

The Oasis Plan: LaRouche's Vision for Peace and Economic Development in Southwest Asia (Middle East), with English transcript

The Oasis Plan:
LaRouche's Vision for Southwest Asia

Released February 11, 2024 by the LaRouche Organization at
this permanent link.

(The video is currently on the Rumble platform, but will move
to the LaRouche Organization's YouTube channel on February 17
or 18.)

Cease-fire now!

The whole world is witness to the horrors being inflicted upon
the Palestinian people, shared with us every day in video
form. But the destruction continues, actively supported by the
United States and a diminishing number of other countries.
Humanity's moral fitness to survive is being tested. The
horror show must end, starting with an immediate,
unconditional ceasefire.

At the time we are recording, South Africa's action against
Israel for genocide at the International Court of Justice will
be heard in just a few days.

Peace is possible, but it is not the peace of a return to

October 6! Before the Hamas invasion of October 7, the Palestinian people and the whole region popularly known as the Middle East were living in a terrible reality, as a cauldron of conflict deliberately maintained for geopolitical aims, an unsustainable and unjust tension.

The solution requires the recognition of a Palestinian state, in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 242, which was unanimously adopted by the Security Council in 1967. This is the first step towards a long-term solution, such as the two-state solution supported by Schiller Institute founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

The solution though, is not local, is not regional; it has to be international today. China has proposed an international peace conference to develop a lasting vision for realizing Palestinian-Israeli and Arab-Israeli peace.

The mistakes that led to the lost chance of the 1993 Oslo agreement must not be repeated. Security guarantees for all parties in the region must be agreed upon. And this includes finding solutions for the potentially explosive situations elsewhere, in Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, and Sudan, all products of decades of dangerous geopolitics.

The Oasis Plan, proposed by Lyndon LaRouche

But without economic development, without a viable and meaningful path of progress into the future, political agreements in themselves are unsustainable. The people of the region must know that their children will enjoy a better future, a better life. Peace through economic development is the only successful basis for a lasting, just peace in the region. This is what Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin came to realize – there is no purely military basis for peace or security; development is essential.

A template for peace through economic development already exists, in the form of the LaRouche program of building a

World Land-Bridge, today exemplified by China's Belt and Road Initiative joined by more than 150 nations, including all the neighbors of Palestine and Israel. The World Land-Bridge is not only a specific plan for growth; it is a rejection of anti-growth hegemonism in the form of neo-colonialism and green Malthusianism.

A strong economic reconstruction and development plan is needed for a viable Palestinian state, in particular.

Lyndon LaRouche (1922-2019) laid it out 30 years ago. [Lyndon LaRouche was an American economist and statesman who founded the LaRouche political movement, which includes the Schiller Institute.]

It is called the Oasis Plan.

Immediately after the 1993 signing of the Oslo Accord in the White House by Israeli and Palestinian leaders, Lyndon LaRouche and his associates urged those parties *and the international community* to implement economic development projects to sustain, to advance the peace process. LaRouche and his associates developed the Oasis Plan, which included both certain economic aspects of Annex IV of the 1993 Oslo Accord – which was called the “Protocol on Israeli–Palestinian Cooperation Concerning Regional Development Programs” – plus it called for additional crucial water and power and other projects that LaRouche had noted were needed in the mid-1970s.

The Oasis Plan focused primarily on addressing the greatest barrier to development in the region – the shortage of fresh water – through the construction of a network of desalination plants that could turn the plentiful seawater into freshwater. And these plants would not only be on the Mediterranean coast; they would be built along two new canals: one connecting the Red Sea with the Dead Sea, and another connecting the Dead Sea to the Mediterranean. To be clear, these new canals or aqueducts are not for cargo shipping, as an alternative to the

Suez Canal – their purpose is to transport water. Because of the low elevation of the Dead Sea, which is more than 400 meters below sea level, the flowing water could also provide hydropower electricity along the way, which could help to power the desalination plants and development more generally. The plants could also be powered by the large quantities of natural gas off the shores of Gaza, Israel, Lebanon, Syria and Egypt. But most importantly, the Oasis Plan calls for going beyond hydropower and chemical fuels altogether, through the construction of nuclear power complexes along these canals and on the shores of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, to produce plentiful electricity and to desalinate seawater to green the vast deserts of the region and to power an industrialization process in Palestine, Israel, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt.

The use of nuclear power for energy would liberate the region's hydrocarbon resources to be used chemically, to produce industrial materials through intermediate petrochemical products.

The nuclear powered complexes could use inherently safe pebble-bed high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, of the type just brought into operation in Shidao Bay, China.

The new man-made rivers created by desalination will tremendously expand the potential for agro-industrial development across the region, making the deserts – and the economies – bloom!

LaRouche explained the necessity of developing new sources of water in a 1994 speech. LaRouche:

“One cannot meet the indices of water consumption for a modern population, for both the Palestinian and Israeli populations, under present conditions. There is a conflict over water because the Israelis have, frankly, been using their conquests to take water from everybody. It's one of the

conflicts with Syria on the Golan Heights issue. It involves, in Lebanon, the Litani River, and things of that sort.”

The power and water development have to be accompanied by a network of transportation infrastructure upgrading the physical connectivity between all the nations of the region, turning a region of conflict, a barrier to connectivity, into a hub of interaction, into a crossroads.

A highway connecting the West Bank with the Gaza Strip, linking the Palestinian state, is an absolutely essential feature of this network.

Regional highways and rail networks will allow the entire area to operate from a higher economic platform.

LaRouche also proposed an expansion of the Suez Canal, with industrial zones on both sides, a task that has been accomplished by Egypt in recent years.

LaRouche argued since 1975 that this region, which is the crossroads of civilization and located geographically between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean and between Europe, Asia, and Africa, has a unique position as an industrial and logistics hub. Oil and natural gas will be feedstocks for industrial production of plastics, paints, and many other useful materials, rather than being exported as a raw material, to be used primarily for simple combustion.

The upgrading of connectivity to enable higher levels of development has been a key feature of the 2013 China-proposed Belt and Road Initiative.

Using this region as a land-bridge between continents, with the major powers like the U.S., China, Russia, and the EU contributing to its development, will stabilize the area and, along the way, help cement the better relations among the superpowers that will have been necessary to bring it into being.

Scientific, technological, and cultural cooperation and exchanges are key elements in the transformative process the Oasis Plan represents.

By cooperating to fight the desert, rather than each other, the people of the region will better be able to recognize the humanity in each other, the common capability of human beings to discover principles of nature and to transform our relationship to the environment around us. There are no human animals.

So, how will we pay for all this, and who's paying?

Funding

Part of the funding will come from financial aid, made more possible by beating swords into plowshares, by converting the industrial and research capabilities of the military-financial complex into productive uses, as detailed in a study by EIR.

Apart from international aid, \$100 billion in *credit* can be realized, over a decade, for the reconstruction of Palestinian areas and the full building out of the Oasis Plan infrastructure. This can be organized through development banks associated with BRICS-plus nations, including the Islamic Development Bank in Saudi Arabia; the New Development Bank headquartered in China; and other national development banks of the Southwest Asia region. The sovereign wealth funds of the major regional BRICS-plus nations can help capitalize these development banks for this purpose. The countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council have sovereign wealth funds holding some \$4 *trillion* worth of capital. This has traditionally been placed in financial, banking or real estate assets of the bankrupt trans-Atlantic system. Now, these countries are looking for more productive investments instead, in Eurasia and Africa.

This investment can be concessionary development loans from these banks – for example of 20 years duration with interest

rates of 2% and an initial grace period of 5 years if necessary.

The debt service payments on these development loans, at least if they're made in the immediate future, would have to be made by the State of Israel, as the state currently occupying and taxing the entire area of Israel and Palestine today. The United States, and perhaps other nations, as determined at an international peace and development conference, should be the guarantor for these debt service payments.

The organization of the reconstruction work and building of the Oasis Plan infrastructures can be organized under authority of the United Nations Peacekeeping Missions Military Logistics Unit, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Refugees in Palestine, and any other authorities that are required.

These arrangements should all be formally agreed upon by the nations involved in the framework of an international peace conference on Israel and Palestine, which must urgently be organized. International commitments to development, both through these particular projects and *as a paradigm*, must be made.

A peace vision

Achieving peace in Southwest Asia, not only between Israelis and Palestinians, but among all the countries of the entire region, will mark a new epoch in human history, as a region known for conflict transforms into one of connectivity, standing at the crossroads of three continents.

The Oasis Plan is not some distant aspiration of what can be achieved years in the future *after* the peace. It is only through a paradigm of international relations supporting this approach, that peace is even possible!

An end to the killing, a ceasefire is urgently needed now. But

just as urgently is needed a vision for durable peace that will, at long last, shape a peaceful and prosperous destiny for the region.

Every minute the war continues brings more death, more bitterness, more difficulty in achieving shared prosperity. It must end now!

Justice for those who have died, those who have been injured, those who have suffered, demands that the awful violence awaken the conscience and intellect of the international community, not simply to say “never again” but to end, forever, the geopolitical paradigm that is the origin of most conflict in the world today. The Oasis Plan cannot today be implemented as a purely regional plan – a new security and development architecture is required globally.

The voices of the Global South are becoming stronger and more confident. Moral authority, now and in the future, depends on how we act today.

LaRouche wrote in 1978:

“The only human thing is to give the lives and suffering of the dead meaning, not merely by establishing peace in the Middle East, but by establishing the basis for peace which gives fulfillment to the lives of the present and future generations of the Palestinians and other Arabs, and thus purpose and fulfillment to the sacred lives of the dead.”

This applies to Israelis as well.

How about you? Will you act to give meaning to the lives of those who have perished? Will you be a voice for peace and development?

Epilogue

I'd like to thank you for watching. To learn more about the Oasis Plan and for ways to support The LaRouche Organization's

efforts to make it a reality, follow the link here and in the video description. And if you haven't already subscribed and turned on notifications, be sure to do that to stay up to date on the progress of this vision.

Skriv under for at støtte Oase-planen:
https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/support_the_larouche_oasis_plan_for_peace_and_development_in_southwest_asia

Schiller Instituttets Strasbourg konference: Videoer og et engelsk afskrift af alle fem paneler

Panel 1 findes ovenover.

