske luftangreb på sin egen position, da han var omringet af IS under slaget om Palmyra. Han er posthumt blevet udnævnt til russisk helt, og hans legeme blev returneret hjem i dag.

Orkestrets dirigent Valery Gergiev ledede programmet, med hovedaktørerne Pavel Milyukov, førsteviolin og Sergei

Roldugin, cello, sidstnævnte den kunstneriske direktør i Sankt Petersborgs Musikhus. I den officielle russiske delegation fandtes også direktøren for Sankt Petersborgs Eremitagemuseum, Mikhail Piotrovsky. Blandt publikum var også repræsentanter fra Kina, Zimbabwe og Serbien.

Det klassiske program omfattede Johann Sebastian Bachs Chaconne, Sergei Prokofievs Første Symfoni, og et uddrag af den moderne russiske komponist Rodion Schedrins (enkemand efter den berømte russiske ballerina Maya Plisetskaya) opera, "Ikke blot kærlighed." Da Gergiev introducerede programmets musikstykker, påpegede han, at Prokofiev skrev sin symfoni "i hyldest til fortidens store mestre – Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven," hvis værker udtrykker "optimisme og håb."

Ved åbningen af begivenheden hilste den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin alle velkommen via live video fra Sotji. Han talte imod terrorisme og udtrykte påskønnelse af koncerten, som han kaldte et "tegn på taknemmelighed, erindring og håb." Han sagde, "Jeg ser dette som et minde om alle ofrene for terroren, uanset tiden og stedet for forbrydelserne mod menneskeheden, og, selvfølgelig, som et håb, ikke blot for genopførelsen af Palmyra som et kulturelt aktiv for hele menneskeheden, men for den moderne civilisation, under denne tids skrækkelige tilstand, som er skabt af den internationale terrorisme.

Putin takkede musikerne og støtteaktørerne. "Dagens aktioner involverede større ulejlighed og farer for alle, ved at befinde sig i et land i krig, tæt på, hvor fjendtlighederne stadig pågår. Det har krævet stor styrke og personligt mod fra jer alle. Mange tak." Gergiev er en nær medarbejder til Putin, og cellist Roldugin en god ven.

Dirigent Gergiev talte før musikken – på russisk og engelsk. Han sagde, "Vi protesterer imod barbarer, der ødelagde vidunderlige verdenskulturelle monumenter. Vi protesterer imod henrettelse af folk her på denne storartede scene," idet han

refererede til Islamisk Stats offentlige massedrab i amfiteatret sidste november. Gregiev er musikdirektør for Munchen Philharmoniske Orkester, så vel som dirigent for Mariinsky Teater Orkesteret.

Publikum fyldte amfiteatret. Sammen med lokale syrere, og militært personel fra både Syrien og Rusland, inkluderede notabiliteterne den russiske kulturminister Vladimir Medinsky, der har ledet indsatsen for at redde og restaurere antikviteterne fra Palmyra. Han var rørt til tårer over begivenheden.

Takket være superstærk optagelse, er selve koncerten, og billeder af den storslåede opsætning i Palmyra-ruinerne, nu bredt internationalt tilgængelig. Begivenheden er dagens hovednyhed i Rusland, og videoen breder sig hastigt verden over. RT udsendelsen af koncerten kan findes her:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9b0hFI4Zaw>

---

# **RADIO SCHILLER den 9. maj 2016: Koncerten i Palmyra, Syrien: Putins seneste flankemanøvre**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

```
<iframe width="100%" height="450" scrolling="no"
frameborder="no"
src="https://w.soundcloud.com/player/?url=https%3A//api.soundc
loud.com/tracks/263241683&auto_play=false&hide_related
```

=false&show\_comments=true&show\_user=true&show\_reposts=false&visual=true"></iframe>

---

# **Et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden: Afskrift af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale til seminaret på Frederiksberg den 18. april 2016**

Kommer senere på dansk.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Addresses Seminar in Copenhagen, April 18, 2016 [unproofed draft]

We Need a New Paradigm for Humanity

HELGA ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, thank you very much for this kind introduction.

Dear Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to start my presentation with showing you a point of view which may

be unusual to discuss the strategic situation, but I think it is quite adequate.

This is a time-lapse video where you can actually have a view from space. This is the kind of view normally only astronauts,

cosmonauts, taikonauts have. They all come back from their space travel with the idea that there is only one humanity, and that our planet, which is very beautiful and blue; however, it is very small in a very large solar system and an even larger galaxy, not to mention the billion galaxies out there in our universe. With that view comes, naturally, the question of the future. Where should mankind be in 100 years from now, in a 1000 years, in 10,000 years? Well, you have to exercise your power of imagination. In 10,000 years, we probably are well beyond having colonized the Moon, we have completed very successful Mars missions, we will have a much, much better understanding about our solar system, our galaxy, and we will have gotten a much deeper understanding about the principle of our universe. Just think, that it took 100 years before modern science could confirm that Einstein's conception about gravitational waves was correct. Ten thousand years of the past human history has brought tremendous progress. But just think that this growth can go on, exponentially. And since there is no limit to the creativity and perfectibility of the human species, in 10,000 years we can have a wonderful world. So, let's look from that view, into the future, to the present, to have the right perspective. Yesterday, the {New York Times}, in the Sunday edition, had an article saying "The Race Escalates for the Latest Class of Nuclear Arms," portraying in detail that the United States, and Russia, and China are developing new generations of smaller and less destructive nuclear weapons, which would make them more useable. They quote in the article James Clapper, the Director

of

the National Intelligence of the United States, that the world has now entered a new Cold War spiral, where, basically, totally

different laws and rules govern, than it used to be the case with

Mutual Assured Destruction.

The previous NATO doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction proceeded from the assumption that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is so horrible, because it will lead to the annihilation of the human race, that nobody in their right mind

would ever use it. And therefore, it was a deterrence that these

weapons would never be used.

This is now no longer valid. What they are now discussing, openly, on the front page of the {New York Times}, is that what

we, for a very long time, only we and a few of military experts,

have said, namely, that these modernized tactical nuclear weapons, like the B12-61, in combination with stealth bombers, with hypersonic missiles, can actually lead to the winning of a

nuclear war.

Ted Postol and Hans Kristensen, very respected military analysts, have detailed at great lengths, why the idea of a limited nuclear war is completely ludicrous, and it is the nature

of the difference between thermonuclear weapons and conventional

weapons, that once you enter a nuclear exchange, that it is the

logic of such a war that all weapons will be used, and that will

be the end of mankind. We are closer to that possibility than most people dare to even consider, because if they would, they

would not remain so passive as they are now.

This is why I want to make emphatically the point—and this is the purpose of conducting meetings like this seminar and many

other conferences we are engaged in—that we have reached a point

in human history where geopolitics must be superseded with a completely new paradigm. And that is why I started with the view

from space. We need a new paradigm, basically saying goodbye to

the very idea of geopolitics, which has caused two world wars in

the 20th century. That new paradigm must be completely different

than that which is governing the world today.

We have, right now, rising tensions in the South China Sea.

Policymakers and the neighboring countries are extremely worried

about what will happen in the period between now and the trial in

The Hague. You have the largest maneuver around North and South

Korea right now, where people in the region are extremely worried

that the slightest provocation could lead to an exchange of nuclear weapons.

You have the NATO expansion up to the Russian border.

Countries like Poland and Lithuania are asking to have these modernized nuclear weapons located on their territory, even that

makes them prime targets.

The United States is continuing to build the anti-ballistic missile system which, supposedly, was against Iranian missiles,

but after the P5+1 agreement has been reached, it is obvious this

was always a pretext and the aim was always to take out the second strike capability of Russia.

Then you have the entire region of Southwest Asia, still being a terrible destruction and consequence of failed wars. North Africa is exploding. You have new incidents between NATO and Russia, all of a sudden in the Baltic Sea, which was, up to now, a calm region where there are no conflicts, or, there have been no conflicts.

In the Middle East briefing, discussing President Obama's trip to Riyadh on the 21st of this month, they say that this trip will open up a new page of NATO in the relationship to the Middle

East, that what Obama will try to establish is a new relationship

between NATO and the Gulf Cooperation Council countries.

So, we have a situation where the {New York Times}, also yesterday, and I'm quoting these papers to say that these are not

some opinions of us, but this is now the public discussion, that

what is really at stake in the South China Sea is not so much the

fight around some uninhabited reefs and cliffs, or some tiny islands, but it is the American effort to halt China's rise. And

not only China's rise, but that of Asia. China, Asia arising; the

trans-Atlantic region is in decline.

Just now, we are heading towards a new financial crisis, and all signs are, that we are going into the same kind of crash like

2008. Already since the beginning of this year, \$50 billion corporate defaults were taking place, which is on the same level



like what happened in 2009.

What the United States is trying to assert under this conditions, where the trans-Atlantic world is in decline or marching towards collapse, to insist that nevertheless a unipolar

world must be maintained. The problem is, that unipolar world, effectively, no longer exists. But still, what carries American

policy to the present day, is the Project for the New American Century, the so-called Wolfowitz Doctrine, which is a neocon idea

which says that no country and no group of countries should ever

be allowed to challenge the power position of the United States.

In the age of thermonuclear weapons, the insistence to maintain a

non-tenable world order could very quickly lead to the annihilation of civilization.

It is a fact: China has made an economic miracle in the last 30 years which is absolutely breathtaking. And it is continuing,

despite all the media rumors about China's economic collapse.

India has by now the largest growth rate in the world; it's above

7%. Many other Asian countries have explicitly formulated the goal for themselves to be developed countries in a few years.

The

Chinese economy right now is rebounding. They just announced that

in the next five years China is going to import \$10 trillion worth of imports. They will invest \$600 billion worth of investments abroad. Every day 10,000 new firms are being created

in China.

