

**Vi befinder os midt i en kamp
for USA's sjæl.**

»Hvorhen, USA:

Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«

LaRouche PAC Internationale

Webcast,

28. april, 2017

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britiskanført kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i 2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

***Vi må bruge det bedste fra alle kulturer
og skabe en virkelig universel
renæssance!***

Vært Matthew Ogden: God aften; det er 28. april, 2017; jeg er Matthew Ogden; velkommen til vores LPAC webcast fredag aften, her på larouchepac.com. Med os i studiet i dag har vi en

særlig gæst, Mike Billington fra *Executive Intelligence Review (EIR)*, som vi har inviteret i dag pga. af den aktuelle, strategiske situations ekstraordinære natur.

Vi står naturligvis blot to uger fra det meget betydningsfulde Bælt & Vej-topmøde, der finder sted i Beijing, Kina, den 14. og 15. maj; og det er altså præcis to uger fra i morgen. Flere dusin statsoverhoveder fra lande i hele verden har bekræftet deres deltagelse. Som vi har rapporteret, så er den russiske præsident Putin inviteret som æresgæst til at deltage i Bælt & Vej-topmødet. Vi fortsætter vores kampagne for at opfordre præsident Donald Trump til at deltage i dette topmøde, som særlig gæst; og for at bruge det som hans mulighed for at gengælde præsident Xi Jinpings tilbud om, at USA kan gå med i det nye paradigme for udvikling og fred, som repræsenteres af Bælt & Vej, eller den Nye Silkevej.

Vi befinder os midt i en kamp for USA's sjæl, for det amerikanske præsidentskabs sjæl. Vi ser denne kamp blive mere intens over spørgsmålet, »Hvorhen, USA?«, med den titel, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche gav den nylige Schiller Institut-konference i New York City – »Hvorhen, USA: Ny Silkevej, eller Atomkrig?«. Der er i løbet af den seneste måned, siden det meget ukloge angreb, som Trump-administrationen beordrede mod Syrien, sket det, at det er kommet offentligt frem, at der rent faktisk finder et britiskanført kup sted i USA imod Trump-administrationen. Indholdet er de løgne, de fabrikerede efterretninger, der er kommet fra britisk efterretning og er blevet bulldozet hen over præsident Trump; meget på samme måde, som Tony Blair brugte løgnene om maseødelæggelsesvåben i 2003 for at bringe USA ind i Irakkrigen.

Men dette var ikke et enestående tilfælde for Irak i 2003, eller for Syrien i 2017. Dette er den måde, hvorpå briterne har spillet deres imperiespil i det ene årti efter det andet; de har brugt USA som deres dumme kæmpe, med det formål, fortsat at holde verden opdelt. Denne del-og-hersk-strategi har været en britisk imperiestrategi i århundreder, og tiden

er inde til, at USA bliver intelligent og siger, »Det er slut! Vi vil ikke lade os bruge på denne måde; og vi vil tage imod det Nye Paradigme med 'win-win'-samarbejde«. Briterne og deres rejsekammerater i USA har sandelig været meget ligefremme i deres forsøg på at destabilisere og vælte Trump-administrationen, fordi de var meget bange for, at han ville gennemføre, hvad han har sagt. Ikke flere regimeskift; ikke flere imperialistiske krige, og vi vil samarbejde med Rusland og med Kina. Det sidste var lidt mere komplekst, men det om Rusland var meget klart. Men som vi ved, så har præsident Trump og præsident Xi Jinping fra Kina, siden topmødet med præsident Xi, haft meget tætte, personlige relationer og har regelmæssigt haft samtaler. Denne kommunikationskanal er afgørende, især med det brændpunkt, som nu er vokset frem direkte på Kinas grænse, i tilfældet Nordkorea.

Vi vil bruge tilfældet Nordkorea som en case study, men i sammenhæng med denne meget bredere opfattelse af opgøret over, hvilket system, der i fremtiden vil styre verden: det imperialistiske del-og-hersk, eller et nyt 'win-win'-paradigme for fred og udvikling. I denne sammenhæng har vores gæst her i dag, Mike Billington, netop udgivet en ny artikel, som er en meget vigtig artikel, I bør læse . Den er meget klar. Den har den provokerende titel og stiller spørgsmålet, »Hvorfor er Korea ikke allerede genforenet?«.