Panel 2:

Panel 3:

Panel 4:

Panel 5:

Koncerten kommer forhåbentligt senere.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Interview: Li Xing, phd: Den fælles erklæring fra Kina og Rusland af 4. februar: En erklæring om en ny æra og en ny verdensorden

22. februar 2022 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark gennemførte et 45-minutters interview med Dr. Li Xing, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Institut for Politik og Samfund, Det Humanistiske og Samfundsvidenskabelige Fakultet, Aalborg Universitet, Danmark.

Dr. Li beskriver indholdet af den fælles erklæring af 4. februar 2022 mellem Kina og Rusland og analyserer, hvad dette betyder for forbindelserne mellem Kina og Rusland, men også for resten af verden. De emner, der diskuteres, omfatter unipolaritet eller multipolaritet, et nyt forhold mellem nationer, demokrati, økonomisk udvikling, en amerikansk domineret "regelbaseret orden" eller en FN-baseret orden, behovet for en ny international sikkerhedsarkitektur, som efterlyst af Helga Zepp-LaRouche, og hvordan Kina vil reagere på de kraftige vestlige sanktioner mod Rusland, der er udløst af Ukraine-krisen.

Dr. Li havde også givet Schiller Instituttet et interview den 26. januar med titlen "Samarbejd med Kina": Det er ikke fjenden".

Afskrift på engelsk:

Interview: Li Xing, PhD

The China-Russia Feb. 4 Joint Statement:

A Declaration of a New Era and New World Order

Michelle Rasmussen: Presidents Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin held a summit meeting on the sidelines of the Beijing Olympics and issued a statement on Feb. 4 called Joint Statement of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China on the International Relations Entering a New Era and the Global Sustainable Development. Schiller Institute founder and international President Helga Zepp-LaRouche said that this signals a new era in international relations. To discuss the content and implications of the development, I am pleased to interview Dr. Li Xing, Professor of Development and International Relations in the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences from Aalborg University in Denmark. Dr. Li also gave the Schiller Institute an interview on Jan. 26 of this year, entitled "Cooperate with China. It Is not the Enemy."

Before we go into details, can you please give us your assessment of the overall importance of the summit and statement, including what it means for relations between China and Russia, and China-Russian relations with the rest of the world. And at the end of the interview, we will also discuss what it means in the current, very tense situation between Russia and NATO.

Li Xing: Thank you Michelle for your invitation. It's my pleasure to be invited again by the Schiller Institute.

First of all let me emphasize that it is a landmark document. Why? Because the document emphasizes what I call a "new era," declaring a shift in the world order, a multipolar world order, in which the U.S. and the West are not the only rule-makers, and Russia and China take the lead, and lay out a set of principles and a shared worldview. This is my first general summary.

Second, unlike the U.S./NATO alliance, the China-Russia relationship is described by the joint document as a "close comprehensive strategic partnership." In Putin's early words, he said, "The China-Russia relationship is a relationship that probably cannot be compared with anything in the world." The

relationship is not “aimed against any other countries.” It is “superior to the political and military alliances of the Cold War era,” referring to the U.S.-NATO alliance. It also echoes Xi Jinping’s recent statement, that “the relationship even exceeds an alliance in its closeness and effectiveness.” So the document tries to demonstrate that the China-Russia relationship is a good example of interstate relationships.

Rasmussen: You have characterized the introduction as “a conceptual understanding and analysis of global changes and transformations taking place in the current era.” It especially refers to the transformation from a unipolar to a multipolar world. Can you please explain how the statement addresses this, and what it means?

Li: In the beginning of this statement, it puts forward both countries’ conceptual understanding of the world order, which is characterized as “multipolarity, economic globalization, the advent of information society, cultural diversity, transformation of the global governance architecture and world order; there is increasing interrelation and interdependence between the States; a trend has emerged towards redistribution of power in the world.” [emphasis added by Li] “Redistribution of power in the world.” This is what the part emphasizes.

Second, this part also clearly sets up a series of analyses, arguments and discourses to demonstrate both countries’ understanding, and to emphasize the fact that the world order has entered a new era. Again, “new era” are the key words for this document.

Lastly, in this beginning part of the joint statement, it shows both Russia and China’s grand worldview that pave the foundation for the two countries’ broad consensus on almost all issues of the world, which we will deal with one by one later on.

Rasmussen: Part 1 is about the question of democracy, and it starts by saying: “The sides” —that is, China and Russia—“share the understanding that democracy is a universal

human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States, and that its promotion and protection is a common responsibility of the entire world community.”

But the charge is that China and Russia are not democratic, but rather autocratic. This is one of the leading accusations by those in the West who are trying to maintain a unipolar world, and they portray the world as a battle between the democrats and the autocrats. How does the document respond to this, and treat the idea of democracy?

Li: Actually, this document utilizes a large amount of space to discuss this point. First, the joint statement points out that “democracy”—including human rights—is a universal human value, rather than a privilege of a limited number of States.” So here it implies that the concept of democracy must not be defined by the West alone. The West cannot singlehandedly define which country is autocratic and which country is democratic.

Second, the joint document emphasizes that their standpoint is that there is no universal one-form document, or human rights standard. Different countries have different cultures, histories, different social-political systems in a multipolar world. We have to respect the way each country chooses their own social-political system, and also the tradition of other states.

Third, it signals a strong critique of the West, and in this part, there are a lot of criticisms toward the West. That is, that the West has a tendency to weaponize the issue of democracy and human rights, and very often uses it as a tool to interfere in other countries’ internal affairs. It is completely wrong for the U.S. and the West to impose their own “democratic standards” on other countries, and to monopolize the right to assess the level of compliance with democratic criteria, and to draw a dividing line on the basis of ideology, including by establishing exclusive blocs and lines of convenience, and this is very bad, according to these two countries, that the West tends to use democracy and human

rights to interfere into other countries' internal affairs, and China really suffers a lot from this point.

Rasmussen: How would you say democracy works in China?

Li: I would argue that if we use Western standards to define democracy, then definitely, China is not a democracy. In a Western version of democracy, China does not have a multi-party system, China does not have elections. But the point is, how the West will respond to the fact that according to major Western sources, survey data sources, throughout many years, that the Chinese people's confidence in their government is the highest in the whole world. And the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese state receive the highest approval from the Chinese population according to those data. And also China has reached very high, rapid economic development, under the so-called "non-democratic government." Now, how can the West explain these issues? Many democratic countries suffer from economic backwardness and underdevelopment.

So, as to the form of governance in China, I think it is the Chinese people, themselves, who should make the judgment.

Rasmussen: Let's move on to part 2, which is about coordinating economic development initiatives, including harmonizing the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, and also the Russian Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), even more, and taking initiatives to create economic development, where they emphasize the role of scientific research in generating economic growth, something that Lyndon LaRouche and our movement have had as a priority concept. And also increasing healthcare and pandemic response in poor countries. What do you see as the significance of this call for increasing economic development cooperation?

Li: Yes. I also read this part of the document very carefully. This part shows a clear difference in approach between the West and the U.S. on the one side, and China-Russia on the other side. While the West is emphasizing, or holding the flag

of democracy and human rights, China-Russia actually emphasize that peace, development and cooperation lies at the core of the modern international system. So, according to the understanding of Russia and China, development is the key driver in ensuring the prosperity of other nations, even though democracy and human rights are important, but development must be the core. So it implies that good development will lead the country in the direction of democracy, but not defined solely by the West, the concept of democracy.

Second, that following this line of understanding, then China's Belt and Road Initiative and Russia's Eurasian Economic Union are good examples of interregional cooperation. So they actually use the Belt and Road, and also Russia's Eurasia Economic Union, as good examples. One interesting point I want to emphasize is that both countries emphasize scientific and technological development, and "open, equal, and fair conditions." I think here, there is a kind of implicit criticism toward the United States, which has been conducting sanctions against Chinese tech companies, for example, Huawei, or other high-tech companies.

Finally, I'll remark here that both countries show their commitment to the Paris Agreement and to combat COVID-19, and these two issues are the most vital issues for the international community today. So it is a core for every country to emphasize these two vital issues: climate change, Paris Agreement, on the one side, and COVID-19 on the other side.

Rasmussen: Yes, I can add that Helga Zepp-LaRouche has initiated a proposal which she calls Operation Ibn Sina, which deals with the terrible humanitarian catastrophe in Afghanistan, leading off with creating a modern health system in every country. And if we could get much more international cooperation for building a modern health system, having the economic development which gives the basis for the population to have the immunology to resist disease, this would be a very

important field for economic development, which means life and death at this moment.

Li: I fully agree with Helga's understanding and call.

Rasmussen: As to part 3, this is about the increasing, dangerous international security situation, with a sharp critique of Western attitudes and actions. And the statement reads: "No State can or should ensure its own security separately from the security of the rest of the world and at the expense of the security of other States." And here, China addresses Russia's concerns and criticizes NATO's expansion eastward after the Fall of the Berlin Wall. And Russia addresses China's concerns by reaffirming the One-China principle and concerns about building different regional alliances against China –the Quad and AUKUS. It also praises the recent P5 statement against nuclear war.

Can you say more about China's and Russia's concerns? And do you think this is a call for a new international security architecture?

Li: Yes. If you read the document carefully, and this part on international security architecture, or their understanding of international security, occupied quite a large space. So it is a very important part for China and Russia.

In this part, the statement is actually bluntly clear about their mutual support for each other's national security concerns. For Russia, it is connected with the Ukraine crisis, but the document does not mention Ukraine specifically, but it is connected. For China, it is the Taiwan issue, definitely. So they show their mutual support for each other.

On Russia's concern for its national security, both countries oppose "further enlargement of NATO," and "respect the sovereignty, security and interests of other countries." And it clearly pronounced, there will be no peace if states "seek to obtain, directly or indirectly, unilateral military advantages to the detriment of the security of others." The document claims that the NATO plan to enlarge its membership

to encircle Russia will mean security for the Western side, but it is a danger for Russia. It is a national security concern.

On the Taiwan issue, Russia reconfirms that Taiwan is part of China—the One-China policy—and it is against any form of Taiwan independence.

