

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

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

Med næstformand Michelle Rasmussen

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hverken Kerry eller det Russiske Udenrigsministerium ville

frigive detaljer om den midlertidige principaftale.

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

USA og Europa må gå sammen med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig

– Den Europæiske Union er færdig, med eller uden briterne

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

Download (PDF, Unknown)

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 19. februar 2016:

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

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

Engelsk Udskrift.

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

International LaRouche PAC Webcast

Friday, February 19, 2016

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

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

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

chance

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

that discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr.

LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was

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

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

the British. So, Putin has established a clear sense of control over the situation. Undoubtedly part of Putin's configuration is that Obama has been greatly weakened by the actions of Russia; on the economic sphere, the actions of China; and there are sane military forces in the United States who recognize the folly of what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing. This has been described by Parry, whose article you mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914 flash point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the military correlation in this situation, and has also a very clear sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind of trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment. It's a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms to an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of how to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to destroy Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive Russia of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean region. Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is that

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

dominate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

throughout the African continent.

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

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

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

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

Silk

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

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

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

entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but

development corridors that have been put forward by China as the

cornerstone of their foreign policy.

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

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

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

And

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

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

solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

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

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

the solution to the problems in the United States begins with removing President Barack Obama from office immediately, and moving to wipe out the thoroughly bankrupt Wall Street system.

Because until that system is put through basically a bankruptcy shutdown, then none of the viable and available solutions are going to be there. But, if you were to get rid of Obama, if you were to wipe out Wall Street,—and, for example, immediately passage of Glass-Steagall would be one critical element for that process to happen almost overnight — then we have a history in the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a real economy.

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

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

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

only
way to solve this problem.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much

larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have the sense that the European Union, particularly the European Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union – and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem. So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union, then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials in Europe, even including Schäuble at the Davos Conference earlier this month, said that if the Schengen agreement, the open borders agreement in Europe is broken, then the European Union will cease to exist. And already in Poland, in Hungary, in other countries on the edge of Europe but within the European Union, they're already building those walls. So in effect, the European Union, as it's presently constituted, is a dead letter; it really doesn't exist. And the countries of Europe, either collectively or individually, are going to have to come to face the reality that their banking system is thoroughly bankrupt; they've lost so much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint is no longer capable of self-reliance, self-preservation. So,

the whole thing is going under; and of course, there's a certain irony in the British threatening to leave the European Union, since the bankruptcy of the entire trans-Atlantic system is largely the result of policies that were created in London, and were then spread about Europe and the United States. You could almost say that Europe was doomed from the moment that Margaret Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy. So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission, are tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes up with its own version of shutting down the City of London and Wall Street, a genuine full-scale Glass-Steagall separation of legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling, then Europe is completely doomed. And the only hope that they will have is that some sane future leaders, who emerge out of this political rubble, recognize before it's perhaps too late that aligning with China and Russia – which is exactly the opposite of the policies that are being pursued in Europe right now – is the only answer. So, I think that that's the context in which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part of

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

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

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

his

responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this universe

must be.

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

really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

varying intensity of gravity due to these two black holes

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

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

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

You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we learn more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to

Kepler

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to model these types of things; all of that took place. But what could be called the fundamentally scientific change occurred 100 years ago with Einstein's theory of relativity; with gravity waves being one of the implications. Being able to detect them is wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in Einstein's time, certainly, or even a few decades ago. The development that we've made has been tremendous. But I think it's fair to say this was not a scientific breakthrough in the real sense of science. It is a new sensation; it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible, we can compare it to the really awful influence of Bertrand Russell.