(Artiklen findes i EIR's seneste nummer, men er kun tilgængelig for abonnenter. Andre artikler kan læses gratis – se knappen EIR på vores hjemmeside. Du kan henvende dig til vores kontor mht. at tegne abonnement på EIR, tlf. 35 43 00 33 – red.)

Hermed giver jeg ordet til Mike og lader ham gennemgå lidt af indholdet, de aktuelle udviklinger, og så spørgsmålet, som han fremlægger i sin artikel:

(engelsk):

MICHAEL BILLINGTON: Thank you, Matt. In fact, the purpose of this article was to show that the answer to that question is that there is {no} legitimate reason that Korea is not peaceful and at least on the way to reunification already. I'll review some of that material here. But let me start. There were some extraordinary developments today; so let me give a short update on the crisis. It has to be noted that this is a very serious crisis, in the sense that were something like what happened with Syria, where Trump was – as Matthew said – lied to coerced into carrying out an attack against Syria for absolutely no reason; on totally false intelligence. Were that to happen in Korea, this would not be like an attack on an airbase in Syria. This would lead to a total disaster throughout all of East Asia and perhaps even global nuclear war. Whether or not they could take out North Korea's nuclear capacities, North Korea – as I'm sure people know, because it's all over the press – they have massive conventional capacity. Their armaments lie a total of 30 miles from the capital [of South Korea] Seoul, this beautiful, developed, advanced city; which could be just absolutely wiped out if there were a war. And they could possibly attack even Japan, let alone US bases within South Korea; so this would be a move of insanity. The Japanese and the South Koreans know this very well. I should point out that our friends in South Korea

note that there is no panic in South Korea; because they've been through these kinds of things before, and they simply assume that nobody is crazy enough to launch a preemptive attack on North Korea.

But, because of what happened in Syria, a lot of people – including all of us – were very concerned that the British might pull off another stunt and get Trump to go with this. What happened today is extremely important. Trump himself did an interview with Reuters, in which he said on North Korea, “We'd love to solve things diplomatically, but it's very difficult. But Xi Jinping is playing a crucial role in this. I believe he's trying very hard. I know he would like to be able to do something. Perhaps it's possible that he can't, but I think he'd like to be able to do something.” Then, most extraordinarily, he said about Kim Jung-Un, the leader in North Korea and grandson of the founder of North Korea, Kim Il-Sung, he said, “He's 27 years old. His father dies; he took over a regime. So, say what you want, that's not easy; especially at that age. Now I'm not giving him credit, or not giving him credit. I'm just saying it's a very hard thing to do. As to whether or not he's rational, I have no opinion, but I hope he's rational.” So, this is useful. He then returned again to the fact that he has very good personal relations with Xi Jinping: “I feel that he's doing everything in his power to help us with a big situation. I wouldn't want to be causing difficulty right now for him; and

I certainly would want to speak to him first before taking any action." Very useful.

Then Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, who chaired a meeting at the UN Security Council this morning of ministers, taking the place of that wacky lady we have in there right now speaking for the US too often. But Tillerson was not wacky; not at all. He was very clear in his presentation to the UN Security Council. He said, "For too long, the international community has been reactive in addressing North Korea. Those days must come to an end. Failing to act now on the most pressing security issue in the world may bring catastrophic consequences." Now, what does he mean to act now? The press headlines all over the world are "Trump and Tillerson Are Threatening War on North Korea; They Want To Act Now. It's the End of Strategic Patience", which was the policy of Obama. But keep in mind, "strategic patience" was not being patient; it was saying "We will not talk to North Korea. We refuse to talk to North Korea; we simply sit back and constantly increase the sanctions, increase the military build-up around their border until they do what we say." Which, of course, they won't do as long as they're being threatened. So, the question is, what does it mean to act now? Does it not mean, let's get back to talks, let's negotiate. What the President said about Kim Jung-Un is a very serious comment. Here's somebody who's in a difficult position.