Third, the joint statement also openly criticized the formation of closed blocs, as what you mentioned about the Quad. The document does not mention the Quad, but it does mention AUKUS. The document shows that both countries oppose U.S.-led military camps, or security camps in the Asia-Pacific region, definitely implying the Quad and AUKUS, and it points out the negative impact of the United States Indo-Pacific strategy.

Finally, the two countries call for a new international security architecture, with “equitable, open and inclusive security system ... that is not directed against third countries and that promotes peace, stability and prosperity.” So this part is very important for China and Russia to challenge the traditional international security architecture, and call for a new international security architecture, which I will touch on a bit later.

Rasmussen: Many political spokesmen in the West have criticized Russia and China for not adhering to the “rules-based order” and here, in part 4, China and Russia write that they “strongly advocate the international system with the central coordinating role of the United Nations in international affairs, defend the world order based on international law, including the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, advance multipolarity and promote the democratization of international relations, together create an even more prospering, stable, and just world, jointly build international relations of a new type.”

And it continues: “The Russian side notes the significance of [Xi Jinping’s] concept of constructing a ‘community of common destiny for mankind...’”

Can you say more about the significance of this section, about global governance and the difference between the question of the “rules-based order” and an order based on international law, as laid out by the United Nations Charter?

Li: Yes. This part is extremely interesting, because it touches upon the mental clashes between China-Russia on the one side, and the U.S. and West on the other side, about the “rules-based order.” China, in particular, has been criticized a lot, as you also mentioned, that China has been accused by the U.S. of not following the “rules-based order.” If you remember the dialogue between a Chinese delegation and a U.S. delegation in Alaska in December two years ago, then we still remember the clash, that the Chinese claim that the U.S. rules-based order does not represent the global rules-based order, rather the United Nations—China emphasizes that the United Nations should play the central coordination role in international affairs. But the United States does not really like the UN-based structure, which is based on one-country/one-vote. So if we trace UN voting, we could easily find that the United States very often suffers from many setbacks when it comes to UN voting on many issues. So that’s why China emphasizes the United Nations rules-based order, whereas United States prefers a U.S. rules-based order.

And this joint statement also calls for advancing multipolarity and promoting democratization of international relations. In my interpretation, democratization of international relations implies that the power structure embedded in the Bretton Woods system, which was created by the United States after the Second World War, does not really reflect the new era, as I pointed out earlier. China and Russia think reforms are needed to reflect the new era. This definitely, again, from my interpretation, refers to international financial institutions like the World Bank, and the IMF, where Chinese voting power is proportionally weaker than it should have been, according to its economic size.

And also the joint statement mentions the China foreign

policy, as you mentioned in your question, “community of common destiny for mankind,” which was raised by President Xi Jinping. And in this nexus China’s Belt and Road Initiative is a good example, seen from China’s point of view, a good example of community of common destiny for mankind, in which the Belt and Road intends to promote, through worldwide infrastructure investment, the formation of a new global economic order, through creating a community of shared interest, and the community of shared responsibilities.

Unfortunately, the West does not really like both a “community of common destiny for mankind,” and the Belt and Road Initiative, because they are interpreted as the Chinese agenda is to transform global governance and the rules-based order.

However, I really think that the West should rethink their opposition, and they must face the fact that the Belt and Road memorandum has been signed by 148 countries and by 32 international organizations. So, according to my judgment, the Belt and Road, and also a community for common destiny for mankind, have already become an indispensable part of global governance and global order.

Rasmussen: Yes, this is also to underscore what you said before, about how important economic development is for the wellbeing of the countries. And here you have China, which was the first country to eliminate poverty in their country, over the last 40 years, and is offering this as a model for other countries to get economic development. The slogan of the Schiller Institute is “Peace through Economic Development,”—

Li: Exactly.

Rasmussen: The way that you can get countries that have perceived each other as enemies to rise to a new level, to seek common interest, is through arranging economic development programs, not only for a single country, but for a whole region, which encourages them to work together. You spoke before about the Chinese criticism of the Bretton Woods institutions. What the Schiller Institute and Lyndon LaRouche

have been saying, is that the initial idea of the Bretton Woods institutions as proposed by Franklin Roosevelt was to try to get the economic development of the poorer countries. But it degenerated into, for example, where you had the World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposing austerity conditions on countries as a precondition for loans, where nothing was done to actually increase the productivity of the countries, in the way that the Belt and Road is actually –with the infrastructure development, creating the basis for the countries to becoming prosperous. And what we're saying is that the total change in the international financial institutions is absolutely necessary now, at a point where financial speculation is blowing out, hyperinflation, and we need to have a new economic architecture, you could say, based on the physical development of the countries.

Li: I fully agree with your remarks and comments.

Rasmussen: Then another important statement in part 4, is that Chinese-Russian relations have reached a new level, as you said at the beginning, "a new era."

"The sides [China and Russia] call for the establishment of a new kind of relationship between world powers on the basis of mutual respect, peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial cooperation. They reaffirm that the new inter-State relations between Russia and China are superior to political and military alliances of the Cold War era. Friendship between the two States has no limits, there are no 'forbidden' areas of cooperation, strengthening of bilateral strategic cooperation is neither aimed against third countries nor affected by the changing international environment and circumstantial changes in third countries."

And yet, this is a plea to end the geopolitical blocs, where the two countries also call for strengthening multilateral fora, like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the BRICS.

Li Xing, what will this much strengthened alliance mean for China and Russia, and also for the rest of the world? Should

the West be worried, or is this a plea for a new type of international relations? What are the implications for shaping the new world order? What is your conclusion from the joint statement?

Li: I think one of the purposes of the joint statement is to demonstrate the good example of the China-Russia relationship, characterized as mutual respect, peaceful coexistence, and mutually beneficial cooperation. It is not targetted at any other country. It is not like the U.S.-led coalitions which are Cold War minded, according to Russia and China's understanding.

And if we look at the BRICS, and if you look at the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, they are not purely juridical and geopolitical organizations or alliances. They are non-binding, open and non-binding.

After I read the document several times, I reached the conclusion that the unipolar world order is over. The West and the United States might have a hard time to accept it.

So the joint statement shows a strong unity between Russia and China. So my question is where is the West's unity after the Cold War, and when the unipolar world order is over? How strong is the trans-Atlantic relationship today? I don't know: I'm asking the questions to the West, the U.S. The West must rethink its Cold War strategy of reviving unity through creating enemies, and I think this is a completely wrong strategy, in a multipolar world order, where countries are much more interdependent. So it is necessary for the U.S. to rethink its own version of the rules-based order, in which the U.S. is the rule-maker and others are rule-followers. And this does not work in a new era any more. That is my conclusion after reading the joint statement.

Rasmussen: Now, as to the current situation, today is Feb. 22, and yesterday, Russia recognized the two breakaway republics in Ukraine as independent republics, which is now going to lead to very heavy sanctions by the West. Putin's point was

that these sanctions would have come anyway, but in any case, without going into the details of the Ukraine-Russia-U.S./NATO crisis, the fact is that Russia will be most probably faced with enormously hard sanctions.

In our last interview, you were asked, for example, if Russia were thrown out of the SWIFT system, how would China react? Now it's a question of the not only of the SWIFT system, but also of other major financial penalties. How do you see China reacting, in light of the joint statement, to the new sanctions against Russia, that will most probably come?

Li: Let me first of all put it in this way: That sanctions are never one-sided punishments. That both sides will suffer. It's like President Trump's trade war, that President Trump thought the trade war would hurt China. Yes, it hurt China, but it had a backlash, a backfire to the U.S. economy. And today, if you look at the U.S. economy, the inflation actually is, one way or another, connected with the trade war, as well. It was one of the outcomes.

Now, sanctions against Russia will also cause mutually suffering by both sides. Because if you look at the European dependence on Russia's oil and gas, it's about 30-35%; some countries more, some less. If Russia is thrown out of the SWIFT system, which means that Russia cannot have international trade, then Europe cannot pay Russia as well, then the oil or gas pipelines will be blocked, which is in the interest of the United States, but not in the interest of Europe. This is the first point.

Second, that China and Russia have already agreed that they are not going to use dollars for their bilateral trade. So that doesn't really matter seen from the Russian and Chinese perspective, and in light of the spirit of this joint statement. So definitely China will continue to do business with Russia, and if the U.S. is saying that any country that is doing business Russia will be sanctioned as well, then the U.S. is creating even a larger, a bigger enemy. And China is a different story. And Russia, because Russia's economy,

Russia's economic-financial status is relatively limited, compared with China. China is the second largest economy in the world.

By the way, China is the largest trading nation in the world. And you can see that last year, the China and EU trade reached more than 850 billion! That's a lot! And look at the China-U.S. trade as well. If you punish China, in what way? I cannot imagine it. Take China out of the SWIFT system as well? No, you can't do that! Then the whole world is blocked! Then no trade, no economic development at all.

So these are grave consequences of sanctions. I cannot predict the future situations. Until now I haven't read any concrete reaction from the Chinese government, but I guess, following the spirit of this document, which was signed three weeks ago, definitely, China is going to act. China will also act in accordance with the spirit of solidarity between both countries.

Rasmussen: Our analysts were saying that it may be the case that China would buy more oil and gas and other products from Russia. Actually, one thing is that today, February 21, is the 50th anniversary of Nixon's trip to China, [February 21 to 28, 1972] and the opening up of relations, and the United States commitment to the One-China policy. And at that time, many people were saying that Kissinger's strategy was to open up the relations to China, as a way of isolating Russia, of putting Russia aside. But the fact is that these sanctions and this type of policy over the recent period, has done more to bring Russia and China together, as signified by this document. What is your reaction to that? But also the prospects of how we get out of this?

Lyndon LaRouche, for many years, called for a "Four Power" agreement between the United States, Russia, China, and India. How can we break through, looking at the world as Russia and China on one side, and the U.S. and Europe on the other side, how can we get a cooperation among the great powers for the necessity of dealing with these other very serious crises the

world is facing?