So, if you look at the development, especially since

President Xi Jinping announced in September, 2013 in

Kazakhstan,  
that the New Silk Road, the One Belt One Road, is put on the agenda. In the Two and a half years since that time, more than sixty nations have joined with China in this development. They have created the New Silk Road, the Maritime Silk Road; these nations have created a whole set of alternative economic-financial institutions, such as the AIIB, which, despite massive pressure from the United States not to do so, immediately was joined by sixty founding members. The New Development Bank also started just now its functioning. The New Silk Road Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the Shanghai Cooperation Bank, and many more. All of these were created because the IMF and the World Bank had not invested in the urgently required infrastructure. These banks are now engaged in very, very impressive, large projects. For example: China invested \$46 billion in the China-Pakistan corridor. When President Xi Jinping recently went to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iran, consequently Iran, fool-heartedly, declared that they are now part of the One Belt One Road, New Silk Road development. Greece is now talking about that after China is investing in the Port of Piraeus, that Greece will be the bridge between China and Europe. The 16+1, that is the East and Central European countries, just declared that they absolutely want to participate in China helping to build a fast train system in these countries. Those projects which the EU has not bid, China is now building. Part of it is, for example, the

Elbe-Oder-Danube Canal, which will connect the waterways of these countries. When President Xi recently was in the Czech Republic, President Zeman announced that the "Golden City" of Prague will be the gateway between the Silk Road and Europe. Also, Austria and Switzerland are now fully on board and see the benefits of their country's joining with the New Silk Road. When President Xi Jinping at the APEC meeting in October 2014 offered to President Obama to cooperate in all of these projects in a "win-win" perspective, he not only proposed economic cooperation, but he put on the agenda a completely new model of international relations exactly designed to overcome geopolitics. The new model is supposed to be based on the respect for sovereignty, non-interference into the internal affairs of the other country, respect for the different social system the other country chooses to adopt. It would really be, in a certain sense, a fulfillment of the principles which are laid out in the UN Charter anyway.

How was the Western response? Very, very ambiguous. The United States in spite of this, never really responded to President Xi's offer. They keep insisting on a unipolar world. For example, in the TPP, like in the TTIP for Europe, it is said very, very clearly, the U.S. sets the rules of trade for Asia and not China. Recently, the American Defense Secretary Ash Carter, and also NATO commander General Breedlove, declared the enemies #1 of the United States are, first, Russia, second, China,

third,

Iran, fourth North Korea, and only fifth terrorism.

Now that is in spite of the fact that many other statesmen, such as United States Secretary of State John Kerry and Foreign

Minister Steinmeier, and many others, have recently also stated,

that all crucial problems of the world cannot be solved without

the cooperation of Russia, and China. For example, the P5+1 agreement with Iran, would never have come into being without a

constructive role of {both} Russia and China . Without Putin's very intelligent intervention in the military situation in Syria,

this situation could not have come to the potential of a political solution.

Also, apart from the military pressure, there is massive pressure on the new institutions such as the AIIB and the New Development Bank, to {not} be outside of the casino economy but

to follow the "international standards."

Now, in these times of the Panama Papers, of the various LIBOR scandals, of the money laundering of many of these banks,

it is a sort of laughable thing, what should be these "international standards" of the Western financial system.

Now, let's be realistic. At the IMF/ World Bank meeting which just concluded in Washington over the weekend, behind the

scenes there was complete panic, but nobody dared to speak about

it openly, behind the scenes people were talking, what former IMF boss Strauss-Kahn has said repeatedly, publicly, that we are

heading towards the "perfect political storm." That if one of the too-big-to-fail banks collapses, it will lead to a crisis

much, much worse than 2008.

At the recent Davos Economic Forum, the former chief economist of the BIS William White said that the world system is

so utterly overindebted, that there are two roads only possible:

Either you have an orderly writeoff of the debt, like in the religious Jubilee, so that you just say "these debts are not payable," and you write them off, or it will come to a disorderly collapse.

Now, the situation is all the more urgent, because unlike 2008 when everyone was talking about the "tools" of the central

bank, like interest rate reduction, rescue packages, bailouts, all of these tools don't function any more. As a matter of fact,

when the competition for more zero interest rate, or even negative interest rate, when into high gear in the last month, when, for example, the Bank of Japan or the central bank of Norway, or the ECB declared a zero interest rate policy, or even

a negative interest rate policy, it boomeranged! It had the opposite effect: Rather than leading to more investment, in the

real economy, it led to a deflationary escalation of the collapse.

When Mario Draghi, the chief of the ECB, recently announced, "yeah, yeah, we have a discussion about helicopter money."

And

Ben Bernanke echoed it and said, "yes, now we need helicopter money," meaning electronic printing of {endless} amounts of worthless money, virtual money, they de facto announced that the

trans-Atlantic financial system is absolutely in the last phase.

Because after helicopter money comes only evaporation.

But this is only the most obvious of the crises. Another one, which is in a different domain, but equally systemic is the refugee crisis in Europe. Now, I supported Chancellor Merkel when she initially said, we can manage that, we can give refuge to these people, and for the first time, I was saying "this woman is doing the right thing." I know there was a lot of international criticism, but she acted on the basis of the Geneva Convention on refugees, but it was the right thing to do. But the reactions from the other European countries, revealed an underlying, basic flaw of the EU, a flaw which was not caused by the refugees, but it was revealed by the first serious challenge, that in the EU, as it has been conceptualized in the Maastricht Treaty going up to the Lisbon Treaty, there is no unity, there is no solidarity; and with the collapse of the Schengen agreement which allows free travel within the internal borders of the EU, the closing of the so-called Balkan routes, to prevent refugees from coming, the basis for the European common currency is also gone, because without the Schengen agreement, the possibility to have the euro last is extremely dubious. Now, with the recent response by the EU to basically have a deal with Turkey, I mean, this is beyond the bankruptcy of the whole EU policy if you can top it. At a point when the Russian UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, presented the UN Security Council with evidence that the Turkish government, is continuing up to

the present day to supply ISIS with weapons and other logistical means, to then say, we pay Turkey EU6 billion, for what? To have them receive refugees; and Amnesty International has already said, there is no guarantee that these people will be protected, but rather that Turkey is sending them back to the war zones, like Syria, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. So, if you look at the pictures of Idomeni, where the Macedonian police are using tear gas against refugees who are absolutely desperate; if you look at the fact that Greece is now, rather than having refugee camps which would somehow process these unfortunate human beings, they have, on pressure of the EU, been turned into detention centers. Pope Francis was just in Lesbos, together with the Greek Patriarch Bartholomew, and this Patriarch said, the present EU policy on the refugee crisis, is the completely bankruptcy of Europe. The Doctors Without Borders left their job in Greece, because they said they cannot be accomplices to the murderous policy of detention, where the police decide who is a patient and not doctors. Instead of protecting the people running away from wars and persecution, they are now being treated as criminals. Immediately, days after this disgusting EU-Turkey deal, it turned out that it's a complete failure, the so-called "European values," human rights, humanism, well—they're all in the trashcan, because now the refugees, obviously still fleeing for their lives, go to Libya trying to get into small boats to Italy. And just yesterday the news came that another 400 people

drowned

in the Mediterranean. And this will keep going on. And it will

haunt the people who are refusing to change their ways.

Now, there is a new element in the situation which may cause sudden surprises, and that is a program which was presented by CBS, a week ago Sunday, in the so-called "60 Minutes" program portraying the coverup, of the U.S. governments from Bush to Obama, of the famous 28 pages omitted in the publication of the

official Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 by the U.S.

Congress; and as many people have said, and was said in this program, this pertains to the role of Saudi Arabia in 9/11.

Yesterday, {all} the U.S. talk shows, and all the U.S. media, pointed their finger to the coverup of the Bush administration and even to the present day of the present government, that there

is a coverup of criminal activity.

Now, the Saudi Arabian government reacted very unnerved, and this was again reported in the {New York Times}, that they would

sell off \$750 billion in U.S. Treasuries, if the U.S. would allow

a bill that would allow Saudi Arabia to be held responsible in court, for their role in 9/11. Now, that's not exactly a sign of

sovereignty, but of despair. There are several U.S. Senators, among them Mrs. Gillibrand from New York, who demand that this whole question of the Saudi Arabian role in 9/11 must be on the

agenda when President Obama goes to Riyadh this week. Which in

any case, may not happen, but it will not be the end of the story

because the genie is now out of the bottle.

OK: How do we respond to these many, many crises? Well,

there is a solution to all of these problems. The trans-



Atlantic

should just do exactly what Franklin D. Roosevelt did in 1933, in

reaction to the world financial crisis at the time.

Implement

the full banking separation – Glass-Steagall – and the whole offshore nightmare which is being revealed in the Panama Papers,

and remember, that this firm Mossack Fonseca is only the fourth

largest of such firms, and 11 million documents still need to be

read through, and processed. But we have to go back to the kind

of international credit system, as it existed in the Bretton Woods system, before Nixon ended the fixed exchange rate in 1971,

opening the gate for floating exchange rates and especially the

creation of offshore money markets for the unlimited creation of

money and other illegal operations as it now is coming out.

Then we need a writeoff of the absolutely unpayable state debt, which has accumulated and ballooned after the bailouts of

2008 and afterwards. And we have to basically get rid of the toxic paper of the whole derivatives markets, because they are the burden which is eating up the chance for the investment in the real economy.

Then, we need a Marshall Plan Silk Road; and the only reason I'm talking about a Marshall Plan, despite the fact that China

is {emphatic} that they do not want a Cold War connotation to the

New Silk Road, it gives people in the United States and Europe a

memory, that it is very possible to rebuild war-torn

economies,  
as it happened in Europe after the Second World War.  
Now, with the ceasefire which was negotiated between Foreign  
Ministers Kerry and Lavrov, you have now a still-fragile, but  
you  
have the potential for a peace development in Syria, and soon  
other countries in the region. But it is extremely urgent,  
that  
the peace dividend of this ceasefire is becoming visible for  
the  
people of the region, immediately. That is, there has to be a  
reconstruction and economic buildup, not only of the territory  
and the destroyed cities, but the entire region, has to be  
looked  
at as one: From Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the  
North  
Caucasus to the Persian Gulf. Because you cannot build  
infrastructure by building a bridge in one country. You have  
to  
have a complete plan for the transformation of this region,  
which  
mainly consists of desert.  
Now, the idea is to have a comprehensive plan, greening the  
deserts, building infrastructure, creating new, fresh water  
from  
desalination of ocean water, of tapping into the water of the  
atmosphere through ionization, and various other means. And  
then  
build infrastructure corridors, new cities, and give hope to,  
especially, the young people of the region, so they have a  
reason  
not to join the jihad, but to become doctors, to become  
engineers, to care for their family and their future.  
Now this is not just a program any more, because when  
President Xi Jinping visited Iran about two months ago, he put  
the Silk Road development on the agenda for this region. So,  
all

you need to do, is extend the Silk Road, and the first train has already arrived in Tehran; you have to continue to build that road, from Iran, to Iraq, to Syria all the way to Egypt. Other routes should go from Afghanistan, to Pakistan, to India. From Central Asia to Turkey to Europe, and this obviously can only work because the problem is so big, that all the neighbors of the region, Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, but also the countries which are now torn apart by the refugee crisis such as Germany, Italy, Greece, France, and all other European countries must all commit themselves to work on such a Silk Road Marshall Plan for the reconstruction and economic buildup of the Middle East/Southwest Asia, {and} all of Africa, because the economic situation is equally dire in that continent. The United States must be convinced that it is in their best interest to cooperate in such a development, and stop thinking in terms of geopolitics. Now, the United States should only be encouraged to cooperate in the development of these regions, but the United States needs {urgently} a New Silk Road itself. Because if you look at the condition, not only of the financial sector in the United States, but especially the physical economy; if you look at the social effects of the economic collapse, like the rising suicide rates, in all age brackets of the {white} population, and especially rural women in the age between 20 and 40, the suicide rate is quadrupling and even beyond. This is

a

sign of a collapsing society.