Then, Tillerson said the following: "Our goal is not regime

change. Nor do we desire to threaten the North Korean people, or destabilize the Asia-Pacific region. Since 1995, the US has provided \$1.3 billion in aid to North Korea; and we look forward

to resuming our contributions once the country dismantles its weapons program.” Now that 1995 is a reference to something called the Agreed Framework, which I’m going to mention when I go

through some of the history on this.

Even more powerful, Tillerson – in an interview with NPR before he went into the UN Security Council – said the following: “You know, if you listen to the North Koreans, their

reason for having nuclear weapons is that they believe it is their only pathway to secure the ongoing existence of their regime. We hope to convince them that you do not these weapons

to secure the existence of your regime. We do not seek a collapse of the regime. We do seek an accelerated reunification

of the peninsula; we seek a de-nuclearized peninsula, and China

shares this goal with us.”

Now these are very positive steps; and they refute the British headlines and the {Washington Post} and {New York Times}

headlines that say “Get ready. We’re going to have a war in Korea.” So, this I think is extremely important. Let me go through a bit, some of the history of this; because even in my reviewing to write this article, I was a bit astonished at how close we were, twice before, to having a peaceful relationship in

the Korean peninsula and potentially even being reunified or being on the course to reunification.

The key point, I think, is that the British assets in the White House over the last 16 years – Bush and Cheney, and then

Obama, who served the British purpose of keeping the world divided East and West, as Matthew was pointing out. The key to doing that was making sure the US did not have good relations with Russia, and making sure the US did not have good relations with China. They used the South China Sea, they used Ukraine, they used Syria; all of these really had nothing to do with the South China Sea or Ukraine or Syria. They had to do with preventing any potential for the US and Russia to work together, and the US and China to work together. This is empire; that's the way empire works to keep the world divided, especially the East-West divide.

Let's go back to what Tillerson was referring to in 1995. What happened was that the North Koreans were part of the UN Non-Proliferation Treaty and non-nuclear development agreements; that they wouldn't develop nuclear weapons. Then in the early '90s, the IAEA – the International Atomic Energy Agency – believed that they were using small test reactor at Yongbyon. It was a graphite-moderated reactor which produces plutonium as a side-product of producing energy. So, they believed that they were hiding the plutonium being produced at the Yongbyon plant and using it produce weapons. This led to a very serious crisis.

The Clinton administration and their Defense Secretary at the time, William Perry – and I'll mention Perry a couple of times here – were very seriously considering a strategic take-out of the Yongbyon plant. Would that have been as serious as now? I

don't think so, but it would have been very serious. What happened is quite interesting. Former President Jimmy Carter went to North Korea – supposedly on his own; I'm sure this was very carefully worked out with President Clinton. But he went

on

his own; he met with Kim Il-Sung who was still alive at that time, the original head of North Korea. Out of that meeting, [they] came to an agreement that they would, through negotiations, come up with an agreement to solve the crisis; which they did. It was called the Agreed Framework of 1994. This was quite extraordinary. The North Koreans agreed to dismantle the Yongbyon nuclear plant and to stop construction on

two other plants that also were graphite and could produce plutonium. In exchange, the US built a nuclear plant for North

Korea. The US and the South Koreans were, and they began – they

didn't get very far – to build a large 1000-megawatt nuclear plant; but it was going to be a light water reactor that didn't

produce fuel for nuclear weapons. It was a safer form of a nuclear plant. In the meantime, they did provide oil, until they

got the nuclear plant going, for heating.

They agreed to start negotiations toward a peace agreement.

The US and North Korea are officially still at war. After the Korean War, there was not a peace agreement, but just an armistice to stop the fighting. Officially, there is no peace agreement; we do not have normal relations with North Korea.

We're actually in a state of war with North Korea. Clearly, the

North Koreans want to have a normal relationship with the US, not

to be constantly threatened. It was agreed that that would happen. This was moving forward quite well; it was slow, there

were problems. The US didn't live up to all its agreements; but

it was moving forward.