Li: Extremely interesting that you mentioned Nixon's trip, of playing the "China card," during the Cold War, in the beginning of the 1970s. You are completely right that the U.S. has historically enjoyed a very favorable position, in which the U.S. has been able to keep relatively stable relations with China, relatively stable relations with Soviet Union, at that time—but making the Soviet Union and China fight each other all the time. And especially after the Cold War, the U.S. still had this favorable position—relatively stable relations with both countries, but China and Russia still had difficult relations with each other.

But today, the situation is reversed. It's totally shocking that the U.S. is fighting both world powers simultaneously. If you remember that the former U.S. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, he wrote, before he died, he wrote clearly, that the worst situation for the United States, for the West is when Iran, Russia, and China become a bloc, become an alliance, with China as the economic driver, the economic power. I was very surprised that his words are becoming true today!

So, the only way we can come to the second part of your question, about how we can manage major power relations, is in line with the spirit of the Schiller Institute conference that took place last week and its call for establishing a new international security architecture. There is no other way. The Western dominance, the U.S. singlehanded dominance, the unipolar world is over. We need what Helga proposed, to establish a new international security architecture. We don't know exactly what the form of this architecture, but that needs discussion from both sides! Unless the international community forms a kind of great, new international security architecture, conflict will continue.

Rasmussen: And then, as we spoke, it goes hand in hand with the increasing economic cooperation and the determination of

the great powers to really do something for the economic development of the poor parts of the world.

Li: Yes, definitely. I agree with you. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Is there anything else you would like to add?

Li: No, I just want to add the last point, that I am very amazed by this joint statement, because I have come across many joint statements by two countries, or by multiple countries. But this one is the most comprehensive political document I have ever come across, because it covers every aspect of the world order, international relations, governance, security, values, norms, technology, climate change, health—you name it. So it is an extremely comprehensive document, which shows what Russia and China envision as a just world order.

So I would argue that this document implies a kind of new world order which Russia and China are going to, not only propose, but also push forward.

Unfortunately, this document has been demonized by many Western media—I have read many media talking about – to me it's a kind of Cold War syndrome, because those media describe the document as creating a "bipolar world," they say bipolar world, with the Russia and China/autocracies on the one side, and the U.S. and the West/democracies on the other side. So to me again, it's a dividing line, when they allege that this document divides the world into two camps again. So to me, this is a typical Cold War syndrome.

Again, I come back to my last point: That we need a new international security architecture, as the Schiller Institute also proposed during the conference last week. Otherwise, there will be no peace and development. Thank you.

Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing. This has been a very important discussion.

Li: Thank you very much.

Videomaratton: Jordens næste 100 år: Lyt til Lyndon LaRouches kloge ord

I anledning af Lyndon LaRouches død den 12. februar 2019 inviterer vi dig til at møde eller opfriske dit kendskab til en af de sidste 100 års største geniens sind og personlighed. Geni uden skønhed er ikke geni overhovedet. Deltag i vores LaRouche-maraton, og tag dine venner med, både unge og gamle.

Video: Samarbej med Kina. Det er ikke fjenden.

Interview med Li Xing, PhD, professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet

KØBENHAVN, 27. januar 2022 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark har gennemført et vigtigt, timelangt videointerview med Li Xing, ph.d., professor i udvikling og internationale relationer ved Aalborg Universitet i Danmark. Li Xing er medlem af det samfundsvidenskabelige fakultet på Institut for Politik og Samfund og leder af forskningscentret for udvikling

og internationale relationer. Han er oprindeligt fra Jiaxing nær Shanghai og arbejdede i Beijing, inden han kom til Danmark i 1988 for at tage sin kandidat- og ph.d.-grad.

Det omfattende interview dækker Kinas forbindelser med USA, Europa (USA–Kina-rivalisering), Rusland (Kina ville støtte Rusland, hvis det blev smidt ud af Swift-betalingsystemet), Europa og Afrika (Kinas udviklingsprogram er en hjælp for Europa i forbindelse med flygtningeproblemet), Latinamerika (Kina har fremmet den økonomiske udvikling i USA's baghave, mens USA har været fokuseret på krige og farverevolutioner), Afghanistan (med helhjertet støtte til Operation Ibn Sina) og andre udviklingslande.

Det omfatter også, hvad professor Li Xing ville sige til præsident Biden om forbindelserne med Kina, Xi Jinpings Davos-tale, Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og Xinjiang-spørgsmålet. Han opfordrer USA og Europa til at samarbejde med Kina om deres respektive nødvendige infrastrukturudvikling, for at fremme udviklingen af de underudviklede lande og for at droppe den geopolitiske taber-strategi. Han slutter med at rose Schiller Instituttets udviklingsprogrammer for verden.

Interviewet, der blev foretaget af Michelle Rasmussen, vil blive transskriberet til offentliggørelse i EIR og er nu tilgængeligt på Schiller Instituttets YouTube-kanal i Danmark.

Here is a pdf version published in Executive Intelligence Review, Vol. 49, No. 5 (www.larouchepub.com/eiw). We encourage you to subscribe.:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

INTERVIEW

Professor Li Xing

Cooperate with China – It Is Not the Enemy

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Prof. Li Xing, PhD, conducted on Jan. 26 by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. Dr. Li is a professor of Development and International Relations at the Department of Politics and Society, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Aalborg University. Li Xing was born in Jiaxing, China, near Shanghai. He earned his BA at the Guangzhou Institute of Foreign Languages. He came to Denmark from Beijing in 1988 for his MA and later completed his PhD studies at Aalborg University.

Subheads have been added. A video of the interview is available here . <https://youtu.be/rulm1czmaTE>

Michelle Rasmussen: Welcome, Professor Li Xing, thank you so much for allowing me to interview you.

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you too.

Michelle Rasmussen: Li Xing, as we speak, there is an overhanging threat of war between the United States and NATO against Russia and China, countries which the war faction in the West sees as a threat to the disintegrating, unipolar Anglo-American world dominance.

On the other hand, the Schiller Institute has led an international campaign to try to get the U.S. and Europe to cooperate with Russia and China to solve the great crises in the world, especially the pandemic, the financial and economic crises, the underdevelopment of the poor countries, and the cultural crisis in the West. Our international president, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, has stated that the U.S.-China relationship will be the most important relationship in the future.

You recently gave a lecture at the Danish Institute for International Studies about the U.S.-China rivalry. And you are a contributor to the book *The Telegram: A China Agenda for President Biden* by Sarwar Kashmiri, which was published in

2021 by the Foreign Policy Association in New York City. The book is composed of statements by the contributors of what each would say if they were granted a personal meeting with President Biden. What would your advice be to President Biden regarding China?

Advice to President Biden

Prof. Li Xing: Thank you for giving me this chance for this interview. If I had the chance to meet the President, I would say to him:

Hello, President Biden. I think that it is a pity that you didn't change Trump's China policy, especially regarding the trade war and the tariff. We can see from the current situation that in the U.S., the shortages issue, the inflation issue, these are all connected with tariff issue. Many congressmen and senators are calling for the removal of the tariffs. So, I really think that the president should give second thoughts to continuing the trade war. Contrary to this, though, the data from 2020 and 2021 shows that the China-U.S. trade actually surged almost 30%, compared with early years. So, the trade war didn't work.

The second issue is the competition in the area of high technology areas, especially regarding the chip industry. I'd say to him:

Mr. President, the U.S. has the upper hand in that technology, and China has the largest market. I think that if the U.S. continues to use a technology sanction on Chinese chips, then the whole country and the whole nation will increase the investment on the chips. Once China has the technology, then the U.S. would both lose the market, and also lose the advantage in that technology.

So, this is the second issue, I think the president should give a thought to.

The third issue, which I think is a very touchy issue, is the Taiwan issue. I would really advise the President:

Mr. President, to play the Taiwan card needs caution, because Taiwan is the center of Chinese politics, in its historical memory, and the most important national project in the unification process. So, to play the Taiwan card really needs caution.

But still, I would also say to the President:

Mr. President, China and the U.S. have a lot of areas for cooperation. For example, climate change; for example, North Korea, Iran, Afghanistan; and last but not least, because China has great technology and skill in terms of infrastructure, so you, Mr. President, should invite China to come to the U.S. and play a role in the U.S. infrastructure construction projects. That would be an ideal situation to promote bilateral relations.

Attitude of the U.S. Toward China

Michelle Rasmussen: In your statement in the book, *The Telegram*, you address whether the United States should consider China as an enemy or as rival. What would you say to the American people about the attitude that the United States should have towards China?

Prof. Li Xing: I don't think that the U.S. should regard China as an enemy, but as a rival. I think there is a truth in that because China is obviously a rival to the United States on many, many grounds, both in materials and also in ideation. Nevertheless, it is not an enemy. China and the U.S. have so many areas of cooperation as you point out, that this bilateral relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world. Were this relationship turned into an enemy relationship, it would be a disaster for the world.

Michelle Rasmussen: On January 17, Chinese President Xi

Jinping addressed the World Economic Forum in Davos. What do you think is most important for people in the West to understand about his speech?

Prof. Li Xing: Xi Jinping was invited to the World Economic Forum, and he sent some messages. In his address he admitted that economic globalization has created problems, but that this should not constitute a justification to write off everything regarding globalization, regarding international cooperation. So, he suggested that the world should adapt and guide globalization.

He also rejected the protectionist forces on the rise in the West, saying that history has proved time and time again that confrontation does not solve problems; it only invites catastrophic consequences.

President Xi also particularly mentioned protectionism, unilateralism, indirectly referring to the U.S., emphasizing that this phenomenon will only hurt the interest of others as well as itself, meaning that the U.S. trade war, or sanctions against China, will hurt both. It's not a win-win, it's a lose-lose. President Xi delivered a message that rejects a "zero sum" approach. I think it was a very constructive message from President Xi Jinping. He totally rejects, if I interpret his address correctly, the Cold War mentality. He doesn't want to see a Cold War mentality emerge in either the U.S., or in China.

The Belt and Road Concept

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on now to the question of the Belt and Road Initiative. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Schiller Institute has worked to establish a new Silk Road, the World Land-Bridge, and many of these economic principles have been coming to life through China's Belt and Road Initiative. Li Xing, in 2019 you wrote a book, Mapping China's One Belt One Road

Initiative, and have lectured on this. How has the Belt and Road Initiative created economic development in the underdeveloped countries?