Now, China has built as of last year, 20,000 km of fast train systems. Excellent, top-level technology fast-train systems; it wants to have 50,000 km by I think the year 2025. How many miles of fast train as the U.S. built? I don't any. But if the United States would join the New Silk Road and participate in the economic reconstruction, as Franklin D. Roosevelt did it with the Tennessee Valley Authority plan, with

the Reconstruction Finance Corp. in the '30s, the United States

could very, very quickly be a prosperous country, and could again

be regarded by the whole world as "a beacon of liberty and a temple of freedom," which was the idea of America when it was founded.

So, the whole fate of the whole world will depend if we all succeed to get the United States to go back to its proud tradition of a republic, and stop thinking like an empire, because that cannot be maintained in any case; because all empires in the whole history of mankind always disintegrated when

they became overstretched and collapsed. There is not one exception to this idea.

Now, therefore, let's go back to the idea from the beginning: Let's approach all problems in the present from the

idea, where is the future of mankind? Where should mankind be?

Do we exist, or will we destroy ourselves. And that requires a

change in paradigm, which must be as fundamental and thorough, like the paradigm shift from the European Middle Ages to the modern times. And what caused that shift was such great figures

as Nikolaus of Cusa, but also Brunelleschi, Jeanne d'Arc, and

many others; but what they introduced was a rejection of the old paradigm—scholasticism, Aristotelianism, all the wrong ideas which led to the destruction of the 14th century, and they replaced with a completely {new} image of man, man as an {imago viva Dei}, which was a synonym for the unlimited creative potential and perfectability of the human being. It led to a new image of man which created a blossoming of science, of modern science, of the modern sovereign nation-state; it made possible the emergence of Classical arts.

And that is what we have to do today: We have to stop thinking in terms of geopolitics, and we have to focus on the common aims of mankind. Now, what are these "common aims of mankind"? It is, first of all scientific cooperation to eradicate hunger, poverty, to develop more and more cures for diseases, to increase the longevity of all people. We have to study much more fundamentally, what is the principle of life? Why does life exist? How does it function? What, really, is the deeper lawfulness of our universe? And that must define the identity of human beings, which is unique to the human species.

And I have an idea of the future, which will be full of joy. Because we will discover new principles in science and in classical art, and we will create a new Renaissance. As the Italian Renaissance superseded the Dark Age of the 14th century, what we have to do today, is we have to revive the best traditions of all great nations and cultures of the world; and make them known to the other one. Have a dialogue of the most advanced periods of Chinese, of European, Indian, African, other cultures, and revive—and that is being done in China, already—the great Confucian tradition, which is in absolute

correspondence with the best neo-Platonic humanist ideas of Europe. We must revive the great Vedic tradition in India, the Gupta period; the Indian Renaissance of the late 19th to the 20th century. We must revive the Abbasid Dynasty of the Arab world; the Italian Renaissance; the Andalusian Spanish Renaissance, the Ecole Polytechnique in France, the great German Classical period. The great Italian method of singing in Verdi tuning and the bel canto method. And if all of these riches of all the different countries become the common good of all children of this planet, and everyone can learn universal history, other cultures as if it would be their own, I can already see how humanity can make a jump, and how we can create the most beautiful Renaissance of human history so far. I think everybody who is thinking about these questions, has a deep understanding, that we are at the most important crossroad in human history. And it is not yet clear which way we will go, but it is clear to me, that we will {only} come out of this crisis if we mobilize the subjective emotional quality, which in the Chinese is called {ren}; and the European equivalent, you would call {agapē}, love. And we will only solve this problem if we are able to mobilize a tender, maybe even {passionate} love, for the human species. [applause]

---

**Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind  
i Sydvestasien og Afrika:  
Afskrift af Hussein Askarys  
tale på Schiller Instituttets  
og EIR's seminar på  
Frederiksberg den 18. april  
2016**





Kommer senere på dansk.

Hussein Askary Speech in Copenhagen to the Schiller Institute-  
*EIR*

Seminar "Extend the World Land-Bridge to Southwest Asia and  
Africa," April 18, 2016

{Hussein Askary had fair number of graphics and charts, which  
he  
used to illustrate his presentation.}

TOM GILLESBERG: The next speaker is somebody very unique  
and unusual, Hussein Askary originally comes from Iraq and  
had  
to get out under very nasty circumstances, as many others.  
But  
that became a blessing at least for our organization, because  
Hussein, through Norway, ended up to become part of the  
international LaRouche organization in 1994, and has since  
then  
been contributing quite fantastically to our international  
work.



And he is one of the authors of the original {New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge} report; but then also made a decision, that this cannot simply stay in the English language, or Chinese. This also has to be in the Arabic language. So Hussein took it upon himself to translate this into the Arabic language and then also of course, write some extra parts to it, which is necessary for the present circumstances in Southwest Asia to have. This report just came out. It was release on March 17, in Cairo, in a meeting presided over by the Egyptian Transportation Minister who then introduced Hussein, and the hope of course is that this will become something read and studied and acted on in the whole Arabic world, as well as the rest of the world. So Hussein?

HUSSEIN ASKARY: You have heard Helga today, giving a very stern and sobering warning about the state of affairs in the world, the dangers are very real to the world today. What I am going to do, and please don't misunderstand me, I'm not going to give you a picture of how rosy and nice things are, either in Southwest Asia, the so-called Middle East, or in Africa, but, as they say in sports, you have to keep your eye on the ball. What Helga just said, is that there is a new paradigm in the world, which can lead to a completely different, and new world order. And it's that paradigm, within which myself, the Schiller Institute, and the people we are talking to, we want to direct their attention to that new paradigm. I'm thankful to Leena Malkki for her beautiful singing, and, especially, the {Aida} aria. It was actually performed at the

opening of the Suez Canal, the second Suez Canal, last year. The idea of great projects, the idea of great challenges, like Helga was explaining, this idea of being in space, looking at the world from space, and, also, the idea of major projects, like the Suez Canal, like the Three Gorges Dam in China, the New Silk Road, the effect they have on people, is that they challenge their imagination, and challenge their creativity, because they represent major difficulties, major technical problems, intellectual problems, that have to be solved, before you achieve these major projects. And that transforms the idea of people. It also gives people an idea of a creative constructive identity, and the position of man in the world, on this Earth, and also in the universe. That is why we try to work on these concepts of the New Silk Road, the extension of the New Silk Road, to {inspire} people to think outside of the box, outside of the box of geopolitics, which Helga was trying to explain. We have to get out of geopolitics. We have to act {human} again. But that has practical implications. There are practical problems, and other issues, and even scientific issues we have to resolve. So, for those who are not familiar, this is the extension of the New Silk Road. The New Silk Road has existed as the new strategic policy of China since 1996, but we want to expand this into a global collaboration, a blueprint, as Tom said, a concept for peace and cooperation among nations. We have to connect the

Economic Belt of the Silk Road (the one with the yellow), which is already being built. As Helga said, the first train arrived from China to Tehran last month. There are projects going on in Siberia. So there are trains going from Asia to Europe. There is no problem with that. We need to extend it into the Southwest Asia region, the so-called Middle East (I can explain later why I say Southwest Asia, and not the Middle East), and into Africa, and of course, into the Americas. So, you can see that the red lines are where we have the biggest deficits, the biggest deficits in infrastructure, both transportation infrastructure, but also in other needs, deficits in water, and deficits in electricity. What is different in the Arabic part, which I rewrote certain parts of it, like the Southwest Asia part, we also added the Arabian Peninsula, also, to the idea of the connection to the New Silk Road. This is no longer simply a Silk Road; this is the World Land-Bridge, which can unite all the continents of the world. In 1996, I had the great fortune to work with Helga Zepp-LaRouche and the team of {EIR} to make the first major study of the New Silk Road, and it was that one which was adopted by the Chinese government as the strategic policy of China. It was also a thick report like this. This work is being done, mostly in East Asia, Central Asia, Iran, Turkey, Russia, all these nations are involved, but what is lacking is the connection to the rest. So it has been 20 years

since that idea emerged, but there was no response from the countries in the Arab world, for example, or in Africa. Now, the idea with all these lines is not only about trade. We want to warn people, that we are not talking about moving goods from China to Europe. That's not our concept. That's a byproduct. What we mean by the New Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, that we need to create development corridors: a development corridor where you bring power, water, and technology to areas that are landlocked, that are far from industrial zones, and, explore the resources, human and natural resources of that region, to develop new centers of economic activity. Like landlocked nations, like in Central Asia, or the Great Lakes region in Africa. That's the concept. It's not about trade, although trade is an important aspect of this.

In 2002, Mr. Lyndon LaRouche, the American economist and political leader, the husband of Mrs. LaRouche, was in Abu Dhabi, in a conference about oil, and the role of oil in world politics, and the future of oil. And there were many ministers of oil actually from the Arab countries – the gentleman to the right is the energy minister of the United Arab Emirates – and Mr. LaRouche shocked everybody, and said that the Arab countries, or the Gulf countries, have to gradually stop exporting raw oil, and actually use raw oil and gas as an industrial product, for petrochemicals, plastics, where every barrel of oil will give many times its value, rather than burning it as energy. He said that you should use your position in the world, as a crossroads of continents. You have to utilize that position as a

crossroads

for world trade, but also, the connection between Africa, Asia and Europe.

So I added these to the Arabic version, because I think that this is a very unique area in the world, not only that its strategic location is very unique, no other part of the world has

that; you also have two-thirds of the world's energy resources,

so-called, oil and gas in that region, but also, most importantly, you have about 450 million people. Most of them are

young people. And actually, many of them have a good education.

You also have nations with a very ancient history and culture, and a very historical identity, like Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, and

so on, and they also have an idea of themselves as becoming key

players in the world, but we hope that they will become key players in the world in the economic, scientific and cultural sense.