So, first on Einstein. We've got to recall that what Einstein did in laying out his revolutionary theories was not something that he derived; it wasn't something that he proved. It wasn't something that he showed was true based on what was already known. What Einstein said about the universe contradicted the Newtonian view of space and time that had become dominant. Einstein said that that simplistic view of space and time, which went along somewhat intuitively with our senses, was in fact untrue; and that basic concepts like simultaneity, or knowing that two events happen at the same time, such a basic concept as that. That there's one time that applies everywhere; Einstein

showed that was untrue. That's a very unintuitive thought. The idea that space could have a shape to it; that's a very unintuitive thought. It's not suggested by appearances. But what Einstein was doing was implementing a world outlook that goes back to Cusa – although I'm not going to talk about him right now – but to Leibniz and to Bernhard Riemann. If we consider the work of Leibniz, 1646-1716, the founder of physical economy; there's plenty to say about him, and plenty will be said on this website. One of the specific things that he looked at was in the world of physics, Leibniz's demonstration that there was no absolute space; that there was no absolute time. This was contrary to Descartes, Newton, and others. Leibniz said there's no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God, and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler. Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any

necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing that.

Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or

wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power.

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

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

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

He was right.

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

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

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

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

it's that he said that the basis of our understanding of space

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

what science really is?

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

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that. Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

of. Proposing a scientific dictatorship, using murder to

eliminate people who became intelligent and opposed the ruling class, keeping science secret from the majority of people; this

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

leading representative of that future orientation of the nation.

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

the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for

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

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

to the Moon for the next trip?"

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

a future-oriented mission again.

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

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

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

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

**Efter russisk dagsordens-
forslag:
FN's Sikkerhedsråd pålægger
Tyrkiet
at 'overholde international
lov'
og stoppe beskydning af
Syrien**

17. februar 2016 – Tirsdag blev Tyrkiets beskydning af syrisk territorium taget op i FN's Sikkerhedsråd efter anmodning fra

Rusland, og Rådet vedtog enstemmigt at henstille til Tyrkiet om at standse sine angreb. I et møde bag lukkede døre fik Rådets medlemmer en briefing om Tyrkiets krænkelser af syrisk suverænitet. Efterfølgende sagde Sikkerhedsrådets formand, Venezuelas ambassadør Rafael Ramirez, til journalister, at "alle medlemmer af sikkerhedsrådet ... var enige om at bede Tyrkiet om at overholde international lov", som det citeredes af TASS. Rådet bekræftede sine forpligtelser i forhold til München-aftalen,

Ramirez sagde, at "medlemmerne af FN's Sikkerhedsråd er bekymrede over de tyrkiske angreb på et antal syriske regioner ... " Han talte specifikt imod angreb på kurderne. "Et af de spørgsmål, som nogle lande, inklusive Venezuela, har rejst, er, at det kurdiske folk må inddrages i diskussionerne ... Noget, som er vigtigt – kurderne kæmper mod terrorist-grupper på landjorden, og dette er en betydningsfuld faktor for alle ... "

At russerne tager lederskabet i forsvaret for suverænitet og international lov i FN-processen står indlysende klart. I sidste uge sendte den syriske regering breve til Rådet og rapporterede om Tyrkiets angreb på kurdiske militsstyrker i Syrien, samt hævdede, at Tyrkiet krænkede Syriens suverænitet. I går anmodede Rusland om at få dette spørgsmål sat på Rådets dagsorden.

Den russiske Udenrigsministerium offentliggjorde en udtalelse d. 15. februar, der sagde, at Rusland ser den tyrkiske aktion som "en direkte støtte til international terrorisme, i modstrid med relevante resolutioner i FN' Sikkerhedsråd og de forpligtelser, som Tyrkiet har påtaget sig i Wien, New York og München, som medlem af den Internationale Støttegruppe for Syrien." Derfor "vil Rusland støtte initiativet for at sætte dette spørgsmål på Sikkerhedsrådets dagsorden, hvilket burde afstedkomme en utvetydig vurdering af Tyrkiets provokerende politik, der truer fred og sikkerhed i Mellempøsten og derudover."