Prof. Li Xing: First of all, I think that we need to understand the Belt and Road concept—the historicity behind the Belt and Road; that the Belt and Road is not an international aid program. We have to keep that in mind. It is an infrastructure project attempting to link Eurasia. It has two routes. One is a land route, consisting of six corridors. Then, it has another route called the Maritime Silk Road. Globally, about 138 countries, ranging from Italy to Saudi Arabia to Cambodia, have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China. Just recently another country in Latin America signed up with the Belt and Road.

The idea of the Belt and Road is founded on two basic Chinese economic strengths. One is surplus capital. China has a huge amount of surplus capital in its banks, which it can use for investments. The second is that after 40 years of infrastructure development in China, China has huge technology and skill, particularly in the infrastructure development area. So, the Belt and Road is basically an infrastructure development project.

The driving force of China's Belt and Road is that after 40 years of economic development, China is experiencing a similar situation experienced by the advanced countries in world economic history—for example, rising wages, overproduction, overcapacity, and a lot of surplus capital.

So, China is looking for what the Marxist analytical lens calls a "spatial fix," as in its domestic market, the mass production manufacturing is getting extremely large. In looking beyond Chinese territory at Chinese neighbors, China has discovered that all the countries around China are actually very, very far behind in infrastructure development. So, it's kind of a win-win situation. The idea behind the Belt

and Road is a kind of a win-win situation.

Historically, the Post World War II Marshall Plan in Europe, and the military aid to East Asia, were, you could say, like Belt and Road projects, helping those countries to enhance economic development. I recently came across a World Bank study pointing out that if the Belt and Road projects were successfully implemented, the real income level throughout the entire region would rise between two or four times. At the global level, the real income can rise between 0.7 -2.9%. So, you can say, the international financial institutions, and economic institutions like World Bank, are also very positive toward the Belt and Road.

However, the Belt and Road also has four areas which we need to be concerned about. Number one: the debt trap, which has been discussed quite a lot at the global level. Number two: transparency, whether the Belt and Road projects in different countries are transparent. This, too, is an issue for debate. Number three: corruption, whether Chinese investments in countries creates corruption by local officials. The number four area for concern is the environmental and social cost. So, these definitely need to be taken care of, both by China and those countries.

As a whole, I think the Belt and Road project is huge. It's very constructive. But we also need to consider its potential to create bad effects. We need to tackle all these effects collectively.

'Debt Trap' Diplomacy

Michelle Rasmussen: When you spoke just now about a debt trap, our correspondent Hussein Askary, who covers the Muslim world, and also developments in Africa, has argued against the idea that China is creating a debt trap, pointing out that many of the countries owe much more money to Western powers, than they do to China, and that China has done things like forgiving

debt, or transferring physical assets to those governments, because the debt trap accusation has been used as the primary argument against the Belt and Road. Do you think that this is a legitimate argument or that this is overplayed to try to just create suspicion about the Belt and Road?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I fully agree, actually, with the comment you just quoted from another study. It is true that the “debt trap” has been used by Western media, or those politicians who are against the Belt and Road, as an excuse, as a kind of a dark picture. But, according to my research, China actually understands this problem, and very often, the Chinese government uses different measures, or different policies, to tackle this problem. One is to write off the debt entirely, when the borrowing country would really suffer, if it had to repay. For example, the Chinese government announced that during the pandemic, debt service payments from some poor countries is suspended until their economic situation improves.

China is a central-government-based country. State policy plays a bigger role than in the political system of the West, where different interest groups drive their countries’ policies into different directions. Therefore, the Chinese central government is able to play a bigger role than Western governments in tackling debt problems.

Michelle Rasmussen: What has this meant for the underdeveloped countries, for example, in Africa, and other poor countries in Asia, in Ibero-America? What has the Belt and Road Initiative meant for their economic development?

Prof. Li Xing: The increasing number of countries that have signed up with the Belt and Road, shows that the Belt Road project is comparatively quite welcomed. I have also followed many debates in Africa, where many African leaders were asked the question and they completely agree. They say that the situation regarding the debt of the old time, their

experiences with the colonial countries, is quite different from the debt incurred with China's investment projects or development projects. So, they still have confidence in China's foreign development policies, especially in the Belt and Road project. From the many studies and reports I have read so far; they have strong confidence in that.

Infrastructure Means Development

Michelle Rasmussen: What would you say about the role of infrastructure development in China in creating this unprecedented economic growth and lifting people out of poverty? What role has infrastructure played in the incredible poverty elimination policy that China actually succeeded in achieving this year?

Prof. Li Xing: The entire 40-year history of China's economic growth and economic development, and China's prosperity, is based on the lesson that infrastructure is one of the most important factors leading to China's economic success. China has a slogan: "If you want to get rich, build a road."

Infrastructure is connected with every aspect of national economy. The raw materials industry, the metal industry, you name it. Cement industry, etc. Infrastructure is really the center of a nation's economy, which can really get different areas of the country running. So, I think this experience of China is really a good lesson, not only for China itself, but also for the rest of the world, especially for developing countries.

That's why China's Belt and Road project, identified as infrastructure projects, is really welcomed by many people, and especially President Biden. Even though his budget was not passed, because of the resistance, or even if it's shrunken, the idea about improving U.S. infrastructure, became a kind of hot spot. I think that the U.S. needs to increase its infrastructure investment as well. Definitely.

Europe-China Relations

Michelle Rasmussen: Let's move on to Europe and China relations. You have edited the book China-U.S. Relations at a Crossroads: "Systemic Rivalry" or "Strategic Partnership." What is your evaluation and recommendation about European-Chinese relations? When we spoke earlier, you had a comment about how the impact of African development, if there would be development or not in Africa, would impact Europe. Could you also include your idea about that?

Prof. Li Xing: EU-China relations are increasingly complex, and affected by a number of interrelated factors, such as China's rise, the growing China-U.S. rivalry, U.S. global withdrawal, especially under the Trump administration, the trans-Atlantic split, the Brexit, and at the same time, the China-Russia comprehensive alliance. Under these broad transformations of the global order, EU-China relations are also getting very complex. Right now, I feel that the EU and China are struggling to find a dynamic and durable mode of engagement, to achieve a balance between opportunities on the one side, and challenges on the other, and also between partnership and rivalry.

For instance, China and the EU successfully reached what is called the EU-China Comprehensive Agreement on Investment treaty in December 2020. It was a joyful moment. However, in 2021, due to the Hong Kong events, the Xinjiang issue, and mutual sanctions in 2021, this investment treaty was suspended. Not abandoned but suspended. You can see that the relationship can be hurt by events. It's really difficult to find a balance between strategic partnership and systemic rivalry. "Systemic rivalry" was the official term used in a European Commission document, "EU-China—A Strategic Outlook," issued March 12, 2019. That document states that China is "simultaneously ... an economic competitor in the pursuit of technological leadership, and a systemic rival promoting alternative models of governance."

So, you can see that a systemic rival means alternative normative values. That's why it's a new term, when used in that way. It shows that China's development has both a material impact, and, also, an ideational impact—that many countries are becoming attracted by the Chinese success. For that reason, the Chinese, and the rise of China is increasingly regarded as a systemic rival.

On the other hand, the message from my book is also that the EU must, one way or another, become autonomous, and design an independent China policy. Sometimes I feel that the EU-China policy is somehow pushed around or carried by U.S. global interests, or affected by the U.S.-China competition. I really think Europe needs an independent China policy. You know, the EU is thinking of developing “defence independence.” That is, it is pursuing autonomy in defense. But that's something else.

According to data from Kishore Mahbubani, a very well-known Singaporean public intellectual and professor, the Belt and Road has special meaning for Europe in relation to Africa. This is of importance to your question about Africa.

According to his data on the demographic explosion in Africa, Africa's population in the 1950s was half of that of Europe. Today, Africa's population is 2.5 times that of Europe. By 2100, Africa's population will be 10 times of that of Europe. So, if Africa still suffers from underdevelopment, if any crisis appears, where will African refugees migrate? Europe!

From Kishore's point of view, the Belt and Road is doing Europe a “favor,” so Europe should be very supportive of China's Belt and Road project. I totally agree with that. What he says is also a part of the message of my book.

A ‘Differentiated’ Europe

Michelle Rasmussen: You were speaking about Europe becoming more autonomous in its relations with China. Former German Chancellor Angela Merkel has stated openly that Germany should

not be forced to choose between the United States and China, that Germany needs to have relations with both. Can you say more about that? Is China Europe's biggest trading partner?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, since November last year.

Michelle Rasmussen: There's differentiation inside Europe. For example, the Eastern European countries have a forum called "16+1," where 16 Eastern European countries, plus China, have a more developed Belt and Road cooperation with China, than the Western countries. And there's differentiation in the western European countries. You mentioned that some are making Hong Kong and Xinjiang into obstacles to improving European relations to China. What would you say to these concerns?

Prof. Li Xing: China-EU relations are being affected by many, many factors. One is, as you mentioned, about 16+1, but now it's 17+1, because, I think two years ago, Greece became a part of 16+1, so now it's 17+1. And the western part of the EU, was quite worried about the 17+1 because some think that the Belt and Road plays a role in dividing Europe. Because Europe has this common policy, common strategy, and common action toward the Belt and Road, they also see the 17+1 grouping as somehow playing a divisive role. So, the EU is not very happy about that. Because you're right, the Belt and Road is more developed in the eastern part of the EU. This is one issue.

The second issue is that the EU has to make a balance between China on the one side, and the U.S. on the other. Right now, my assessment is that the EU is somehow being pushed to choose the U.S. side. It's fine with me, from my analytical point of view, that the EU, most of the countries in the West, the traditional U.S. allies—like including Denmark—if they choose the U.S., that's fine. But my position is that their choosing sides should be based on their own analysis, their own national interests, not purely on the so-called values and norms, that the U.S. and EU share norms, and therefore should

have a natural alliance. I think that is not correct. I always advise Western politicians, thinktanks, and policy makers that they should study China-U.S. relations or EU-China-U.S. relations and try to find their own foreign policies. What is the correct direction? And based on their own judgment, based on their own research results, not based on what the U.S. wants them to do.