The problem is that all these advantages have been turned into disadvantages. So this region has become a center for global

politics, for global geopolitics, and that is why we see the conditions we have in the whole Middle East region becoming like

this.

Our idea is, now we have this new situation with the Russian intervention, the prospect, the possibility of having a peaceful

political solution in Syria, the prospect of uniting many powers

to fight ISIS and al-Qaeda, and so on, both in Iraq and Syria, and also in Libya. But this should be followed, as Helga said, we

need a Marshall Plan, we need an economic development plan, to establish peace on a true basis.

The reason I joined the Schiller Institute in 1994, was that I was in Oslo, and I was working as a translator, and there was a

Palestinian children's delegation coming with Yasser Arafat; and

I was going around with them, and, at that time, you had the Oslo

peace agreement. A week later, I saw a sign that the Schiller Institute was having a meeting in Oslo. They had a very interesting title. They said in the meeting that if you don't start with the economic development of the Palestinian people, the people in Jordan, Syria, Israel, and so on, if you don't base

the peace process on a solid economic basis, this whole thing will fail. And the peace process is, of course, dead now, both because of that, but also because of geopolitics which has prevented reaching a true peace.

So, therefore, to establish true peace, we need an economic and scientific program. Helga referred to president Xi Jinping's

visit to the region in January this year. I consider this as an

historic turning point, actually, because at that point, in late

January, Saudi Arabia and Iran were at the point where there was

a big risk of a direct war between Iran and Saudi Arabia, because

of the beheading of a Shi'a clergy in Saudi Arabia, which led to

demonstrations, the burning of the Saudi Embassy in Tehran, and

so on. So the Chinese intervention came at a very crucial point,

where they said, "Look, all these religious conflicts and

problems you have with each other, can lead the whole world into a disaster. Why don't we work on our method? We offer you to join the New Silk Road. We offer economic development, and technology, and even financing, so we can connect all of your countries which are in conflict with each other together into this global process." And this is very, very important. And nations in the region have to really grasp that opportunity now, and, instead of discussing the fate of President Assad, they should discuss what kinds of economic projects they should work together on. One of the issues that I didn't mention, is that, for example, even as Helga said, Saudi Arabia and Turkey, they can join this, if they stop this other policy, because we also have one of the largest concentrations of financial power in the Gulf countries; the so-called sovereign funds of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries is about \$2 trillion. This can be transformed into credit. In the report, I propose the establishment of the Arab Infrastructure Investment Bank. A bank which will be financed by these rich countries, which would have a capital of \$100-200 billion, and that capital will only be earmarked for infrastructure and development projects. So every nation has a role in this. And in the report, we have also added, which is not in the English report, a plan, a general outline for the reconstruction of Syria, by utilizing Syria's position also as a bridge for the Silk Road, both from Asia, and from Europe, into Africa. We also propose the

construction of a Syrian National Reconstruction Bank, which is very important. We have a very important chapter in the report about how nations can internally finance major infrastructure programs. Because, the big question, which comes all the time when I am in Arab countries, or in Africa, is, they say "OK. This sounds good. Who will pay for this? Where will the money come from?" Actually, you don't really need money, in that sense. You can create the money, but you have to know where to use that money. As Helga said, the central banks in Europe and the United States are pumping massive amounts of liquidity into the financial and banking system. But none of that is transformed into technologies or projects, public projects, or housing projects, or industrial projects in Europe or anywhere. So money is being printed, but it is not being used. But there is a method, which we call the Hamiltonian national credit system, which every nation can actually internally generate credit to finance part of its national development plans, and this is one thing we put in the Syria plan. Because every time there is a war like in Bosnia, in Lebanon, and so on, you have donor conferences, where every nation says that we will give you so much money, 100 million, 50 million, but there is no centralized idea about how to rebuild the whole country. It all depends on donations, small drops which come. We want something massive. We want something big. Foreign governments should contribute to that by exporting technology to Syria, for example, which Syria cannot afford to build, or afford to buy, in the current situation.



Also, a part of our plan for Southwest Asia is to fight against desertification, by managing and creating new water resources, stopping the expansion of the desert. This is the Iraqi Green Belt project to stop the effect of sand and dust storms, which actually is a big problem for many cities in Iraq, sometimes even reaching into Iran, by building a Green Belt, planting trees in a large scale, a belt by using both ground water and water from the rivers. This is a kind of national program which can unite the people of Iraq for an idea of their future together. Not Sunni, Shi'a, Kurdish, Turkish, and so on, and so forth. These are the kinds of projects, real physical projects, which will challenge people to work together in a country like Iraq.

Now, I took this Egyptian model, because in Egypt, you have a very terrible situation, which is the accumulation of 30 years of destructive economic and financial policies, mostly caused by former President Mubarak's and Anwar Sadat's collaboration with the IMF and the World Bank. There should be a shift in the way Egyptians consider their economy. Because Egypt always waits for the IMF or the World Bank, the EU or the United States to give some money so that they can start something new. And usually money does not go to large scale. Europe, the United States, the UN, the IMF and the World Bank will {never} finance large infrastructure projects. That's the policy. Small, small, small is beautiful. That's what they say.

But in Egypt, with the new leadership in Egypt, you have the focus on mega-projects, which is a necessity. If you want to save

Egypt's economy, Egypt's entire infrastructure has to be built from scratch again. There should be new industrial and agricultural centers, which they are focusing on.

Using high technology, they try to attract the highest levels of technology, and internal financing. You know, President

el-Sisi, when they wanted to build the Suez Canal, there was no

money, as usual, they said. So what he did was something unique.

He went outside the central bank. He went outside the budget, and

said, "I will go on TV, and I will tell the Egyptian people that

we want to build this canal. It's crucial for our nation. We want

you to give the money."

In 2013 I wrote a memorandum for Egypt, an Egyptian Economic Independence Document, I called it. Actually, inside Egypt, you

can raise more than \$100 billion, because there are resources inside Egypt. People, even today, buy dollars. They take part of

their salary, and buy dollars or gold, and keep it at home, so that financing disappears from the system. It's not reinvested in

the system. People keep their money because of the unstable economic situation.

But if you encourage the Egyptian people with this kind of national development projects, which will put their kids to work,

unemployed young people, they would come out with the money. And

this is what el-Sisi did. I wrote at the time, that they should

build a National Development Bank, not just one fund for the Suez

Canal, as they did. But as soon as President el-Sisi came on TV and said, "We want to build this canal, but we don't have the money. We want the Egyptian people to pay for it." So they went out, and in one week they raised \$8 billion. And people were queuing late into the night; I met a banker last year, who said, "We had to stay open into the night, because people were queuing at the banks to buy the bonds!" Egyptians are real patriots. They love their country, but if they are encouraged by good leadership. Of course, the Suez Canal is not giving back what was supposed to be already from the beginning, because world trade has collapsed. The level of transit in the Suez Canal has gone down, not because of Egypt's policy, but because the world economy is going down. Global trade has been collapsing. But the idea is to use the Suez Canal as a development zone. And this is what I got from people in the Suez Canal Authority – that they are not only thinking about transport of goods, but they want to utilize that route to build new industrial zones around the canal, like we showed in the development corridor idea. And, of course, Egypt has a very key role, both in the Arab world – it's the most important Arab country – and also in Africa. Now Egypt has one big problem – it's the demographic problem. People say that Egypt is overpopulated. That's not true. Egypt is not overpopulated. Cairo is overcrowded! Ninety million people live on only 5% of the land of Egypt; 95% of the land

of

Egypt is empty. It's not used, but it's not overpopulated. The United States and Europe have been financing the Egyptian government with hundreds of millions of dollars for family planning, so that women will have fewer children. But no projects

were built to expand Egypt's economic potential to accommodate to

the new generations, so that they can have new agricultural and

urban centers out in the desert!

After I was in Egypt last year, I wrote a report for a major economic conference in Egypt to attract investment; but these are

the ideas which came out of both the conference, and my observations about Egypt's role in the New Silk Road. In Egypt,

people were very negative to the idea of the New Silk Road, because they said that the transshipment on the Silk Road will take away trade from the Suez Canal – that shipments will go from Asia to Europe by land, and we will lose. So there are a lot

of people in Egypt who are actually against the idea. But I was

telling people, "Look. It's not about trade. If you have economic

development, you will need more Suez Canals to accommodate the trade. But if the world economy is not growing, there is no development, there will be no trade. And people will compete on

attracting trade into other areas."

So the idea is to develop Egypt's economy, but also contribute to more development and more trade among nations.

And

it's in utilizing Egypt's position to connect to Sub-Saharan Africa, to North Africa, the Middle East, and to the Arabian Peninsula. Interestingly, after I was in Egypt, last week the

Saudi King was in Egypt, and they decided to build this bridge.

At Sharm el-Sheikh, there is a connection over the Gulf of Aqaba.

I think that the Egyptian President invited the Saudi King to support the building of this bridge between the Saudi territories

and southern Sinai, which will turn Sinai from an isolated area,

suddenly into becoming the center between two major economies.

There are now big problems in Egypt, because the President made a terrible mistake by conceding sovereignty over the Tiran

and Sanafir islands to the Saudis. There was a dispute between the two countries for many years, but President el-Sisi suddenly

declared that they are Saudi islands, and now there is a big uproar in Egypt. And the mistake was that there was no public discussion about it. The parliament didn't have anything to say

about this. So, now there will be a review of the agreement.

But

the idea of this project is very important.

Now, for Egypt to get out of that demographic box, is for Egypt to expand its economic activities into the desert. This is

the development corridor proposed by Dr. Farouk El-Baz, who is a

space scientist, and he is right now an advisor to the President.

And he designed this idea of creating the new valley, the new Nile Valley, by building railways, roads, and new urban centers.

I added these green zones, because these are actually becoming new agricultural areas that the Egyptian government wants to invest in, by creating new farmlands – they are talking about

million acres of land, and settling young people into these regions, and building new agro-industrial centers. But what is needed is to extend the development corridor, the black line, into the economic zones.

This is the Africa Pass. One of our Egyptian friends, an engineer, presented this at our conference in 2012, it's the same

idea, connecting Egypt to North Africa, to Europe, and into the

Great Lakes region of Africa. Now, the Great Lakes region countries, like Rwanda, Burundi, the eastern Congo, Uganda, they

have massive problems of economic development, also because they

are very far from the transport corridors of the world. We wrote

a series of reports two years ago about the cost of shipment of a

container. The Danish shipping company A.P. Møller-Mærsk has statistics that the cost of a shipment of a container from Singapore to Alexandria is \$4,000, to Mombasa in eastern Kenya,

it becomes \$5,000; but to the capital of Uganda, it goes to \$8,000, because there are no good roads to ship that container!