Rusland trækker på skuldrene ad kansler Merkels opfordring til en flyveforbudszone over Syrien

17. februar 2016 – Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel opfordrede i dag til, at man overvejede en sikkerhedszone med flyveforbud langs den tyrkisk-syriske grænse, inde i Syrien, »for flygtninge«. Dette medførte en russisk respons, der gik ud på, at kun med tilladelse fra den syriske regering kunne en sådan zone skabes.

»Det ville være en hjælp, hvis der i Syrien var et område, hvor ingen af parterne i konflikten lancerede luftangreb«, sagde Merkel til det tyske parlament den 17. februar, iflg. avisen *Hurriyet*.

»Vi kan ikke forhandle med Islamisk Stats [ISIL] terrorister«, sagde Merkel, »men hvis vi kunne nå frem til en aftale mellem anti- og pro-Assadstyrker om en form for flyveforbudszone, forstået som et fristed for de mange flygtninge, så ville det redde mange liv og fremhjelpe den politiske proces om Syriens fremtid«. Det samme sagde hun i et avisinterview den 15. feb.

Talsmand for Rusland, Gatilov, sagde, »Kun med den syriske regerings godkendelse og opbakning fra FN's Sikkerhedsråd kunne en sådan zone skabes.«

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

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

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

Over for afbrydelser, der sagde, at »det er alt for simpelt« fra gæsten Martin Schulz, præsident for EU-parlamentet (Tysk, SPD), påpegede general Kujat konsekvenserne af ikke at gøre dette nu: »Den fare, som Syrien repræsenterer, er totalt undervurderet. Hvis Tyrkiet invaderer Syrien og render ind i russiske tropper, så står vi med et NATO-medlem i konflikt med

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RADIO SCHILLER den 15. februar 2016: Hvornår krakker den første storbank i Europa? Tyrkiet og Saudi Arabien på vej ind i Syrien? Gravitationsbølger

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

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

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

Som han i dag sagde til *Neue Passauer Presse*, der spurgte, om det var Putins plan, at operationerne omkring Aleppo skulle øge konflikten i Syrien: »Nej. Rusland går frem efter en strategisk plan. Putins mål er at støtte de syriske tropper i deres offensiv i Islamisk Stats områder. Hidtil har Aleppo været et punkt, der blokerede for dette mål, idet byen har været kontrolleret af den syriske opposition. Man bør ikke glemme, at Rusland har foreslået en våbenhvile med start 1. marts. Dette er en chance.«

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

Men så ville Syrien være kollapset, og IS ville have overtaget landet. Det næste mål ville have været Libanon – og derefter Israel. Det ville have haft vidtgående konsekvenser for os.«

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

Først gav Ischinger udtryk for Medvedevs ønske om, at alle skulle sætte sig ved forhandlingsbordet, men så kom Ischinger pludselig med, at russerne også måtte standse deres offensiv. ZDF's Kleber spurgte dernæst, men hvis russerne ikke standser, og Vesten massivt øger sin støtte til oprørerne, »Vil dette simpelt hen ikke betyde mere krig?« Ischinger svarede, at det ikke ville være godt, men hvis der ikke sker noget i denne weekend, her, så »må Obama og Putin tale med hinanden for at komme sammen ved et topmøde, hvor de indgår en overordnet, strategisk aftale. Dette kan kun forhandles igennem af lederne af disse to magter. Det kan udenrigsministre ikke gøre; der jo i alle tilfælde er underlagt ordrer, især i USA's og Ruslands tilfælde. Dernæst mener jeg, at vi må have et topmøde af den art, som blev afholdt for 30 år siden mellem Ronald Reagan og Mikhail Gorbachov.«

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

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

13. februar 2016 – I en tale, der var fjendtlighedsindret over for Rusland, helligede NATO's generalsekretær Jens Stoltenberg hele sin korte tale ved Sikkerhedskonferencen i München til at angribe Rusland. Idet han hurtigt afviste truslen fra ISIL, sagde Stoltenberg i begyndelsen, »Vi har set et mere selvhævdende Rusland. Et Rusland, der destabiliserer den europæiske sikkerhedsorden.«

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

Han pralede med den internationale enhed omkring sanktionerne, suspenderingen af Rusland fra G-8 og »voksende støtte til vore

partnere i øst« som respons til »Ruslands handlinger i Ukraine«.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For at gøre det fuldstændig klart, at en sådan propaganda

kunne føre til et atomopgør, nævnte Medvedev udtrykkeligt missilkrisen på Cuba. Men, understregede han, forskellen dengang var, at en dialog forhindrede en »atomar apokalypse«.