Then, extremely importantly, in 1998, Kim Dae-jung was

elected President of South Korea. Kim Dae-jung was a very interesting character; he had been a very strong opponent of the military regimes in South Korea. He had been thrown in jail several times, and there was a point where he was about to be executed; the US intervened and saved his life at that time. By 1998 things had changed; there was more of a move towards getting away from military regimes. They weren't exactly dictatorships; they were elected, but they were military regimes. Kim Dae-jung was elected. He immediately began to not only democratize domestic policies, but he set up something called the Sunshine Policy, which was we will work with North Korea on development; on opening up economic collaboration as the basis over the long term to establish peace between us and long-term reunification. So, Kim Dae-jung was in power. William Perry, the Defense Secretary – he had left being Defense Secretary by that time – but in a recent article on his history in all of this, said that towards the end of the Clinton administration, they were working to take that agreement even further. To have the North basically swear that they were giving up all weapons programs, in exchange for having a peace agreement and setting up normal relations between the two countries. It was so close that they had actually planned a Presidential visit to North Korea; that Clinton would visit North Korea. Unfortunately, as William Perry points out, the Clinton administration ran out; and Bush and Cheney came in. You may

remember that the Defense Secretary under Bush and Cheney was Colin Powell, a general; a fairly wise gentleman. He, in his first press conference, said we intend to engage with North Korea, and pick up where Clinton left off. Very important.

The

{next day}, Bush – with Cheney behind him and Paul Wolfowitz around – said “There will be no engagement with North Korea. They’re a dictatorship.” Sounds familiar, right? Dictators. “We will not talk to them. There will be no engagement.” And Colin Powell was basically put in his place, and the whole process began to fall apart; at least in terms of the US working,

collaborating, and playing a key role in collaboration with North

and South Korea, and Russia and China and Japan.

In any case, Kim Dae-jung and the others – Russia, China, Japan, North Korea, South Korea – continued the process. They basically said OK, that’s what Bush and Cheney are saying; but this is the future lives of our country and really of the world.

They moved forward. Kim Dae-jung, by 2002, was successful in setting up an extraordinary process. I should mention here that

Lyndon LaRouche’s ideas through that period – 2000-2002 – were all over South Korea. One of our members, Kathy Wolfe, was going

back and forth; she was meeting with people in the government, around the government, cultural people in South Korea. You may

remember that 1992 was when Lyndon LaRouche first came up with the idea at the time of the fall of Soviet Union, that we should

build a New Silk Road; we should have a Silk Road which would bridge Europe, Russia, China, and bring them together around a development process by building the New Silk Road – what the Chinese called the Eurasian Land-Bridge.

So, Kim Dae-jung, the South Korean President, built a

process he called the Iron Silk Road. I can assure you there was an influence there; that term didn't come out of nowhere. LaRouche had always said that the New Silk Road should go from Busan to Rotterdam. Busan is at the southern tip of South Korea. In other words, it had to go through North Korea, through Russia, and also through China into Europe. So, this idea of the Iron Silk Road was taking shape. It was taking shape so much – put that first map on [Fig. 1]. This is the map. The plan was to reconstruct two rail lines from South Korea into North Korea, which of course had been shut down. There was an armed Demilitarized Zone [DMZ] with fences on either side; and a no man's land in between. The idea was to build rail connections as you can see on the map. One of them going through the West, that would go up through Pyongyang and then into China. One that would head out towards the West and go up towards Russia into Vladivostok and hit the trans-Siberian railway in both directions, actually. Indeed, they began this process. Kim Dae-jung went to the North and met with Kim Jong-Il, who was the son of Kim Il-Sung; who was in power. Kim Il-Sung literally died the year they signed the Agreed Framework; but his son continued it. They made this process; they built this process up. By 2002, they literally opened up the Demilitarized Zone fences in both of those spots. Both the North-South and the [inaud; 21:43]; they cut the DMZ fences. Soldiers from both the North and South went into the DMZ and began clearing the mines that were all over the place in the DMZ. They reconstructed the rail line between

the two countries. In 2002 [Fig. 2] you had the extraordinary event of a railroad going across the DMZ; going from South Korea into North Korea. Symbolic, because there had to be a lot of construction on the rail lines to make them connect all the way through. But as you can see here, they had a big banner in the front; the Reunification of the Koreas. This was an extraordinary event, which we reported in {EIR} at some length; these pictures were in those articles back in 2002. It wasn't just the railroads. At the same time, Kim Dae-jung began an industrial park in North Korea – the Kaesong Industrial Park. This was across the border in North Korea with South Korean companies setting up factories in the North with North Korean labor. This grew to the point where recently there were 123 South Korean companies working in the North. This was obviously in the direction of setting up collaboration between the South Korean industry and the skilled but very poor workforce in the North. So, this was proceeding forward. They also set up six party talks. You've probably heard of the Six Party Talks. This was where Russia, China, Japan, North and South Korea, and the United States began a series of talks to try to regroup from the failure, the collapse, the shutdown by Bush and Cheney of the Agreed Framework. These meetings began. I won't go through the details of what happened; it's tedious, because every opportunity that Bush and Cheney had to say that