Into Rwanda and Burundi it reaches \$10,600 per container. So they

cannot bear the cost of shipment of containers that maybe have technology inside them, and machines, and that is a major problem

for these so-called land-locked countries. So you need to have new lines of transport which will reduce the cost of the transport.

Now these are ideas which the African nations, the African Union, have had for many years. There are many very nice plans,

but the attitude of the rest of the world to Africa, because

Africa, by itself, does not have the technology, at least, to build these projects, and there has been no willingness in Europe, or the United States, to finance, or contribute to building the projects proposed in any of these major reports, to

integrate the infrastructure of Africa and enhance economic development. Because without infrastructure, you cannot have economic development.

But some of these lines are now coming on the agenda, thanks to the intervention of the BRICS nations, and also of China. For

example, the Cairo-Cape Town highway idea, President Jacob Zuma

of South Africa, presented this actually twice at the BRICS summit in 2013 and 2014, and he said, "This is a crucial, a key

element in the development of Africa. We need to work with the BRICS nations and China, Russia and India to build these projects." There are 400 road and rail projects involved in this.

But this is a big challenge, both in terms of financing, and in terms of technology.

There is also the possibility of connecting the river systems of Africa for river transport, like in Europe, the Main-Rhine-Danube Rivers are an important transport artery, and

development artery. In the same way, you can connect the Nile to

the Great Lakes, to the Zambezi River through a number of canals,

and so-called trans-modal transport systems, where you can ship

from rivers to rail, and back to rivers, to lakes, and so on, in

an easy way.

Filling the gap which the United States and Europe have left

for many, many years, now the Chinese—. Well, in Europe, we have a very problematic and twisted relationship to poverty, to poor countries, to underdeveloped countries. Europeans look at Africa as a burden. It's a problem. How do we solve this problem?

But the problem is that the whole focus has been on aid, emergency relief, and so on, and so forth, but that really doesn't solve problems. I mean, people talk about genocide. In Africa, every year there are 4 million children who die. Now, talk about a war crime. There are 700,000 children before the age of five who die every year in Africa. So, you cannot solve

these problems with small aid projects here and there. You need

to think big. You need to provide those people with adequate transport, electricity, water systems, and this cannot be done by

so-called aid programs. In Africa 600 million people don't have access to electricity, out of 1 billion.

But you look at the Chinese, when they look at an underdeveloped country, they see an opportunity. They see potential. They see a "win-win" strategy – new markets, new areas of development, and they should intervene in that situation.

It is the same idea that President Franklin Roosevelt of the United States had. All of his fights with Churchill were exactly

about this problem. Roosevelt told Churchill in the middle of World War II, that you British are very stupid, because you suck

the blood of the Africans, and you get pennies, you get nothing,

by sucking their blood. But if you develop Africa, as independent

nations, as modern nations, as we did with the United States,



then you will gain much, much more; if you treat them as humans, if you develop their infrastructure, schools and hospitals. And this is exactly what the Chinese are thinking about. Out of the problem, they see an opportunity. Prime Minister Li Keqiang was in East Africa, and also Nigeria in May 2014, and immediately said, "We want to help Africa to connect all the capitals with railways," which is a big deficit problem. And they started from East Africa. And now there are projects being built from Lamu, a new port, into the land-locked South Sudan, into Uganda, into Rwanda and Burundi. And China is both financing major parts of this, but also contributing to building it, to solve the problems of the land-locked countries and the need for development.

China recently completed, it's not running yet, but part of the railway is running, from Djibouti to Addis Ababa. There is an old railway, which is not functional, built by the French colonialists, but now there is a new, electrified railway, which goes from Djibouti to Addis Ababa.

Two interesting things about this railway are, firstly, that Ethiopia is always associated with famine and food problems. Some of these problems still exist. These are on the way to being solved, but to bring food from the ports to inside the country usually took two months, because of the lack of infrastructure. So starving people could not have food in time. Even if the food existed in the port, coming from around the world to Djibouti, it was almost impossible to bring the food to the people who needed

it. Now, that food can be shipped in 10 hours, to the capital, and also to other areas. The other interesting fact about this railway is that China is not just building the railway, and financing it, but training and educating engineers and workers to run these systems.

Now, Ethiopia has a massive infrastructure plan for connecting all the major cities of Ethiopia, with the railway and

roads. The other thing about the railway is that it is all electrified. And the Ethiopians will use all these new dams they

are building, to electrify the railway. So they don't need import

oil, and gas and diesel to run the railway system. They will domestically provide the energy to run the trains.

So, Ethiopia, I am very sure it will never be associated anymore with famine and poverty. Ethiopia is a great nation, a very proud nation. They have massive resources, but these resources have been dormant, have not been utilized. But now, with the Chinese intervention, and also India is active there, these resources will be developed.

This is just a metaphorical picture. This is the Mombasa-Nairobi railway being built by a Chinese and a Kenyan worker. In Africa, the propaganda goes that the Chinese never let

the locals work in these projects. They bring their own workers,

they bring their own engineers, their own technology, they build

the thing, and then they leave. It's not true. They always involve local workers. They train them, because they cannot run

these systems; the locals will have to run these systems themselves.

But they are also training the labor force in Uganda. They are building an Army Corps of Engineers, so that the Army can

play a positive role in the development of the country. Traditionally, the Army Corps of Engineers played a very important role, even in advanced countries. So this is part of the same project.

Another important infrastructure project for Africa is Transaqua. Lake Chad is drying up, which is a known fact, and 30

million people are affected, because they live as fishermen, or they have grazing land around the lake in Chad and Nigeria, and

Niger. All these countries are affected. There are 30 million people around that region, and there will be massive migration actually from the Lake Chad region. So there is an idea called Transaqua, which was developed by one of our friends, an Italian

engineer, to bring 5% of the water from the Congo River, or the

tributaries of the Congo River, and build a 2,800 km.-long canal

into the Chari River, and then flow downwards into Lake Chad, to

refill the lake; but also to have a new economic zone, and build

the Mombasa-Lagos highway, which was one of the plans I showed earlier.

So you can transform that part of Africa, which in people's minds is a complete jungle, into a new economic zone, but also to

bring water to the Lake Chad region.

Now, there are some other issues I want to address. One of the big deficits of course in Africa, is the energy consumption.

And as I said not everybody has that; the average international

level of energy consumption is about 2,800 [kw?] but that's not

equal. The only two countries which are exception are South Africa and Libya, before that. So the energy needs in Africa are

{enormous}! I mean Africa has a lot of wealth, but also the hydropower potential which has never been built. But the attitude of the Western countries, like the Obama administration,

they have something called "Power Africa Initiative," that certain nations in Africa will get energy provided. But they're

not talking about hydropower, they're not talking about nuclear

power, they're not talking about coal or gas or so on.

They're

talking about so-called "renewable" or "sustainable energy."

And

the International Energy Agency has a criteria for access to energy, which is a modern access to energy is about 100kw-hours

per year per person. And this diagram shows very ironically, that that amount will be consumed by an American in three days!

But they expect Africans to live with that for a whole year!

Here's just one more ironical idea: My refrigerator can consume

many times as much as an Ethiopian individual.

These are the criteria for President Obama's Power Africa plan, that the plan will eventually help these nations come to this line, while the real needs are that big now, and they will

be that big in a few years. So, all these ideas to help Africa

from the Obama administration, they're not adequate! It's just a

complete bluff. It does not help, if you just look at the numbers.

And this is also another irony of the Obama administration

policy. These are the sources of energy for the American people, the American economy, and these are what the Obama administration {doesn't} want you to do. So it's "do as we say, not as we do."

So the United States produced 37% of its energy from coal, that's

forbidden for Africa; 30% produced by natural gas, that's a very

suspicious policy, because there's the carbon problem; 19% nuclear – absolutely no nuclear for Africa; 7% hydropower – the

United States is very suspicious of hydropower projects, and so

on and so on. So what is left is solar, so-called geothermal, and biomass, which the United States produced only 0.1% of its needs. But that's recommended for Africa. [laughter]

So anyway, the idea is that if Africa joins the new paradigm shift, African nations, they have exactly, in African families and African individuals, they have exactly the same needs as we

have; as we have in Europe or in the United States. There is absolutely no difference. So they're trying to convince the Africans that they should just, maybe, if they're lucky they could get a lightbulb at home, so the kids can read, by having a

solar battery. They will not bite!

I mean, if you bring electricity to a village, what people will do, is not simply have a lightbulb, if you bring electricity

to a village, – and one of our friends made a study in India –

is that people will start to want to use new devices. They have

to have other appliances at home, you need to have a stove, so women don't have to many hours and cut trees and come home and

cook with the wood, and suffocate with the smoke. Farmers will have to have tractors. They will need to have workshops which use electricity; people will want to have TV sets, computers. They want to build industrial projects. They will need refrigeration which is a big problem in Africa, because most of the food produced in the Sub-Saharan goes wasted because there's no refrigeration.

So just to give yourself an illusion that you will provide every African lightbulb, just forget about it! Because the needs of those people are so immense, and they will not give up on their right to have a living standard which is similar to ours.

Why shouldn't they have it? And this is what – here, in the ideology in Europe and the United States I know, they should not have this kind of technology, they should not have this kind of development in Africa, because that's not "sustainable." Which is not true. It is sustainable, if you provide the tools and the technology to do that. Actually in Africa, there are more resources than in Japan or in the United States and Europe, to sustain industrial development!

So the problem is in the policy. The problem is how they look at Africa, and how they look at the problem of poverty and so on. And that has also to change, exactly as we changed with geopolitics, we have to change our attitude to the problems of Africa, and have really the right methods to solving them, and treating African nations as equal to us, and African families as equal to us, and African individuals as equal to us.

Nobody here will give up their living standard, and live in the forest – maybe some people who do, there are some Danes and

Norwegians... [laughter] But we want to have education. We want to have warm housing, we want to have clean water; we want to have a future for our kids; we want to have trains which go on time. This is what the Africans want. You know, there's nothing

different, we're all one human race!

So, when you design policy and you say, "No, Africans should have 'sustainable energy,' not nuclear power," then you are breaking with that idea of a real human family and equality.