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

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

»Næsten hver dag henviser man til os som den mest forfærdelige trussel mod NATO som helhed eller mod Europa, Amerika og andre lande specifikt«, sagde Medvedev, [men] »vi er blevet klogere ... Og vi er ikke splittet af ideologiske fantomer og stereotyper. Jeg mener, at de udfordringer, som vi i dag står overfor, ikke vil føre til konflikt, men snarere vil opmuntre os til at komme sammen i en fair og ligeværdig forening, der vil gøre det muligt for os at bevare freden i de næste 70 år, mindst.«

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

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

Ruslands udenrigsminister Lavrov advarer Tyrkiet mod at invadere Syrien

10. februar 2016 – Vil Tyrkiet invadere Syrien, eller ej?

»Jeg tror ikke, koalitionen under anførelse af amerikanerne, og med Tyrkiet som medlem, vil lade sådanne vanvittige planer blive realiseret«, sagde den russiske udenrigsminister Sergei Lavrov i et interview til avisen *Moskovsky Komsomolets*, rapporterer TASS. »Ved mødet i Wien med den Internationale Gruppe til Støtte for Syrien var vi og USA villige til, og tilbød, at indsætte i dokumenterne, og siden i resolutionen fra FN's sikkerhedsråd, én meget enkel sætning – krisen i Syrien har ingen militær løsning. USA, Rusland og de europæiske stater gik ind for dette«, bemærkede Lavrov. »Nogle amerikanske allierede i området blokerede afgørende ideen. Således, at [det militære scenario – TASS] er helt muligt. Nu hører vi udtalelser om planer om at indsætte landtropper«, tilføjede han.

Lavrov hævdede anklagende, at der finder hemmelige diskussioner sted mellem Tyrkiet og ISIS. Han advarede om, at Tyrkiet stadig sender budskaber, både offentligt og privat, om, at det allerede gør krav på dele af det nordlige Syrien under påskud af at etablere flygtningelejre.

»Tyrkiet fortsætter med at tale om at skabe en sikkerhedszone i det syriske territorium, der er fri af Islamisk Stat«, sagde han. »Alle forstår, at de taler om den del af grænsen, der ligger mellem de to kurdiske enklaver – som forbinder de to styrker, Tyrkiet anser for at være absolut uacceptable, ikke

mindst, fordi det ville blokere for Tyrkiets midler til at supplere kæmpere i Syrien og modtage deres kontrabande forsyninger«, sagde Lavrov. »Der er indikationer på, at Islamisk Stats lederskab holder hemmelig kontakt med tyrkiske regeringsfolk«, fortsatte han. »De diskuterer alternative muligheder under de aktuelle omstændigheder, hvor angrebene fra vore luftstyrker alvorligt har begrænset mulighederne for traditionelle smuglerruter«, tilføjede han.

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

Vil NATO opgradere sin flådetilstedeværelse i Ægæerhavet?

9. februar 2016 – Efter drøftelser med den tyrkiske premierminister Ahmet Davutoglu i Ankara i går, annoncerede den tyske kansler Angela Merkel en fælles, tysk-tyrkisk

deployering af politi for at kontrollere indstrømningen af flygtninge ved den syrisk-tyrkiske grænse. Hun sagde desuden, at NATO's forsvarsministermøde den 10.-11. feb. burde undersøge, om alliancen kunne øge sin flådetilstedeværelse i Ægæerhavet – angiveligt for at »standse menneskesmuglere«.