the North Koreans were cheating, the North Koreans are lying; you can't trust these vicious dictators. Every opportunity they had to sabotage forward direction; there were some positive agreements made. If you read the history of it from the US press, it'll say the North Koreans reneged. Well, it wasn't that way. It was sabotage by Bush and Cheney every chance they got. It went into the Obama administration and Obama continued sabotaging it every chance he got. So eventually, these fell apart under Obama. Obama then began this so-called "strategic patience"; which meant no talks, build up your military, impose sanctions. They might have said that the purpose was that they expected the North Korean regime to collapse; but that wasn't it at all. Bush and Cheney and Obama {wanted} North Korea to build nuclear weapons. Now why would somebody be so insane as to want North Korea to have nuclear weapons? First of all, they knew that they wouldn't use them, or they'd be blown off the face of the map. William Perry, in his recent article, said the North Korean regime is reckless, but they're not crazy; they're not suicidal. If they were to use a nuclear weapon preemptively, they know that the country would be obliterated overnight and their leadership entirely killed. They're not crazy. But why would the West want them to have nuclear weapons? Because the target is not North Korea; it's China. As long as you have this bugaboo of North Korea threatening the world with their nuclear weapons, you can go ahead and build up a massive force around China, the way

they

were in Europe where they're building anti-ballistic missiles and

moving NATO right up to the Russian border. Sending troops, tanks, planes right up to the Russian border. And in Asia doing

the same thing, supposedly to counter North Korea.

Most people have read about what's going on with these THAAD missiles. Literally just a couple of days ago, they actually set

up the THAAD missiles in South Korea; claiming that these are needed for the defense of South Korea against the North.

THAAD

– this is Terminal High Altitude missiles. North Korea is 30 miles from Seoul; they don't need to send 8 ICBMs up into space

and back down onto Seoul. The THAAD is useless against North Korea; it may be useless in general. But it's a threat to China

and to Russia, because with that you have the X-band radar, which

sees deep into Chinese territory and Russian Far East territory.

Which thereby gives them an advantage in a potential first strike, where they could take out – they fantasize – they could

take out the counterstrike capacity of China. The Chinese and Russians are saying this destroys the balance; we're going to have to put something together to counter this.

The other thing to point out is the obvious fact that North Korea sees very clearly what happened to Iraq; what happened to

Libya. Two countries that voluntarily gave up their nuclear weapons program with all kinds of praise and promises from the West, although they lied about Iraq. But as soon as they did, their nation was bombed back to the Stone Age, their leaders killed, and their country turned over to warring terrorist

forces.

So, the North Koreans are not crazy! And they're aware that, were they to give up their nuclear weapons program preemptively, they'd probably get the same regime change statement. Which is why it's so important Tillerson is saying we

are not going for regime change; which is what Trump had said throughout the campaign – that they weren't going to have regime

change. They also see that the targetting of China, they're aware of this, is part and parcel of this operation. You should

point out that the Obama administration had this TPP – this Trans-Pacific Partnership – which was also a part of the attempt

to isolate China. It didn't work; largely because the countries

there recognized that this was an attack on China, and they absolutely depend upon and appreciate the infrastructure development coming from China through the New Silk Road the New

Maritime Silk Road.

That's where this stood. And the last thing I'll bring up here is that the last administration in South Korea – Park Geun-hye; I'm sure that everybody has seen that she was recently

impeached and thrown out of office. The impeachment was upheld

by the Constitutional Court, and there's now an election which is

taking place in less than two weeks on May 9; which makes it all

the more absurd that the US deployed this THAAD missile system,

literally few days before an election in which the candidates are

both against the THAAD missile system. They rushed this in,

in

order to make it – hopefully, they think – make it impossible to be reversed. But we'll see. It was a foolish move by the US

to ram this through.