So

I think I'll stop here. [applause]

Dias til talen:



---

**Video og lyd: Seminar på**

# **Frederiksberg: Forlæng Den Nye Silkevej ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika mandag den 18. april med bl.a. Helga Zepp-LaRouche og Hussein Askary**

Schiller Institutet og Executive Intelligence Review holdt et seminar mandag den 18. april 2016 på Frederiksberg på engelsk.

Inkl. en diskussion om EIR's specialrapport Den Nye Silkevej Bliver til Verdenslandbroen

Introduktion: Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark

Musik:

Fischerweise af Schubert

Ritorna Vincitor! fra Aida af Verdi

Leena Malkki, soprano fra Sverige

Dominik Wijzan, pianist fra Poland

Teksterne på originalsprogene med engelsk oversættelse

Video: Introduktion og musik

Talere: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, Schiller Institutets internationale præsident, kendt som "Silkevejsdamen" (via Skype video)

Video: Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Audio: Introduktion, musik og Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Afskrift: [Et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden: Afskrift af](#)



## [Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale](#)

Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind i Mellemøsten og Afrika: Hussein Askary, EIR's Mellemøstredaktør, som lige har oversat den arabiske version af rapporten.

Den Nye Silkevej og den iranske rolle; Hr. Abbas Rasouli, først sekretær på Irans ambassade i Danmark.

Video: Hussein Askary og Hr. Abbas Rasouli.

Audio: Hussein Askary og Hr. Abbas Rasouli

Afskrift: Forlæng Verdenslandbroen ind i Sydvestasien og Afrika: Afskrift af Hussein Askarys tale

Afskrift: Den Nye Silkevej og Irans rolle: Afskrift af Hr. Abbas Rasoulis tale

Mere om Den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen på dansk:

Specialrapport: Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Den Nye Silkevej fører til menneskehedens fremtid! Oktober 2014

Den kommende fusionsøkonomi baseret på helium-3. En introduktion til en kommende EIR-rapport om Verdenslandbroen.

Nyhedsorientering december 2014: Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen; Introduktion v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche

### BYG VERDENSLANDBROEN FOR VERDENSFRED

Helga Zepp-LaRouche var taler ved et seminar for diplomater, der blev afholdt i Det russiske Kulturcenter i København den 30. januar 2015, med titlen: »Økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde mellem nationer, eller økonomisk kollaps, krig og terror? Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen«. Nyhedsorientering febr. 2015.

Nyhedsorientering maj 2015 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Tale ved seminar i København: Den Nye Silkevej Kan Forhindre Krig

Tema: Den Islamiske Renæssance var en Dialog mellem

Civilisationer, af Hussein Askary

Genopbygningsplan for Syrien: Projekt Fønix:  
Diskussionspunkter om Syriens genopbygning

Link: Homepage about the EIR report The New Silk Road Becomes  
the World Land-Bridge

The English, Arabic and Chinese versions of EIR's report are  
available from EIR and The Schiller Institute in Denmark.

Prices for the 400-page report:

English: printed 500 kr.; pdf. 300 kr.; Arabic: printed 500  
kr.; Chinese: pdf. 300 kr.

Please contact tel. 53 57 00 51 or 35 43 00 33, or  
si@schillerinstitut.dk

Invitation:

Terror in Europe, and elsewhere. Waves of refugees leaving  
countries racked by war and economic ruin, from Afghanistan to  
Africa. Threats of financial crash in the trans-Atlantic  
region. Dangers of escalating confrontation and war against  
Russia and China. Is there any hope for the future?

The Schiller Institute and Executive Intelligence Review, led  
by the ideas and efforts of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-  
LaRouche, have been working for decades to create a paradigm  
shift, away from "geopolitics," to a new era of cooperation  
between sovereign nations, based on an ambitious  
infrastructure-driven economic development strategy – a plan  
for lasting peace through economic development.

In 2013, this New Silk Road and Eurasian Land-Bridge strategy  
was adopted by Chinese President Xi Jinping, who called it the  
"One Belt, One Road" policy, which now includes agreements  
with 60 countries. In addition, the economic development  
alliance among the BRICS countries, and the establishment of  
new credit institutions, constitute an alternative in the  
making.

In December 2014, EIR published a ground-breaking special

report in English, *The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge*, the sequel to its 1996 report, which elaborates the new set of economic principles needed for world economic development. The Chinese version was issued in 2015.

Now, if there is to be a solution to the heart-wrenching suffering of the people of the Middle East and Africa, and the effects of the crisis in Europe, the New Silk Road must be extended to those regions, on its way to becoming the World Land-Bridge. The recent negotiations led by U.S. Secretary of State Kerry (despite opposition from other factions in the Obama administration), and Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, regarding Iran and Syria, have also helped to create the political preconditions for such a new "Marshall Plan" to immediately come into effect.

There are already moves in that direction. An example of "win-win" cooperation was demonstrated during Chinese President Xi Jinping's recent visit to Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Iran, where he confirmed China's support for real economic development in the region, backed up by \$55 billion in loans and investments.

And on March 17, the Arabic version of EIR's report was presented in Cairo by Egyptian Transportation Minister Dr. Saad El Geyoushi, and EIR Arabic desk chief Hussein Askary, who translated the report, at a well-attended launching at the Ministry. An expanded chapter on proposals to rebuild Southwest Asia is included.

The Copenhagen seminar will present the vision of a new paradigm, instead of geopolitics, terror, war and economic collapse. Mustering the creative efforts of populations collaborating to rebuild their nations, is the only way forward.

We hope that you will be able to attend this important seminar, and join in the discussion about how this alternative can be brought about.

Links:

Introduction to the arabic-version of EIR's report by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (in English, Arabic and Danish)

Here are links to information about EIR's March 24, 2016 Frankfurt seminar, co-sponsored by the Ethiopian consulate, including the speeches of Helga Zepp-LaRouche and Hussein Askary.

Report about the Frankfurt seminar

Helga Zepp-LaRouche's speech

Hussein Askary's speech

Homepages:

Danish: [www.schillerinstitut.dk](http://www.schillerinstitut.dk)

English: [www.newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com](http://www.newparadigm.schillerinstitute.com)

[www.schillerinstitute.org](http://www.schillerinstitute.org)

[www.larouchepub.com/eiw](http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw)

Arabic: [www.arabic.larouchepub.com/](http://www.arabic.larouchepub.com/)

Other languages: [Click here](#)

---

**RADIO SCHILLER den 4. april  
2016:  
Obama truer Kina og Rusland,  
trods topmøde om**

# atomsikkerhed

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

---

## **POLITISK ORIENTERING den 31. marts 2016: Det britiske Imperium og Obama forsøger at knuse BRIKS – Tjekkiet inviterer Kina indenfor –**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video:

2. del (5 min)

Lydfil:

---

## **RADIO SCHILLER den 29. marts 2016: Efter terrorangrebet i**

# BrusSEL

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

---

## **RADIO SCHILLER den 21. marts 2016:**

### **Den arabiske udgave af Den Nye Silkevejsrapport lanceret i Transportministeriet i Kairo**

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen.

Lydfilen er fra mandag den 21. marts, ikke den 25. marts, som der blev sagt.

---

## **Putins strategi i Syrien: Det Westfalske Princip i praksis**

*19. marts 2016* – Efter at der nu er gået flere dage, siden den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin gav meddelelse om den delvise tilbagetrækning af russiske militærstyrker fra Syrien,

er de mere generelle principper, der ligger bag dette træk, ved at blive åbenbare for relativt kompetente iagttagere. Fyodor Lukyanov, redaktør for *Russia in Global Affairs*, skrev i går en artikel i *Huffington Post*, hvor han går mere i detaljer med, hvorfor og hvordan, Putins strategi i Syrien har lagt fundamentet for en politisk afgørelse. Putin har gjort det, han sagde, han ville gøre lige fra begyndelsen, bemærker Lukyanov. Han bemærker desuden det fundamentale skel mellem det russiske og vestlige verdenssyn: »Fra Moskvas standpunkt kan kun støtte til legitime regeringer, selv de ikke-demokratiske, i det mindste sinke det overvældende kollaps af det regionale sikkerhedssystem og understøtte generel stabilitet. Alle ambitioner om at forbedre den måde, nationer regeres på, fører til ukontrolleret socio-politisk eksplosion og nedtagelse af institutioner, hvilket er den bedste måde at skabe et vakuum for terrorisme på. Den vestlige fremgangsmåde er den modsatte: autoritære og dermed 'onde' regeringer bør erstattes af demokratiske, 'gode' regeringer. Det er derfor, det russiske mantra lyder 'rør ikke ved det, der er tilbage', alt imens det vestlige mantra er 'diktator må væk'. Dette er grunden til, at Ruslands fremgangsmåde over for Syrien var at styrke staten, i modsætning til de amerikansk anførte operationer for regimeskift.«

I henseende til at skabe betingelserne for en politisk afgørelse har Moskva ændret betingelserne på jorden. »Oppositionen har ikke længere noget håb om at vinde militært, og det samme gælder for regimet efter en eventuel exit af russiske tropper [selv om en iagttager påpeger, at der har været meget få russiske tropper på jorden, mens luftstøtte til den syriske hær fortsætter, -red.]. Moskva ønsker ikke at blive et gidsel for Damaskus' politik, der søger at bevare status quo«, skriver Lukyanov. »Men det er kun få i Moskva, der mener, at det nuværende syriske regime vil holde længe uden ændringer. Syrien har brug for dybtgående reformer for at genoprette staten. Og Moskvas beslutning om delvis at trække sig tilbage er også et signal til de syriske myndigheder om,

at Rusland ikke vil gøre deres arbejde for dem.«

Krigen mod ISIS må nu vende sig mod en krig på jorden, ideelt set med en forenet indsats fra både regeringens og oppositionens styrker. »Men dette kan kun opnås gennem en politisk proces«, skriver Lukyanov. »Ved at intervenere i oktober viste Moskva oppositionen, at den ikke kan forvente at vinde denne krig«, konkluderer Lukyanov. »Ved nu her i marts at trække nogle styrker ud, sender Rusland det samme signal til regimet: det kan ikke forlade sig på russisk militærmagt for at vinde en total, militær sejr.« Syrien vil forandre sig, men det vil blive et Syrien, hvor Moskva kan indgå med alle parter, og dette vil give mulighed for en politisk afgørelse.