Om det ville hjælpe noget med at dæmme op for flodbølgen af flygtninge er mere end tvivlsomt, men det er rimeligt snarere at antage, at det er en orkestrering af nok et påskud for NATO til at opgradere sin tilstedeværelse i området – imod Rusland, naturligvis. Den kendsgerning, at Merkel gjorde Rusland »medansvarlig« for den nye flygtningestrøm fra Aleppo til den syrisk-tyrkiske grænse, synes at passe ind i dette. Den planlagte deployering af AWACS-overvågningsfly fra Tyskland til Tyrkiet, der ikke giver anden mening end at være rettet mod Rusland, kommer i samme sammenhæng.

Tysklands respekterede general Kujat er imod NATO-deployering i Syrien

8. februar 2016 – Den pensionerede, tyske general Harald Kujat, tidligere stabschef for Bundeswehr (2000-2002) og formand for NATO's Militærkomite frem til 2005, blev interviewet til en artikel i *Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung* på tærsklen til kansler Merkels møde i dag med den tyrkiske præsident Recep Tayyip Erdogan i Ankara, med overskriften, »Ex-stabschef advarer mod NATO-deployering«.

NATO's forsvarsministre mødes i Bruxelles den 10. feb., hvor en afgørelse kan blive truffet om en provokerende anmodning fra Obamaregeringen om, at NATO skal koordinere »koalitionens«

luftstyrker over Syrien med anvendelse af NATO AWACS-fly, hvilket i realiteten vil forvandle tysk, amerikansk og anden tilstedeværelse der til et NATO-anliggende. AWACS, der i øjeblikket flyver over Tyrkiet, har intet NATO-mandat til Syrien. General Kujats bemærkninger har særlig vægt, da han var chef for NATO's militærkomite fra 2002-2005.

Neue Osnabrücker Zeitung citerer ham for at sige, at »en involvering fra NATO's side i kampen imod terrorgruppen Islamisk Stat i Syrien kræver et strategisk koncept og politisk mål ... Vi bør ikke lade os trække skridt for skridt ind i en konflikt uden at vide, hvad næste skridt vil blive, og hvordan det fortsætter derfra ... NATO kan ikke afgøre borgerkrigen i Syrien med et par AWACS-fly«. Det ville blive nødvendigt med landtropper, udtaler han, og stiller spørgsmålstejn ved, om NATO virkelig er parat til at påtage sig denne farlige opgave. Hvis ikke, bør NATO holde sig udenfor: »Man må anskue situationen fra et slutpunkt; ellers bliver en NATO-deployering til en prekær glidebane.«

Flere presserapporter har meldt om utilfredshed i regeringen i Berlin over USA's ønske om at deployere AWACS-fly, fordi en NATO-rolle kunne forvandle den næste hændelse til et strategisk opgør mellem NATO og Rusland. Desuden kunne et NATO-mandat til AWACS-fly åbne en dør for at indkalde NATO-landtropper fra Tyrkiet, den eneste troværdige landtropicestyrke i området bortset fra den syriske hær, med dens tætte russiske luftstøtte.

I sidste uge krævede i modsætning hertil NATO-general Hans-Lothar Domröse, en tysker, der er kommandør over NATO's Fælles Kommandostyrke i Brunssum, Holland, deployeringen af NATO AWACS-fly, så vel som også forholdsregler til at imødegå russerne i Baltikum.

Det tyske nyhedsagentur *Deutsche Welle* oversatte artiklen om general Kujat til sin russisksprogede nyhedsdækning. General Kujat er en offentlig fortaler for en Marshallplan for Syrien

og området der.