But in any case, Park Geun-hye started her administration – this is the daughter of Park Chung-hee, who was the brilliant leader who brought Korea out from being one of the poorest nations on Earth to being one of the great industrial, nuclear power producing and exporting countries in the world. His daughter, Park Geun-hye, was elected President. But unfortunately, she was elected mostly on her name. However, she

began her administration with what she called the Eurasian Vision. This was, in fact, part of the New Silk Road process. She saw working with Russia, China, and Japan, that Korea belonged to Eurasia; which obviously meant that it had to work through North Korea. Officially, the regime in the South under

her and her predecessor were not allowed to have relations with

North Korea, except for the Kaesong Industrial Park. But, Park

Geun-hye allowed three major South Korean companies – Hyundai Merchant Marine, which is their biggest ship company; KoRail, which is their state rail company; and POSCO, a huge steel company – to have a consortium with Russia and North Korea.

Literally, a consortium; a business agreement where the Russians

rebuilt a port in the north of North Korea; rebuilt the railroad

from Vladivostok down to that port. They were shipping Russian

coal into North Korea, where it was picked up by a South Korean

Hyundai ship; shipped to the South, put on South Korean rail and

shipped to a South Korean steel mills. This was, again like the
Kaesong, it was a model for the kind of collaboration which could
lead towards long-term economic progress and development and trust; and lead towards a reunification.
Then, without going into details, the North Koreans tested I think it was the fourth of their nuclear tests. Everybody knew
it was going to happen for the reasons I said. They're not going
to give this up unless they can get an honest pledge that there's
not going to be a war, a regime change against them. They did;
and unfortunately, Park Geun-hye who was weak, capitulated entirely to Obama. She shut everything down; shut down even the
Kaesong Industrial Plant which had been up for 15 years, which killed their own industries. Shut down the [inaud; 31:25]
process of the rail, and basically cut off all ties to the North
all together on behalf of Obama, on behalf of a war against China. Despite the fact that in 2015, she had gone to Beijing on
the 70th anniversary of World War II's victory against the Japanese and the Germans. She'd gone there and stood on the podium with Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin; the three of them standing together, honoring the war victory. Then she comes back
and basically pulls the plug on the whole thing.
She wasn't impeached because of that; she was impeached because of a corruption case within South Korea. But I'm certain
to this led to the loss of any trust in her; that she'd undermined her own industries; that she'd capitulated to an American policy, that she was going ahead with this THAAD

deployment. She lost the industry, she lost the left factions that were about to win the election, the more liberal side.

So,

this was a real disaster for South Korea, and potentially for the world.

Now, we have Trump; we have Xi Jinping; we have Abe in Japan working very closely with Putin. And we're going to have a new

regime in South Korea. I won't go into exactly who these guys are; but in general, both the leading candidates want to work with Russia and China and want to open up better relations with

the North. So, you have the geometry. If Trump goes with the Silk Road process, you have a geometry which is going to end this

last British outpost of destabilization and instability – this North Korea monster. The monster issue; it's not that North Korea is a monster. But this has served the British imperial purpose of keeping the US at a point of conflict with Russia and

China. If we can solve that, then all of Asia is now unified, except for the North Korea issue. With the election in the Philippines of Duterte, his rejection of the war policy in the South China Sea, it basically united all the Southeast Asian countries; all ten of them are now united around working with China. Not cutting off ties to the US, but working with China.

So, you have tremendous potential; and it's all really coming down to the next very short period. Weeks, months at most. A lot of this is going to be determined in the very near

term. As LaRouche has always insisted, to look at any particular

crisis – like the North Korean crisis – you have to look at it in the context of the entire world; and certainly in the context

of the Eurasian potential of the New Silk Road. I think there's

every reason to be confident that some sort of talks are being discussed privately; not just threats. That this is going to move forward in the context of the Silk Road. As Matthew mentioned, if Trump were to go to this meeting on May 14 and 15,

Abe would probably then go from Japan; and there's no question that we would have a peace process that would be almost unstoppable, no matter what the British claim they're going to unleash.

So, this is a very great moment in history. A dangerous, but potentially great optimism is in hand.