Michelle Rasmussen: One of Denmark's top former diplomats, Friis Arne Petersen, has been Denmark's ambassador to the United States, to China, and to Germany. At the Danish Institute for International Studies, he recently called for Europe to join the Belt and Road Initiative. Why do you think it would be in the interest of Europe and the United States to join or cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative, instead of treating it as a geopolitical threat?

Prof. Li Xing: Well, on the Belt and Road, as we have already discussed, we must first understand what it is. I fully agree with Friis Arne Petersen. When he was Ambassador to Beijing, I met him at one of the international conferences. He was always very positive towards Denmark-China cooperation. I fully agree with his point on the Belt and Road. But we have to understand, first of all, why the West is nervous about the Belt and Road. This is very important, because the European's or the American's worry is based on two perspectives. One is geopolitics. The second is norm diffusion. Geopolitics means that through the Belt and Road, China's economic political influence will gradually expand to cover all of Eurasia, which is not in the interest of the West. This is a geopolitical rationale.

Then the second perspective is norm diffusion, which means that through the Belt and Road, the Chinese development model spreads. As I mentioned before, because of the global attraction to China, the Chinese development model will be consolidated and extended through the Belt and Road, and that is also not in the interest of the West. That's why China is a

“systemic rival,” because it has a norm diffusion effect. We have to understand these two aspects.

But why should Europe support the Belt and Road? I have already discussed this issue in my answer to your previous question regarding the importance of infrastructure development, and regarding why Europe should support the Belt and Road, especially in the context of Africa.

Michelle Rasmussen: And you also spoke about the need for infrastructure development in the United States. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave the United States a grade point average of C- for the state of its infrastructure. Looking at high speed rail in China and in the United States, there's nothing to compare.

Prof. Li Xing: No, no.

Michelle Rasmussen: In its 14th Five-Year Plan, China has committed itself to increase its high-speed rail lines by one third, from the present 38,000 kilometers to 50,000 kilometers by 2025. The U.S. has maybe a hundred and fifty kilometers.

Prof. Li Xing: I was told by American friends that the U.S. has not invested heavily in infrastructure for many, many decades, about half century, something like that. I was shocked to hear that. So, I think Biden's idea of infrastructure investment is great, but somehow the bill could not be agreed on by the Congress, and also the Senate, due to partisan conflict.

Michelle Rasmussen: And it was not very ambitious in any case.

Prof. Li Xing: Yes, totally.

Reordering the World Order

Michelle Rasmussen: It was a step in the right direction, but was not very ambitious.

Let's move on to Latin America, which we in the Schiller Institute call Ibero-America. That's because our members say that the Spanish language did not proceed from Latin. The Iberian Peninsula is Portugal and Spain, so Ibero-America is a better term. In any case, Li Xing, you are working on a study, China-U.S. Rivalry and Regional Reordering in Latin America. Can you please share the main idea with us?

Prof. Li Xing: Yes. I'm working on this book, together with a group of Latin American scholars from different countries in the region. The objective of the book is to provide a good conceptualization, first, of the changing world order, and the reordering process. When we talk about that the world order is changing because of the U.S.-China rivalry, at the same time, we also suggest that the world is experiencing a reordering process, that we do not know the future order, or the new order, but the world is in the process of reordering, driven by the China-U.S. rivalry.

The book will also try to convey that the U.S.-China rivalry, according to our conceptualization, is "intra-core. According to the world system theory, you have a core which is the advanced economy countries, then you have a semi-periphery, and then you have a periphery. The semi-periphery is between periphery and the core, and the periphery is the vast number of developing countries. So the China-U.S. rivalry, competition, especially in high technologies in the security areas, is between these two core countries, or is intra-core.

The China-U.S. rivalry also represents a struggle between two types of capitalism. On the one side is Chinese state capitalism, very centralized, state led, with central planning. On the other side is the U.S. free market, individual capitalist economy. Somehow the China model is gradually appearing to be more competitive. Of course, the U.S. doesn't agree with that assessment, at least from the current perspectives.

So, this rivalry must have a great impact on the whole world, especially on the developing world we call the Global South. Here we've tried to focus on the U.S.-China rivalry, and its impact on the Latin American and Caribbean region.

The message of the book is, first, that global redistribution of power is inevitable. It's still in process, and the emerging world order is likely to be dominated by more than one superpower, so the world order will likely look like a polycentric world, with a number of centripetals competing for high positions or strong positions. This is the first message.

The second message is that the situation shows that the world is in a reordering process driven by the competition between the two superpowers, and it poses opportunities, and also constraints, to different regions, especially for the Global South, such as Latin America, because Latin America is the U.S. backyard; it is the subject of American doctrines—that North America and South America, are a sphere of U.S. influence.

The Monroe Doctrine

Michelle Rasmussen: You're talking about the Monroe Doctrine?

Prof. Li Xing: The Monroe Doctrine. Thank you very much. North America and South America have to be within the U.S. hegemonic influence. No external power is allowed to have a hand in, or interference in these two regions. You can say that China's relations with Latin America has really been increasing tremendously during the past two decades.

At the same time, the U.S. was busy with its anti-terrorism wars, and its creation of color revolutions in other parts of the world. If you look at the investment in infrastructure, and also imports of agriculture, China-Latin American trade and Chinese investment in Latin America are increasing tremendously, dramatically, which becomes a worry, a really deep worry, to the U.S.

The different scholars, the book's chapter authors, will use different countries and country cases as examples to provide empirical evidence to our "theoretical conceptualization." This book will be published around summertime by Brill, a very good publisher in Holland.

Michelle Rasmussen: Well, actually, the Monroe Doctrine was adopted in 1823, in the very early history of the United States. This is after the United States had become a republic and had freed itself from the British Empire. It was actually John Quincy Adams—

Prof. Li Xing: Exactly.

Michelle Rasmussen:—who was actually involved in the idea, which was that the United States would not allow imperialism, imperial powers to bring their great power games into Latin and South America, but that the United States would help those countries become independent republics. So the question becomes, will Chinese policy strengthen the ability of the Ibero-American countries to be republics and enjoy economic development, or is China's intention also a kind of imperialism?

Prof. Li Xing: Based on your definitions, on your conceptualization of the Monroe Doctrine, you can say that there are two implications. One is that the U.S. should defend these two regions from imperialist intervention. The U.S. itself was not an imperial power at that time. The U.S. didn't have intentions to become a global interventionist then, but today it is a different situation.

Second, that the U.S. definitely interprets Chinese investment and infrastructure cooperation, and economic investment in Latin America as "helping," to consolidate the country's independence? No, I don't think that is the case. That would be a kind of positive-sum game. Today, unluckily, these two countries are trapped into a zero-sum game. Whatever China is

doing in the South American region, is interpreted as not being good for United States. That's a very unfortunate situation.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, we in the Schiller Institute have said that if the United States were to join with China to have even better economic development in Ibero-America; that would be a win-win policy. You spoke about the immigration challenge from Africa to Europe. It's the same thing from Ibero-America to the United States. People would much rather stay in their own countries if there were jobs, if there were economic development,

Prof. Li Xing: Yes.

Michelle Rasmussen: And if the United States would join with China, then instead of—

Prof. Li Xing: —building the wall! Instead of building the wall!

Michelle Rasmussen: Exactly, exactly.

Prof. Li Xing: Yeah, I agree with you.

Operation Ibn Sina

Michelle Rasmussen: Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the President of the Schiller Institute, has stated that one very important way to lessen the war danger between the United States, Russia and China would be for these countries to join forces to save the people of Afghanistan, where there is the worst humanitarian crisis in the world now, after the war, the drought, and the freezing of Afghanistan's central bank assets by the western countries. She has proposed what she calls Operation Ibn Sina, named after the great physician and philosopher from that region, to build a modern health system in Afghanistan to save the people from disease, and as a lever to stimulate economic development.

I know that when we spoke about Afghanistan before, you also referred to very important discussions now going on in Oslo, for the first time, between the Taliban and Western governments, including in the United States.

But what do you think about this idea of China and the United States, and also Russia and other countries, joining hands to act to alleviate the terrible crisis for the people of Afghanistan?

Prof. Li Xing: It's a superb idea. This is one of the initiatives by the Schiller Institute. When I read your website, you have many development projects, and this one is a great idea. This is one of the areas I mentioned where the U.S. and China have a common interest. Unfortunately, what is happening today is the Ukraine crisis and the China-U.S. rivalry—so many battle fronts—puts Afghanistan more into the background.

Right now, the Taliban delegation is talking with the West in Oslo, and I really hope there will be a constructive result, because after the U.S. withdrew from Afghanistan, Afghanistan's Taliban government immediately went to China. And it was a Chinese interest. It was in China's fundamental interest to help Afghanistan, because if Afghanistan is safe and prosperous, then there will be no terror and terrorism coming from Afghanistan across the border. Many of the terrorists in Xinjiang actually based themselves in Afghanistan. So it is in China's national interest to help Afghanistan.

Right now, I don't know whether it is still in the U.S. interest to help Afghanistan. The U.S. might be tired of that region, because the U.S. lost two trillion dollars in the Afghanistan war, without any positive results. So, I do not know. I cannot tell the what the U.S. politicians' feelings are, but the U.S. holds \$9.5 billion of Afghanistan assets. And I think that money has to be released to help in the

country's rebuilding.

And particularly, the Schiller Institute's suggestion of a health care system is the priority. When people are in good health, then people can work, and earn money. When people have a job or have a family, normally, people do not move. According to refugee studies, people normally do not move just because of a shortage. People move because of a situation devastated by war, by climate change, by various crises. Otherwise, people are relatively stable and want to stay in their homeland.

Xinjiang

Michelle Rasmussen: You mentioned Xinjiang again now. Do you have something to say about Xinjiang for people in the West?

Prof. Li Xing: I think that there are a lot of misunderstandings between the West and China, especially the misunderstanding from the Western side concerning Xinjiang. The other day, I saw a debate at Oxford University between an American former politician and a British former politician, about whether China is a friend or a foe. The American representative put forward the claim that in Xinjiang, we are experiencing what is called genocide. But later, at the end of his discussion, he admitted that there is no genocide, but he deliberately used genocide as a kind of provocation in order to receive attention from the world. The British representative asked if this view caused such a bad misunderstanding, misperception, then why not just give it up?