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

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**Stands den umiddelbare fare
for atomkrig
og skab i stedet en alliance
mellem USA,
Rusland og Kina om
menneskehedens
fælles mål**

Uddrag af LPAC Fredags-webcast, 5. feb. 2016. Så hvis man ønsker at standse en umiddelbar krigsfare, hvis man har noget som helst ønske om, at USA skal genoptage sin indsats for menneskehedens fælles mål – hvilket vil sige en alliance med

Rusland, en alliance med Kina for at avancere med disse store projekter i rummet, i vores Solsystem, for at udforske disse dybder og dernæst fortsætte ud i galaksen – så må man træffe visse omgående hasteforanstaltninger for grundlæggende set at afskære faren for krig, før vi befinder os i en situation, hvor denne planet vil befinde sig i den største fare i hele menneskehedens hidtidige eksistens.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Rusland deployerer nye kampfly til Syrien for at gøre Tyrkiet skakmat

Februar, 1., 2016 – Rusland har deployeret fire Sukhoi Su-35S kampfly til Syrien, rapporterer Sputnik, der citerer en artikel i Kommersant. Kampflyet Su-35S med kun én siddeplads, det mest avancerede kampfly, der i øjeblikket produceres i Rusland, beskrives som et Generation 4++ fly, idet det er et stealth-design og inkorporerer visse stealth-egenskaber og er et af de mest manøvredygtige fly i luften. »Generalstaben har besluttet at gennemføre en test i marken af den splinternye Su-35S i Syrien for første gang nogensinde«, sagde en militærkilde til Kommersant. De fire fly, der er blevet deployeret, blev iflg. rapporten først leveret til det Russiske Luftvåben i oktober og november 2015.

Dette er selvfølgelig ikke en direkte respons til Tyrkiets beskyldning, endnu engang, om, at russiske fly i weekenden skulle have krænket tyrkisk luftrum. Men sammen med deployeringen af S-400 luftforsvarssystemet ved den russiske flyvebase i Latakia, krigsskibet Varyag med sit S-300 luftforsvarssystem ud for kysten og bevæbningen af russiske kampfly, der flyver over Syrien, med luft-til-luft-missiler, betyder deployeringen af Su-35S, at Tyrkiet nu er gjort »skakmat« i Syrien, som Lyndon LaRouche udtrykte det i dag.

Kronik af den tyske finansminister Schäuble opfordrer Europa til tættere samarbejde med Rusland om løsning i Syrien

25. januar 2016 – Den tyske finansminister Wolfgang Schäuble har en kronik den 24. jan. i *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, hvor han erklærer, at Europa må yde et større bidrag end tidligere for at stabilisere Sydvestasien. »Vi berøres mere end andre kontinenter af det, der foregår i dette område. Og vi kan sikkert ikke undgå at blive mere engageret i en stor del af Afrika.«

Han tilføjer, at Rusland spiller en nøglerolle i enhver løsning på konflikten i Syrien og således også i enhver løsning på flygtningekrisen. En europæisk strategi for Mellemøsten og det øvrige Sydvestasien kan afgjort ikke

fungere uden Amerika, men den har også brug for Rusland: »Hvis jeg har forstået Ruslands sikkerhedsinteresser mht. islamisk terrorisme korrekt, så har Rusland snarere problemer med sunnimuslimsk relaterede aktiviteter. Hvorfor kan vi således ikke udvikle en fælles strategi sammen med Rusland for at deeskalere konflikter mellem den saudisk-ledede sunni-koalition og den iransk-ledede shia-koalition?«

Eftersom termen »Marshallplan«, som Schäuble brugte ved forummet i Davos den 21. jan., da han krævede investeringer i størrelsesordenen milliarder af euro til genopbygning i Syrien, ikke forekommer i denne kronik, må man antage, at den blev skrevet før dette forum.

Størstedelen af denne kronik domineres af Schäubles favoritemne, nemlig at bruge denne krise til mere europæisk integration og overførsel af suverænitet. Han mener f.eks., at det ikke var en god idé at lade de nationale centralbanker forblive autonome vis-à-vis Den europæiske Centralbank. Han erklærede også, at en europæisk bankindsudsgarantifond og et europæisk bankopløsningsreglement er en nødvendighed, med vanskeligt at virkeliggøre i øjeblikket, hvor nationale regler stadig mangler at blive harmoniseret.