OGDEN: And you can tell that the British are definitely very anxious of what could be lurking around the corner for the

future of their divide and conquer strategy. I know we were talking before the show, Mike, about the very appropriate and incisive statements that were made by the Russian representative

at that meeting at the United Nations Security Council. Here's

the quote. This is the Russian Deputy Permanent Representative

to the UN, Vladimir Safronkov, and he turned to Matthew Rycroft,

who is the British Permanent Representative at the United Nations

Security Council, and he said the following: "The essence is, and everyone in the United Nations knows this very well, is that

you are afraid. You have been losing sleep over the fact that we

might be working together with the United States; cooperating with the United States. That is your fear. You are doing everything to make sure that this kind of cooperation be

undermined.”

BILLINGTON: This has had a tremendous impact, because people know that LaRouche has argued all the last 50 years, that the problem is the British Empire. Almost nobody of stature has ever acknowledged that continuing role of the British Empire until this, really.

I learned today that Ambassador Rycroft, who was a close ally and advisor to Tony Blair, and was one of the authors of the “dodgy dossier” which started the Iraq War in the first place. I

learned today from our friends in England, that Rycroft was meeting today with the head of the White Helmets; the terrorist

so-called “humanitarian” group that works with al-Qaeda and al-Nusra, and who provided the fake evidence of Assad carrying out a chemical weapons attack. So, this is confirmation that this open collaboration with a terrorist organization funded by

the British, and functioning to try to start a war in Syria for

which we can and must prevent that in league with this overall fight to bring about the New Silk Road, not a new war.

OGDEN: Let me end with this, and I’ll let you respond to it. I think as everybody knows, a very significant personality

in Korea and that area of the world, was the great US General Douglas MacArthur. In the aftermath of the original Korean War,

Douglas MacArthur came back to the United States, and he reported

back to Congress. This is a quote from MacArthur’s speech to a

Joint Session of Congress in 1951. I think it gets directly at the much broader point that Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have been making at the present time about what is really at stake, and what is necessary if we're going to move civilization into a new paradigm of survival. This is what Douglas MacArthur said: "Military alliances, balances of power, leagues of nations, all in turn fail; leaving the only path to be by way of the crucible of war. The utter destructiveness of war now blocks out this alternative. We have had our last chance. If we will not devise some greater and more equitable system, Armageddon will be at our door. The problem, basically, is theological and involves a spiritual recrudescence and improvement of human character that will synchronize with our almost matchless advances in science, art, literature, and all material and cultural developments of the past 2000 years. It must be of the spirit if we are to save the flesh."

So Mike, you were one of the speakers at the conference the Schiller Institute sponsored in New York City two weeks ago. The subject of that conference was not only the diplomatic and strategic cooperation which is necessary between the United States and China right now, the United States joining the New Silk Road and the Belt and Road Initiative. It was also a dialogue of civilizations; a dialogue of the greatest parts of these two great cultures – European culture and Chinese culture.

In a form where Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in a really profound way,

stretching across generations, across centuries, across millennia

really put the great German poet, the revolutionary poet and philosopher Friedrich Schiller in dialogue with the poet and philosopher who really is the basis of all of modern Chinese civilization – Confucius. That dialogue she set up between Friedrich Schiller and Confucius, speaking to each other across

the span of millennia and across literally two sides of the world, created the kind of image of mankind, the possibility of a

mankind which could emerge if we were to finally put an end to this imperial system of dividing the East and the West and bringing these two great cultures into a dialogue with each other.

So, you presented at that conference, and maybe just in that context

BILLINGTON: Those are available now. The new {EIR} that came out today has Helga's speech and a speech by Patrick Ho, who

is a very good friend of ours from China, from Hong Kong, who is

campaigning all over the world for the New Silk Road. It's three

conferences now that we've done together. He gave a presentation

then on Confucian thought and Western thought; but in that presentation, he showed a very serious problem which I had addressed over my long years of sabbatical leave in prison, where

I studied extensively the Chinese culture and the relationship between Confucian culture and the Western Christian Renaissance.

Patrick didn't take up that challenge for this speech; so he gave

a speech which fell prey to exactly what I then spoke about.