Do not use genocide. You can criticize China for human rights abuses. You can criticize China for its minority policies, etc. But to deliberately defame China is not a good way. I don't think it's a good way. We also have to be fair.

On the one side, you can criticize China's policy treating problems in the minorities and others. But you have to also condemn terrorist actions because there were a lot of

terrorist bomb killings in that region, especially from 2012-2015, around that time.

I was in Xinjiang as a tourist in 2011, and I was advised to not pass by some streets, because there could be some risks. You can see that it was a very tense situation because of a lot of bombings. People pointed out to me, here were some bombings, there were some bombings. You don't understand. So, the West should be fair and condemn these things, while at same time, also advising the Chinese government to develop a more constructive policy to resolve the problem, rather than using harsh policies. It has to be fair. This is the first point.

Second, is that genocide not only defames China, it's also contrary, it's opposite to the facts. Twenty years ago, 30 years ago, Xinjiang's Uighur population was about five million or eight million. But after 30 years, I think it's about 11-13 million. I do not know exactly, but there has been a growth of population. How can you claim genocide, when the local population is increasing? Do you understand my point? So, this is not a good attitude. It is not a very good way to discuss with China and it makes China much more resistant in talking with you, when China fears that it is being defamed.

When some Western sources, in particular one German scholar, use a lot of data from a Turkish scholar, who is connected to the "minority resistance" from Xinjiang, then the credibility, reliability of the source is in question. You understand my point. So, the Xinjiang issue is rather complicated, but the West and China should have a dialogue, rather than use in this specific discourse rhetoric to frame China in a way that China is the bad guy. It should be condemned. I think this is not constructive.

The SWIFT System

Michelle Rasmussen: Going back to the war danger, what do you

think the impact on China and on the world economy would be, were the U.S. to force Russia out of the SWIFT international payment system, or similar draconian measures?

Prof. Li Xing: Let me tell you that Olaf Scholz, the current German Chancellor, already expressed it very well, saying that if Russia were sanctioned and pushed out of the SWIFT payment system, then Europe could not pay Russia for its gas and oil. "If we can't pay Russia, then Russia will not supply us. Then what should we do?"

I read in the news today that the U.S. said, "We could supply most of Russia's oil and gas." Then Europe began to ponder: "Well then, this war has become your war, you know—a very egoistical interest, because you actually want to replace Russia's gas and oil supply. That's why you want to instigate the war."

So, I think it's the U.S. that has to be very cautious in its sanctions, because the only sanctions possibilities for the United States today against major powers is financial, is payment—it's the U.S. dollar. That's the intermediate currency, the SWIFT system.

And when China sees this, that only strengthened China's conclusion to develop what we call electronic currency. China is using a lot of energy today investing in electronic currency. This electronic currency is a real currency. It's just electronic. It's being implemented in some big cities in test trials.

Then, back to the SWIFT system, [if a country were thrown out] it would be rather impossible or would rather create a lot of problems in the international payment system, then the whole system will more or less collapse, because most countries watch this, and they will try to think about how they should react in the future if the U.S. uses the same system of sanctions against them. I just mentioned China, but also many

other countries as well. They have to find an alternative.

One other alternative is to use currencies other than the U.S. dollar as much as possible. I just read in the news today that the Chinese yuan has surpassed the Japanese yen as the fourth international [reserve] currency. And the situation will accelerate in that direction. So, I think that the U.S. should think twice.

On China-Russia relations, I definitely think that China will help Russia in case the U.S. really implements a sanction of pushing Russia out of the SWIFT payment system. China definitely will help Russia, because both face the same pressure, the same struggle, the same robbery from the U.S.

So, it is very bad. It is extremely bad strategy from the U.S. side to fight, simultaneously, on two fronts with two superpowers. This is what Henry Kissinger had said many times during the entire Cold War period. The U.S. was able to keep relatively stable relations between U.S. and China and between U.S. and the Soviet Union, keeping the Russia and China fighting against each other. But now it's the opposite situation. The U.S. is fighting with two big powers simultaneously. I don't know what is in the mind of the U.S. politicians. I really think that the U.S. needs to redesign its strategic foreign policy.

The Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: Yeah. We've been speaking mostly about the U.S., but the British really are an instigator in this: the British Old Empire policy of trying to drive a wedge between the United States, Russia and China. That also has a lot to do with the current situation. We spoke before about that the Schiller Institute is trying to get the United States' population to understand that the whole basis for the existence of the United States was the fight against the British Empire, and against this divide and conquer strategy,

and, rather, to cooperate with Russia and China.

In conclusion, this conversation has been very wonderful. Do you have any parting words for our audience? We have many people in Europe and in the United States. Do you have any parting words of advice as to how we should look at China and what needs to be different about our policy?

Prof. Li Xing: No, I think that I want my last words, actually, to be invested in talking about the Schiller Institute. I think that some of your programs, some of your projects, and some of your applications are really interesting. The Schiller Institute has a lot of ideas. For example, you just mentioned your campaign for an Afghanistan health care system, but not only in Afghanistan. You promote these ideas for Africa, in developing countries. I really think that the Schiller Institute should continue to promote some of the ideas—a health care system in every country, especially now, considering the pandemic. The rich countries, including China, are able to produce vaccines, but not the developing countries. The U.S. has more vaccine doses stored up than necessary [for itself]. But Africa still has only a very low percentage of people [who have been vaccinated].

Michelle Rasmussen: I think 8%.

Prof. Li Xing: And we claim the Omicron variant of the coronavirus came from Africa. That's an irony. That's an irony, because it's definite that one day, another variation will come from Latin America, or from some other part of the world.

So, it's rather important for the West, and for China, to think about some of the positive suggestions by your Institute. I'm glad that you invited me for this interview, and I expect to have more cooperation with you. Thank you very much.

Michelle Rasmussen: Thank you so much, Li Xing.

Interview med Rusland ekspert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Hvorfor USA og NATO bør underskrive traktaterne foreslået af Putin. Interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Why the U.S. and NATO should sign the treaties proposed by Putin?

Udgivet på Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) tidsskrift bind 49, række 2 den 14. januar 2022. Her er en pdf-version:

[Download \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Kortet på side 15 viser NATO udvidelse, hvis Ukraine og Georgien bliver medlemmer.

The following is an edited transcription of an interview with Russia expert Jens Jørgen Nielsen, by Michelle Rasmussen, Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Demark, conducted December 30, 2021. Mr. Nielsen has degrees in the history of ideas and communication. He is a former Moscow correspondent for the major Danish daily Politiken in the late 1990s. He is the author of several books about Russia and the Ukraine, and

a leader of the Russian-Danish Dialogue organization. In addition, he is an associate professor of communication and cultural differences at the Niels Brock Business College in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Hello, viewers. I am Michelle Rasmussen, the Vice President of the Schiller Institute in Denmark. This is an interview with Jens Jørgen Nielsen from Denmark.

The Schiller Institute released a [[memorandum]] December 24 titled "Are We Sleepwalking into Thermonuclear World War III." In the beginning, it states, "Ukraine is being used by geopolitical forces in the West that answer to the bankrupt speculative financial system, as the flashpoint to trigger a strategic showdown with Russia, a showdown which is already more dangerous than the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, and which could easily end up in a thermonuclear war which no one would win, and none would survive."

Jens Jørgen, in the past days, Russian President Putin and other high-level spokesmen have stated that Russia's red lines are about to be crossed, and they have called for treaty negotiations to come back from the brink. What are these red lines and how dangerous is the current situation?

%%Russian 'Red Lines'

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Thank you for inviting me. First, I would like to say that I think that the question you have raised here about red lines, and the question also about are we sleepwalking into a new war, is very relevant. Because, as an historian, I know what happened in 1914, at the beginning of the First World War—a kind of sleepwalking. No one really wanted the war, actually, but it ended up with war, and tens of million people were killed, and then the whole world disappeared at this time, and the world has never been the same. So, I think it's a very, very relevant question that you are asking here.

You asked me specifically about Putin, and the red lines. I heard that the Clintons, Bill and Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry, and many other American politicians, claim that we don't have things like red lines anymore. We don't have zones of influence anymore, because we have a new world. We have a new liberal world, and we do not have these kinds of things. It belongs to another century and another age. But you could ask the question, "What actually are the Americans doing in Ukraine, if not defending their own red lines?"

Because I think it's like, if you have a power, a superpower, a big power like Russia, I think it's very, very natural that any superpower would have some kind of red lines. You can imagine what would happen if China, Iran, and Russia had a military alliance, going into Mexico, Canada, Cuba, maybe also putting missiles up there. I don't think anyone would doubt what would happen. The United States would never accept it, of course. So, the Russians would normally ask, "Why should we accept that Americans are dealing with Ukraine and preparing, maybe, to put up some military hardware in Ukraine? Why should we? And I think it's a very relevant question. Basically, the Russians see it today as a question of power, because the Russians, actually, have tried for, I would say, 30 years. They have tried.

I was in Russia 30 years ago. I speak Russian. I'm quite sure that the Russians, at that time, dreamt of being a part of the Western community, and they had very, very high thoughts about the Western countries, and Americans were extremely popular at this time. Eighty percent of the Russian population in 1990 had a very positive view of the United States. Later on, today, and even for several years already, 80%, the same percentage, have a negative view of Americans. So, something happened, not very positively, because 30 years ago, there were some prospects of a new world.

There really were some ideas, but something actually was screwed up in the 90s. I have some idea about that. Maybe we

can go in detail about it. But things were screwed up, and normally, today, many people in the West, in universities, politicians, etc. think that it's all the fault of Putin. It's Putin's fault. Whatever happened is Putin's fault. Now, we are in a situation which is very close to the Cuban Missile Crisis, which you also mentioned. But I don't think it is that way. I think it takes two to tango. We know that, of course, but I think many Western politicians have failed to see the compliance of the western part in this, because there are many things which play a role that we envisage in a situation like that now.