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/naher-osten/f-a-z-exklusiv-schaeuble-will-zusammen-mit-rusland-fluechtlingskrise-loesen-14031573.html>

Foto: Flygtninge på grænsen mellem Makedonien og Serbien.

**RADIO SCHILLER 25. januar
2016:**

**Løsningen på
flygtningekrisen:
Silkevejen og Marshallplan
til Mellemøsten**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

**POLITISK ORIENTERING 21.
januar 2016:
OECD's William White:
"Det er værre end i 2007"**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video i 2 dele. Her er playlisten:

Lyd:

Tysklands general Kujat: Hårdt brug for en Marshall- plan som generel strategi for Syrien

20. januar 2016 – General Harald Kujat (pensioneret), den tidligere formand for NATO's Militærkomite (2002-2005) og Stabschef for Tysklands Forbundshær (2000-2002), afsluttede sine bemærkninger på talkshowet »Under den Linden« på Phoenix TV den 18. jan. med en appel til omsider at udarbejde en altomfattende strategi for Syrien for at drive Islamisk Stat ud, og han understregede behovet for en genopbygningsstrategi i lighed med Marshall-planen. General Kujat optrådte på programmet sammen med regeringens rådgiver i terrorisme, Guido Steinberg.

Studieværten bad general Kujat om en afsluttende erklæring, der adresserede den kendsgerning, at deres diskussion havde demonstreret manglende udsigter, der således skabte et vakuum, som terroristerne udnyttede.

Her følger en oversættelse af general Kujats bemærkninger:

»Jeg må selvfølgelig komme tilbage til det, jeg sagde før. Terroristerne ser selvfølgelig, at vi ikke har en, jeg vil bruge konceptet, altomfattende strategi, til hvilken ville høre, f.eks., en økonomisk genopbygningsplan, en Marshall-plan for denne region og lignende ting. Det er meget synligt. Og det, som hr. Steinberg netop sagde med, at USA er faldet bort som en stabiliserende faktor, men det kan ændre sig. Amerikansk politik er kendt for pludselige skift. Det kan ændre sig igen, men i øjeblikket har det været sådan siden 2003 [Irakkrigen], og Europa alene kan ikke udfylde denne rolle. Det har vi set. Vi så bare til i mange år, mens

flygtningene fra Syrien samledes i Libanon og Jordan. Vi har så at sige fulgt katastrofen her fra tribunen, og vi var ikke engang i stand til at forudse konsekvenserne af dette for vort eget land, for ikke at tale om at udvikle i det mindste en idé om, hvordan man kunne skabe en mere stabil situation. Og man må desværre sige, at dette fører til de resultater, der er kommet frem her i vores diskussion, at man bliver frustreret, fordi man ikke kan komme med en omfattende løsning, eller nogen som helst form for løsning, for man ser kun selektive tilgange, reaktioner, krisestyring, og så, når det faktisk allerede er for sent. Det er det store underskud i vores vestlige politik; det er især også et underskud i europæisk udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitik, og især et underskud i den tyske udenrigs- og sikkerhedspolitik, den største og økonomisk stærkeste magt i Europa.«

Debat om genopbygning af Syrien er, omend langsomt, kommet i gang

15. januar 2016 – Det ene afgørende aspekt, som er helt udeladt i de fleste medier og den offentlige dækning af flygtningespørgsmålet – nemlig spørgsmålet om at lancere et økonomisk/infrastrukturelt genopbygningsprogram for Syrien – er langsomt ved at komme i gang i Tyskland, Østrig og Schweiz.

De respektive initiativer er stadig meget begrænset, men er et skridt i den rigtige retning. Der må komme meget mere, og det må sættes på dagsordenen for forhandlingerne om en våbenhvile i Syrien i Wien, der genoptages den 25. januar.