That speech is also in the {EIR} this week; or you can watch it on the Schiller Institute website. It's very important, because what I learned in studying this, is what the British set about – as they do in every colony that they took over – in profiling the backward tendencies within that culture and then grasping those backwards tendencies that want to stay primitive, stay backwards; and defining those to be the natural ideology of that country.

In the case of China, they recognized that Confucianism was a very great threat to their ability to control and keep China backwards; because it's a vision like Platonism in the West. And as Helga had brilliantly shown, like the Renaissance thinking in Europe that professed progress. It valued the mind of the individual as that which made him human; it's the creative power of the human mind. Against that, the British said no, no, Confucianism is keeping you backwards because it's formal and it's structured. You have to go back to the roots of Taoism, which basically tells the peasant that he's a happy peasant; he's happy not knowing about science and technology. Stay backwards.

Or the so-called "legalist" ideology which was punishment and reward; you treat people like animals. You punish or reward them like you do a dog, to make them do what you want them to do. The unfortunate reality is that the British deployed their top guns – especially Bertrand Russell – into China; especially when Sun Yat-sen came along promoting the American System. They

sent Bertrand Russell in to poison that system; to denounce Confucianism; to promote the happy peasant and the Taoist ideology. Unfortunately, this was deeply ingrained into the Chinese culture, so that even today, Xi Jinping, who is fighting to bring that country forward, is faced with this kind of thought in China. And, what they presented to the Chinese as “Western thought” so-called, was not Leibniz and Schiller and Nicholas of Cusa; the people who gave us the Renaissance, who gave rise to modern science. But rather, they said, “We, the British, defeated you because we have wealth and power. How do we have wealth and power? It’s that we believe in Darwinism, social Darwinism; that the strong must crush the weak. That’s the way you get strong. So, if you want to be strong, then you should be like us and believe that Western thought – i.e., British empirical anti-human thought – is what you should aspire to. I won’t go into more details, but I encourage you to read it; because these are fundamental debates. This question of how can we create a renaissance, which crosses every great culture; because every great culture has great moments and bad moments, bad tendencies. Weak tendencies, and strong tendencies which honor the human creative power; the other which tries to keep people enslaved as master and slave. We have to pull out the best of every culture throughout the world. Islam; Judaism; Christianity; Confucianism; the Muslim tradition of the Baghdad Caliphate. All of these are there – the Indian Gupta period. We can pull these together and have a Renaissance which is not this part of the world as opposed to that part of the world; but is truly universal. Of man with a common aim for mankind as

Helga likes to say.

This is within our grasp; this could truly be the end of war for all mankind. People say, "Oh, that's naïve; because human nature is war-like." Well, {human nature} is not; human nature

is creative. It's the bestial imposition of this backward ideology on peoples which leads to wars. If we had a true, global renaissance based on science and technology, great culture

and great music, there's no reason to think we could not end the

scourge of war once and for all; as that beautiful quote from Douglas MacArthur – which I'd never heard – clearly indicates. These are philosophic and theological issues; but they're in our

grasp today. This is what the LaRouche Movement has been about

since its inception; and it's now literally within our grasp.

OGDEN: Thank you very much, Mike. This material is available; Mike's article is going to be published. This is in

the {Executive Intelligence Review}, and it will be made available through LaRouche PAC as well. As Mike said, all of the

proceedings of that Schiller Institute conference in New York are

also available. LaRouche PAC also made a video a couple of years

ago on the question of the reunification of Korea and some of these initiatives from the 1990s and these reunification efforts.

So, we'll make that video also available; it will be linked in the description of this video. But I think that's a wonderful discussion; and it's extraordinarily valuable for people to have

this view, this depth of background. But also this vision of

what is possible. Douglas MacArthur's point that in essence this is a spiritual, this is a theological question. Will mankind come to know himself as a creative species? Will we change the way that man views himself, which is what is necessary if we are to survive? The vehicle for doing that is this type of "win-win" development projects; that's the true name of peace. So, I think we have a wonderful microcosm in what we just used as a case study in Korea; but this type of thinking is what is so urgently necessary for the entire world. That's absolutely the value of what the LaRouche Movement has done over the last several decades, and continues to represent on this planet today. So thank you, Mike. And thank you all for tuning in, and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com.