Den tidligere officer i MI6, Alistair Crooke, skrev også en artikel i *Huffington Post* og fremfører, at Ruslands tilbagetrækning ikke så meget er en tilbagetrækning, som det er en rotation af styrker, idet russiske styrker aktivt støtter den syriske hær dér, hvor den er i kamp mod ISIS. Men hvad så siden, man ønsker at kalde det, så er det »et temposkift, der med overlæg bruges til at metastasere politikken, til med et voldsomt stød at vælte politikken af sporet og ud på nye veje«. Efter Crookes mening kunne en kickstart af forhandlinger mellem parterne i konflikten være mindre vigtig for Putin end at fremtvinge reelt samarbejde fra USA's side, men han har under alle omstændigheder opnået begge dele. »Putins tilbagetrækning – eller rotation – har utvivlsomt galvaniseret den politiske ramme på forskellig vis. Det lægger pres både på Damaskus og på de oppositionsgrupper, der deltager i Genève-forhandlingerne – med mindre hele den russiske luftstyrke af en eller anden grund skulle blive tvunget til vende tilbage«, skriver Crooke. »Mere end noget andet, pålægger det USA det ubehagelige ansvar at standse sine allieredes (Tyrkiet, Saudi-Arabien og Qatar) bevæbning og finansiering af deres stedfortrædere i denne krig.«

Crooke fortsætter med at sige, at der er en fælles tråd, der løber igennem både krisen i Ukraine og Syrien for Putin: at



undgå en konfrontation med NATO og Vesten, men han antyder, at et arrangement i stil med Minsk-aftalerne ikke ville passe til Syrien. Syrien var før jihadiernes ankomst ikke en sekterisk nation, så den form for føderalisme, som Rusland gerne ser i Ukraine, ville ikke fungere i Syrien. Men den virkeligt interessante del af Crookes rapport er indikeringen af, at det intense, russiske arbejde for at skabe våbenstilstand på jorden – flere end 40 sådanne lokale våbenhviler er blevet underskrevet – i realiteten er en flanke imod saudernes potentielle sabotage i form af den Høje Forhandlingskomite. »Hvis Genève-processen slår fejl, vil vi få en proces fra bunden og op at se i stedet«, skriver Crooke. Han burde have sagt det ligeud: denne indsats er en flanke imod den saudisk sponsorerede Høje Forhandlingskomite. »På basis af disse aftaler, af hvilke nogle er blevet forhandlet af FN og andre af den syriske regering, vil lokale valg sluttelig blive afholdt. Dernæst regionale valg. Dernæst valg til parlamentet. Forfatningen vil blive revideret. Og sluttelig vil præsidentvalg blive afholdt under international overvågning. Kort sagt, så ville syrere – både hjemme og i eksil – sluttelig træffe beslutning om deres egen styrelse.« For at dette skal kunne lade sig gøre, er det dog afgørende med tillid mellem USA og Rusland. Der er intet andet valg på bordet nu, hvor regimeskift er taget af bordet.

---

**Putin: Rusland er forpligtet over for fredsproces i Syrien;**

# fortsat militær årvågenhed over for terrorisme

17. marts 2016 – Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holdt i dag en tale i Kreml ved en ceremoni for præsentation af statsmedaljer til dem, der deltog i den militære operation i Syrien. Flere end 700 officerer, mænd og kvinder fra luftstyrkerne, styrker på jorden og flåden, deltog i ceremonien i Skt. Georgs Sal sammen med repræsentanter fra den militær-industrielle sektor.

Præsident Putin bekræftede, at russisk militærstøtte til Bashar al-Assads regering vil fortsætte, og at den russiske flygruppe hurtigt kunne deployeres tilbage til Syrien, om nødvendigt.

»Hvis det bliver nødvendigt, vil Rusland være i stand til at forstærke sin gruppe i regionen i løbet af få timer til en størrelse, der kræves i en specifik situation, og at bruge alle de tilgængelige muligheder«, sagde Putin. »Det er ikke noget, vi ville ønske at gøre. En militær eskalering er ikke vort valg. Derfor regner vi stadig med begge siders sunde fornuft, med tilslutning fra både de syriske myndigheders og oppositionens side til en fredelig proces.«

Den primære opgave for den tilbageværende russiske styrke i Syrien »er at overvåge våbenhvilen og skabe betingelser for en intern, politisk dialog i Syrien«, sagde Putin, inklusive elementer fra luftforsvaret for at forsvare dem. Han bekræftede også, at Rusland har hjulpet med at genoprette det syriske luftforsvars kapacitet, der tydeligvis er et meget skarpt budskab til Tyrkiet og andre magter, der stadig kunne have ambitioner i stil med Sykes-Picot i Syrien. »Vi går frem fra fundamentale, internationale normer: ingen har ret til at krænke et suverænt lands luftrum, i dette tilfælde Syrien«, sagde Putin. »Vi har, sammen med den amerikanske side, skabt

en effektiv mekanisme for at forhindre hændelser i luften, men alle vore partnere er blevet advaret om, at vore luftforsvarssystemer vil blive brugt imod ethvert mål, som vi vurderer som en trussel mod russisk militærpersonel«, fortsatte han. »Jeg vil gerne understrege: ethvert mål.«

Russisk støtte til den syriske regering vil fortsætte i form af finansiel hjælp, forsyninger af udstyr og våben, hjælp til uddannelse og opbygning af syriske bevæbnede styrker, støtte til rekognoscering og hjælp til hovedkvarterer til planlægningsoperationer.

Mod slutningen af sin tale mindede Putin atter om Ruslands lektier fra Anden Verdenskrig, der har formet hans syn, som Lyndon LaRouche har påpeget, selv om Putin endnu ikke var født. Han bemærkede, at de nyeste russiske våben bestod prøven, ikke på øvelsesområder, men i ægte kamp. »Livet selv har vist, at de er en pålidelig garanti for vort lands sikkerhed«, sagde han, og dernæst, »Vi bør holde os de trusler for øje, der kommer, når vi ikke gør tingene til tiden; vi bør huske lektien fra historien, inklusive de tragiske begivenheder fra begyndelsen af Anden Verdenskrig og den Store Patriotiske Krig, den pris, vi betalte for fejltagelser i militæropbygning og planlægning, og manglen på nyt militærustyr. Alt bør udføres til tiden, hvorimod svaghed, sjusk og forsømmelse altid er farligt.«

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin sammen med udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov (venstre) og forsvarsminister Sergej Shoigu (højre).*

---

# 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 Ehrlicke

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

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

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

to come to join together. And to further the progress of addressing the necessary challenges to the economic condition of

the planet by actually recognizing that the solutions do not lie

right here on planet Earth.

So, I think that's the conceptions I wanted to get across; and what I hope to have further discussion on as we continue this

fight to identify what is the real mission of the space program,

and how we come to rid the world immediately of this current dead

system that's keeping us from advancing in the way that we should

be.

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

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

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

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

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

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

include Mr. Lyndon LaRouche in that lineage.

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

JASON ROSS: Thanks, Matt. Well, I think if you consider how to conceptualize the value of the kinds of programs that Kesha

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

very real way, humanity is a totally new and totally distinct force of nature from anything else. Over geological time, geologists describe to us how the Earth has changed, or how a

planet has formed; this is over hundreds of millions of years. Over evolutionary time, perhaps tens of millions of years, we're able to see transformations in the kinds of life that exists on the planet. Over biological time, we have short-term periods of the life of an organism, of its respiration, very much tied to the daily cycle of the Earth, for example. And with humans, we have a different kind of time. We create time. The flow of history isn't always the same speed. During the Dark Ages, when not much happened, you might say that human time slowed down. And with the Renaissance, and with the ability to discover more about nature by having a more powerful way of thinking about it, and a more powerful conception of us as human beings interacting with it; you could say that time sped up. We create a certain time in that we create new eras of humanity; not in the way that geology or evolution does, but willfully by developing new principles that if we were animals, you would say this is a whole new type of life all together. Life moving from the oceans onto land; that's a totally different quality of life. Life having developed photosynthesis and using the Sun as a power source; that's a totally different kind of life. But we're still human beings after the discovery of the combustion engine, for example; the use of heat-powered machinery. We create in ourselves the change that's comparable only to large-scale evolutionary changes when we look at life in general. So, we're distinct. Now, how do we understand this? Both how do we understand

that world around us that we act on and interact with; and how do we understand our thoughts about it and our ability to progress and use the practice of science itself? What sort of terrain is it? What sort of world is it? The physical world and the mental world.

Well, here's where I'd like to take up some concepts that Mr. LaRouche has been bringing up recently about Bernhard Riemann and about Gottfried Leibniz, and a bit about Einstein, too, who got the verification of his hypothesis of gravity waves announced very near his birthday this year – which was on Monday. So, let's think about it. Is the terrain that we're operating on, one which is steady and indifferent to our actions? Or, is it one where what we do and what we discover and how we interact with it, changes that world around us in a way that the world is not fixed; either in ourselves or in our understanding of it? And, that is the case; we transform the world in changing our mental understanding of it. The math that we use in understanding how do we conceptualize that world; that changes our interaction with it, and we're a force of nature. We change the operation of the forces of nature by improving our understanding of the world around us and of ourselves and our ability to discover such things. How can we possibly think about that quality of change?

As a couple of other examples, think about the difference between what you might say is a fixed object – let's say iron



oxide. Iron oxide is basically rust; it's a mineral that's rust.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So, this substance transforms its meaning based on our developing

understanding. How can we think about this?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

go to the physics department. You can't answer questions like that just 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  
whorehouse is just as valuable as money made in a steel plant;  
and instead say, "How do we foster scientific discovery? How  
do

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

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

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

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

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

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

basis of our economics.

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

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

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

impact

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

and the consideration of getting out into space.

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

a purely Chinese development; this is clearly something that we

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

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

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

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

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

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jason. Now, as Jason just mentioned, and as I said in the beginning, really right now you

do see the initiative – the economic and the scientific initiative – being taken by China to lead mankind into the future; especially with the space program. You also see the initiative being taken by Russia; and this is very clearly illustrated this week with the actions that have been taken by Russia in Syria. The strategic initiative lies in Putin's actions

there. As Mr. LaRouche emphasized, Putin is setting the agenda;

he is constantly on the flank. You can see this going back to

the  
chemical weapons, where Putin took the initiative to say fine,  
we  
will help Assad dismantle these chemical weapons. It can be  
seen  
with the decision to intervene, a few months back, by Putin  
into  
the situation in Syria; and then with the pull-out that  
happened  
earlier this week. What's clear is that every step along the  
way,  
Putin's actions have caught Washington and Obama by surprise;  
constantly breaking profile. And this is what's called "taking  
the flank" in a military sense. There's clear precedence, as  
Mr.