I Tyskland har udviklingsminister Gerd Müller gentagne gange,

og atter ved årets slutning, opfordret til et forceret program på 10 milliarder euro, hvor mindst halvdelen af □□dette beløb skal bruges af EU i Syrien, Jordan, Libanon og Tyrkiet til programmer for faglig uddannelse, skoleundervisning, lægehjælp og infrastrukturel genopbygning. Der er imidlertid ikke sket meget, med undtagelse af en særlig udbetaling fra Müllers ministerium på 140 mio. euro til at støtte UNHCR-programmer i de nævnte fire lande.

Udenrigsministeriet og den tyske udenlandske tjeneste for akademiske uddannelser (DAAD) har lanceret et program, "Ledere for Syrien", for henved 300 unge syrere, udvalgt blandt 5.000 ansøgere, og som vil blive optaget på tyske universiteter og modtage stipendier til at gennemføre deres studier.

Et lignende program er undervejs i Schweiz, hvor et tværpolitisk initiativ inden udgangen af □□januar i det nationale parlament vil fremlægge et forslag om lancering af et stipendieprogram for unge syrere: det understreges, at disse udgifter vil betale sig selv ind, når disse syrere vender tilbage til deres land for at hjælpe med genopbygningen. Her er det interessant, at det schweiziske initiativ henviser til en nylig undersøgelse foretaget i Østrig af arbejdsmarkedstjenesten (AMS) blandt ca. 1.000 flygtninge fra flere lande, og som viser, at procentdelen af unge syrere, der har kvalifikationer på gymnasie- og universitetsniveau, er høj, og højere blandt kvinder med 36 % end blandt mændenes 21 %.

Resultaterne af undersøgelsen er blevet rapporteret i mange medier i Tyskland, Østrig og Schweiz i de sidste par dage.

I den østrigske hovedstad Wien præsenterede AMS og den nationale Marshallplan-fond i går en opfordring til en "EU-Marshallplan for Syrien", der – som fondens præsident Wolfgang Petritsch sagde – bør indledes nu, selv om en våbenhvile for Syrien endnu ikke er blevet forhandlet. Planen vil henvende sig til unge syrere med erhvervskvalifikationer såvel som med

gymnasiale og universitetskvalifikationer.

Foto: fra Kobane i det nordlige Syrien.

USA: Chuck Hagel langer ud efter Obamas "Assad må gå"-mentalitet

15. januar 2016 – Ifølge *Defense News* langede den tidligere amerikanske forsvarsminister Chuck Hagel under en tale i onsdags i det nordatlantiske råd ud efter Obamaregeringen. "Vi har ladet os blive indfanget og lammet i vores Syrien-politik med erklæringen om, at "Assad må gå", sagde han og bemærkede, at Rusland og selv Iran begge har givet udtryk for, at de var villige til at samarbejde med USA imod ISIS, såfremt USA ville droppe politikken med regimeskift. Men, sagde Hagel, "der kan ikke, og vil ikke være nogen mulighed for en afgørelse eller løsning, før der er en stabil platform. Stabilitet i den forstand, at situationen er stabil nok til, at den kan tages til det næste niveau, hvor man forsøger at udrede, hvad det er, der foregår."

"Det er klart, at det indebærer samarbejde med Rusland", fortsatte Hagel. "Jeg mener, at det betyder samarbejde med iranerne. Jeg tror ikke, man vil se nogen mulighed for stabilitet i Mellemøsten, før russerne, iranerne, USA og de arabiske nationer tager del i det." Han tilføjede, at Assad i sidste instans vil træde tilbage, men "Det bør ikke binde os til alt muligt andet."

"Assad har aldrig været vores fjende. En brutal diktator? Ja. Der er mange brutale diktatorer derude. Jeg går ikke ind for brutale diktatorer. Men vi burde have lært fra Saddam Hussein og Gaddafi, at man kan fjerne en brutal diktator, men man må hellere forstå, hvad man får til gengæld", sagde Hagel. "Lad os komme frem til denne stabile platform."