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

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

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

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

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

vividly what we mean by this:

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

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

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

say

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moon. And will for the first time, give mankind a window into the

Solar System and the Galaxy beyond. And this is something of enormous importance and enormous excitement, because it puts this

nature of man as an extraterrestrial creature capable through creative discovery, of not remaining Earthbound, but of exploring

the near Solar System and beyond. And it reminds me that virtually every astronaut and cosmonaut who has travelled in space, has remarked at one point or other, that having the vantage point of looking down on Earth, you become at one



point

overwhelmed with the fact that so much of what goes on, on the planet of Earth, is trivial relative to the challenges that are

very obvious when you look at man from the standpoint of man's ability to explore the Universe and make these kinds of discoveries. And it was that approach that actually informed our

discussion about the Syria situation per se. Because as Matt said, Russian President Putin has demonstrated once again that he

has a certain understanding that at the core of grand strategy is

always the idea of continuously moving; continuously flanking; continuously confusing your adversaries by constantly being on this kind of offensive.

So, we do have the developments of the past days, where at the very moment that the Geneva second round of peace talks were

beginning, President Putin announced a draw-down of the Russian

military forces inside Syria. And in fact, the very next morning

– Tuesday morning of this week – the first Russian bombers and other air force equipment and personnel began leaving. Now, the

Russians are there still; make no mistake about it. Russia has established a fundamental change in the situation on the ground,

which is both a military shift and a shift at the diplomatic table taking place right now in Geneva. Russia has a permanent naval base fully established and more secured than at any time previously at the port of Tartus; and it has now a major air force facility in the Latakia province. And more recently this week, yesterday President Putin issued a statement where he said,

if the circumstances change, if the peace process does not go

forward, then Russian forces can be reinforced in Syria, not in a matter of days, but in a matter of hours. And quite clearly, the

infrastructure is in place for that to happen.

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

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

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

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

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

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

diplomatic solution to the Syria crisis, that the Russian forces

would begin to be withdrawn.

As Matt pointed out with the {New York Times} coverage, people in the West were scratching their heads, because they refused to take note of the fact that Putin is a strategic

thinker. And very often, what he says – in most cases, in fact – is exactly what he intends to do; but he's not going to do it in a predictable fashion. He's going to do it in a way that will catch you by surprise. And the biggest surprise is that most political thinkers in the West, most officials in government in the West, are ignorant and prejudiced. So, their own prejudices prevent them from understanding how Putin thinks about these things. Their own prejudices prevent them from understanding because they're incapable of thinking in this kind of a strategic fashion. Now the problem is, that we're still in a state of warfare; and that state of warfare will continue until certain things occur that go way beyond the borders of Syria. Until the British Empire ceases to exist, there will be a condition of warfare on this planet. We see it, not necessarily in the form of warfare that most people think about – soldiers shooting, artillery pieces firing, bombers dropping bombs. Look what's happening right now in Brazil. The British Empire is waging a war against the new emerging Asia-Pacific-centered global system. They're trying to destabilize Brazil, which is a founding member of the BRICS. There's a similar effort underway to destabilize the Zuma government in South Africa; because South Africa is the latest country to join in the BRICS initiative. So, there are all kinds of problems going on; you can't look for a simply linear expectation or projection of what's going to happen by the situation now ongoing on the ground in Syria or in

Geneva. Another example: President Obama is taking a series of measures that will lead unavoidably – unless they're reversed –

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

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

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

So the United States is preparing contingencies for poking China

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

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

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

the United Nations.

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

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

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

President Obama has spent the last seven years systematically

taking down and dismantling America's space capability; and  
Kesha  
is leading the fight to reverse that process.  
Over the last 15 years, if you look at the Bush/Cheney  
administration followed by the Obama administration, the  
United  
States has been under British occupation. Both Bush/Cheney and  
Obama were each, in their own way, governments that were at  
the  
beck and call of the British Empire, of the policies of the  
British financial oligarchy operating through Wall Street. And  
as  
the result, the United States, really the entire trans-  
Atlantic  
region, is dead. Germany was once a great prospering economy;  
the  
result of the "economic miracle" that Franklin Roosevelt  
envisioned for the post-World War II period; no replay of  
Versailles, but a completely different approach. Germany has  
now  
been destroyed by the policies largely coming from the British  
Empire. All of continental Europe is hopelessly and  
irreversibly  
bankrupt; and Mario Draghi's announcement of an expansion of  
quantitative easing and a zero interest rate policy is a  
reflection that certain people are desperate over the fact  
that  
Europe is doomed, that the United States under present  
circumstances. We've talked in recent months on this broadcast  
about the death rate increase in the United States; the true  
rate  
of unemployment; the epidemic of heroin addiction and heroin  
overdose deaths; the declining life expectancy in the United  
States. These are all measures of the fact that the  
trans-Atlantic region is dead; and will only begin to reverse  
that death if there is a revolutionary, fundamental change in  
policy. That alternative policy is being carried out in the

Eurasian and Asia-Pacific region; led by China, led by Russia, reflected in the way that Russian President Putin has navigated

the strategic situation.

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

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

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

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

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

in this new emerging combination, cooperation among nations for

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

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

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

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Jeff. I would just add, the

initiative being taken by these countries also very much has to do with the decades-long work Mr. Lyndon LaRouche and Mrs. Helga LaRouche have undertaken. The One Belt-One Road policy that China has adopted, is the Eurasian Land-Bridge policy which the LaRouche movement uniquely championed in the beginning of the 1990s. Now, you have an evolution of that to the World Land-Bridge; and this is what is documented so thoroughly in the 350-page Special Report that was issued by {Executive Intelligence Review} called "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge". One very exciting announcement, because you mentioned Egypt, just this week there was a very high-level event which was sponsored by the Transportation Ministry in Cairo; featuring a LaRouche collaborator, Hussein Askary, to announce the formal publication of the Arabic language of this full, 350-page World Land-Bridge Special Report from {Executive Intelligence Review}.

So, you can see that at the very highest levels of government around the world, this is what is shaping the discussion; the initiatives that the LaRouche movement have taken for decades. And one final note along those same lines, as we announced last Friday, Mrs. Helga LaRouche just got back from a very important trip to India; at which she was one of the featured speakers in a very prominent, very high-level dialogue – the Raisina Dialogue. And if people have not seen it yet, a wonderful half-hour interview that Jason Ross conducted with Mrs. LaRouche was posted on the LaRouche PAC website earlier this week. So, if you haven't watched that yet, I would really

encourage you to watch it; and to just think about everything that has been said here today. Think about these initiatives that

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

So, thank you all very much for joining us here today. I'd like to thank Kesha Rogers for joining us over video; and I would

like to thank Jeff and Jason here in the studio. Please stay tuned to [larouchepac.com](http://larouchepac.com). Good night.

---

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 17.**

**marts:**

**Putin sætter den strategiske  
dagsorden//**

**Kina forbereder finansstyring  
og Tobinskat**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg:

Lyd:

---



# Putins »overraskelse« er hans normale kreative praksis, som amerikanere må lære at beherske

15. marts 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Den vestlige verden var forbløffet i mandags, da præsident Vladimir Putin annoncerede begyndelsen på en tilbagetrækning af Ruslands militære styrker i Syrien – lige så pludseligt og uventet, som han indledte interventionen sidste september. Men Vestens overraskelse skyldes ikke Putin, men den kendsgerning, at stort set ingen i Vesten forstår, hvordan Putin tænker. Han er måske den største strategiske tænkner siden general Douglas MacArthur, en fremtids-tænkning af en kvalitet, som i svær grad mangler i USA og Europa i dag.

I en tale, der blev vist over Tv, sagde Putin, der optrådte sammen med sin udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov og sin forsvarsminister Sergei Shoigu, at missionen stort set var gennemført, og at terroristernes offensiv imod den syriske stat var blevet knust og ved at blive drevet tilbage – en betydningsfuld sejr over terror på internationalt plan. Han bemærkede, at, mens terroristernes styrker, som hans vestlige venner støttede, vandt frem, var disse vestlige venner ikke interesseret i fredsforhandlinger, men havde nu ombestemt sig til at gå med i fredsindsatsen. Han gjorde det klart, at den russiske støtte til den syriske hær imod ISIS og al-Nusra ville fortsætte – en indsats, som de kompetente ledere inden for USA's militær og udenrigstjeneste støtter.

Flere politiske og militære kilder har informeret *EIR* om, at der finder intense diskussioner sted bag scenen, langs den linje, som samarbejdet mellem Kerry og Lavrov har lagt, og som vil blive afsløret i de nærmeste dage.

Lyndon LaRouche påpegede i dag, at denne succesfulde flankoperation, som Putin udførte i Syrien, og som afslørede Obamas støtte til terrorister gennem hans venner i Tyrkiet og Saudi-Arabien, har lagt sig som en forhindring for det britiske imperieapparat internationalt og hjulpet Putins venner andre steder til at forsvare deres strategiske interesser – især Xi Jinping i Kina. Kineserne er nu i færd med at forberede et program, der skal lægge skat på spekulative, finansielle transaktioner – ikke for at tjene penge, men for at forhindre spekulanternes aktiviteter. Hedgefonde vil blive afkrævet bevis for, at genforsikrings- og valutatransaktioner er baseret på reel handel eller reelle investeringer og ikke er til spekulative formål – og har sendt spekulanterne ud i hysteriske anfald.

Hvorfor tolererer amerikanere ødelæggelsen af deres økonomi, politikken med evindelige krige og en valgkampagne, der er langt værre, og farligere, end en klovneforestilling? Svaret skal søges i troen på penge – det faktum, at alting måles ud fra monetære værdier og matematiske formler snarere end ud fra realøkonomiens og det menneskelige samfunds fremskridt. USA's, Europas og Japans økonomier flyder med likviditet, med penge, men det er alt sammen fiktivt. Realøkonomien er i frit fald – med infrastrukturen, der forfalder, industrien, der kolliderer og massearbejdsløshed – hvilket driver et stadigt større antal arbejdende mennesker til selvmord gennem narko, eller på anden vis.

Kina og Rusland og Indien har opbygget et nyt paradigme, gennem BRIKS, AIIB og Den nye Silkevej, baseret på principper, som amerikanere engang antog som deres. Amerikanere og europæere må atter engang antage konceptet om et fælles mål for menneskeheden, baseret på den succesfulde fremgang for menneskeheden som helhed, eller også se på, at Vestens nuværende imperieherskere leder verden til Helvede.

*Foto: Den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin holder en tale ved den officielle ceremoni for afsløringen af statuen af den russiske digter Alexander Pushkin i Seoul, Korea. 13. november, 2013.*