The basic thing, if you look at it from a Russian point of view, it's the extension to the east of NATO. I think that's a real bad thing, because Russia was against it from the very beginning. Even Boris Yeltsin, who was considered to be the man of the West, the democratic Russia, he was very, very opposed to this NATO alliance going to the East, up to the borders of Russia.

And we can see it now, because recently, some new material has been released in America, an exchange of letters between Yeltsin and Clinton at this time. So, we know exactly that Yeltsin, and Andrei Kozyrev, the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs at this time, were very much opposed to it. And then Putin came along. Putin came along not to impose his will on the Russian people. He came along because there was, in Russia, a will to oppose this NATO extension to the East. So, I think things began at this point.

And later on, we had the Georgian crisis in 2008, and we had, of course, the Ukraine crisis in 2014, and, also, with Crimea and Donbass, etc.

And now we are very, very close to—I don't think it's very likely we will have a war, but we are very close to it, because wars often begin by some kind of mistake, some accident, someone accidentally pulls the trigger, or presses a

button somewhere, and suddenly, something happens. Exactly what happened in 1914, at the beginning of World War I. Actually, there was one who was shot in Sarajevo. Everyone knows about that, and things like that could happen. And for us, living in Europe, it's awful to think about having a war.

We can hate Putin. We can think whatever we like. But the thought of a nuclear war is horrible for all of us, and that's why I think that politicians could come to their senses.

And I think also this demonization of Russia, and demonization of Putin, is very bad, of course, for the Russians. But it's very bad for us here in the West, for us, in Europe, and also in America. I don't think it's very good for our democracy. I don't think it's very good. I don't see very many healthy perspectives in this. I don't see any at all.

I see some other prospects, because we could cooperate in another way. There are possibilities, of course, which are not being used, or put into practice, which certainly could be.

So, yes, your question is very, very relevant and we can talk at length about it. I'm very happy that you ask this question, because if you ask these questions today in the Danish and Western media at all—everyone thinks it's enough just to say that Putin is a scoundrel, Putin is a crook, and everything is good. No, we have to get along. We have to find some ways to cooperate, because otherwise it will be the demise of all of us.

%%NATO Expansion Eastward

Michelle Rasmussen: Can you just go through a little bit more of the history of the NATO expansion towards the East? And what we're speaking about in terms of the treaties that Russia has proposed, first, to prevent Ukraine from becoming a formal member of NATO, and second, to prevent the general expansion of NATO, both in terms of soldiers and military equipment towards the East. Can you speak about this, also in terms of

the broken promises from the Western side?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Actually, the story goes back to the beginning of the nineties. I had a long talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, the former leader of the Soviet Union, in 1989, just when NATO started to bomb Serbia, and when they adopted Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary into NATO. You should bear in mind that Gorbachev is a very nice person. He's a very lively person, with good humor, and an experienced person.

But when we started to talk, I asked him about the NATO expansion, which was going on exactly the day when we were talking. He became very gloomy, very sad, because he said,

[[[begin quote indent]]]

Well, I talked to James Baker, Helmut Kohl from Germany, and several other persons, and they all promised me not to move an inch to the East, if Soviet Union would let Germany unite the GDR (East Germany) and West Germany, to become one country, and come to be a member of NATO, but not move an inch to the East.

[[[end quote indent]]]

I think, also, some of the new material which has been released—I have read some of it, some on WikiLeaks, and some can be found. It's declassified. It's very interesting. There's no doubt at all. There were some oral, spoken promises to Mikhail Gorbachev. It was not written, because, as he said, "I believed them. I can see I was naive."

I think this is a key to Putin today, to understand why Putin wants not only sweet words. He wants something based on a treaty, because, basically, he doesn't really believe the West. The level of trust between Russia and NATO countries is very, very low today. And it's a problem, of course, and I don't think we can overcome it in a few years. It takes time to build trust, but the trust is not there for the time being.

But then, the nature of the NATO expansion has gone step, by step, by step. First, it was the three countries—Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic—and then, in 2004, six years later, came, among other things—the Baltic republics, and Slovakia, Romania and Bulgaria. And the others came later on—Albania, Croatia, etc. And then in 2008, there was a NATO Summit in Bucharest, where George Bush, President of the United States, promised Georgia and Ukraine membership of NATO. Putin was present. He was not President at this time. He was Prime Minister in Russia, because the President was [Dmitry] Medvedev, but he was very angry at this time. But what could he do? But he said, at this point, very, very clearly, “We will not accept it, because our red lines would be crossed here. We have accepted the Baltic states. We have retreated. We’ve gone back. We’ve been going back for several years,” but still, it was not off the table.

It was all because Germany and France did not accept it, because [Chancellor Angela] Merkel and [President François] Hollande, at this time, did not accept Ukraine and Georgia becoming a member of NATO. But the United States pressed for it, and it is still on the agenda of the United States, that Georgia and Ukraine should be a member of NATO.

So, there was a small war in August, the same year, a few months after this NATO Summit, where, actually, it was Georgia which attacked South Ossetia, which used to be a self-governing part of Georgia. The incumbent Georgian president, Mikheil Saakashvili did not want to accept the autonomous status of South Ossetia, so Georgia attacked South Ossetia. Russian soldiers were deployed in South Ossetia, and 14 of them were killed by the Georgian army. And you could say that George W. Bush promised Georgian President Saakashvili that the Americans would support the Georgians, in case Russia should retaliate, which they did.

The Russian army was, of course, much bigger than the Georgian army, and it smashed the Georgian army in five days, and

retreated. There was no help from the United States to the Georgians. And, I think, that from a moral point of view, I don't think it's a very wise policy, because you can't say "You just go on. We will help you"—and not help at all when it gets serious. I think, from a moral point of view, it's not very fair.

%%A Coup in Ukraine

But, actually, it's the same which seems to be happening now in Ukraine, even though there was, what I would call a coup, an orchestrated state coup, in 2014. I know there are very, very different opinions about this, but my opinion is that there was a kind of coup to oust the sitting incumbent President, Viktor Yanukovych, and replace him with one who was very, very keen on getting into NATO. Yanukovych was not very keen on going into NATO, but he still had the majority of the population. And it's interesting. In Ukraine, there's been a lot of opinion polls conducted by Germans, Americans, French, Europeans, Russians and Ukrainians. And all these opinion polls show that a majority of Ukrainian people did not want to join NATO.

After that, of course, things moved very quickly, because Crimea was a very, very sensitive question for Russia, for many reasons. First, it was a contested area because it was, from the very beginning, from 1991, when Ukraine was independent—there was no unanimity about Crimea and it's status, because the majority of Crimea was Russian-speaking, and is very culturally close to Russia, in terms of history. It's very close to Russia. It's one of the most patriotic parts of Russia, actually. So, it's a very odd part of Ukraine. It always was a very odd part of Ukraine.

The first thing the new government did in February 2014, was to forbid the Russian language, as a language which had been used in local administration, and things like that. It was one of the stupidest things you could do in such a very tense

situation. Ukraine, basically, is a very cleft society. The eastern southern part is very close to Russia. They speak Russian and are very close to Russian culture. The western part, the westernmost part around Lviv, is very close to Poland and Austria, and places like that. So, it's a cleft society, and in such a society you have some options. One option is to embrace all the parts of society, different parts of society. Or you can, also, one part could impose its will on the other part, against its will. And that was actually what happened.

So, there are several crises. There is the crisis in Ukraine, with two approximately equally sized parts of Ukraine. But you also have, on the other hand, the Russian-NATO question. So, you had two crises, and they stumbled together, and they were pressed together in 2014. So, you had a very explosive situation which has not been solved to this day.

And for Ukraine, I say that as long as you have this conflict between Russia and NATO, it's impossible to solve, because it's one of the most corrupt societies, one of the poorest societies in Europe right now. A lot of people come to Denmark, where we are now, to Germany and also to Russia. Millions of Ukrainians have gone abroad to work, because there are really many, many social problems, economic problems, things like that.

And that's why Putin—if we remember what Gorbachev told me about having things on paper, on treaties, which are signed—and that's why Putin said, what he actually said to the West, “I don't really believe you, because when you can, you cheat.” He didn't put it that way, but that was actually what he meant: “So now I tell you very, very, very, very clearly what our points of view are. We have red lines, like you have red lines. Don't try to cross them.”

And I think many people in the West do not like it. I think it's very clear, because I think the red lines, if you compare

them historically, are very reasonable. If you compare them with the United States and the Monroe Doctrine, which is still in effect in the USA, they are very, very reasonable red lines. I would say that many of the Ukrainians, are very close to Russia. I have many Ukrainian friends. I sometimes forget that they are Ukrainians, because their language, their first language, is actually Russian, and Ukrainian is close to Russian.

So, those countries being part of an anti-Russian military pact, it's simply madness. It cannot work. It will not work. Such a country would never be a normal country for many, many years, forever.

I think much of the blame could be put on the NATO expansion and those politicians who have been pressing for that for several years. First and foremost, Bill Clinton was the first one, Madeline Albright, from 1993. At this time, they adopted the policy of major extension to the East. And George W. Bush also pressed for Ukraine and Georgia to become members of NATO.

And for every step, there was, in Russia, people rallying around the flag. You could put it that way, because you have pressure. And the more we pressure with NATO, the more the Russians will rally around the flag, and the more authoritarian Russia will be. So, we are in this situation. Things are now happening in Russia, which I can admit I do not like, closing some offices, closing some media. I do not like it at all. But in a time of confrontation, I think it's quite reasonable, understandable, even though I would not defend it. But it's understandable. Because the United States, after 9/11, also adopted a lot of defensive measures, and a kind of censorship, and things like that. It's what happens when you have such tense situations.

We should just also bear in mind that Russia and the United States are the two countries which possess 90% of the world's

nuclear armament. Alone, the mere thought of them using some of this, is a doomsday perspective, because it will not be a small, tiny war, like World War II, but it will dwarf World War II, because billions will die in this. And it's a question, if humanity will survive. So, it's a very, very grave question.

I think we should ask if the right of Ukraine to have NATO membership—which its own population does not really want— “Is it really worth the risk of a nuclear war?” That's how I would put it.

I will not take all blame away from Russia. That's not my point here. My point is that this question is too important. It's very relevant. It's very important that we establish a kind of modus vivendi. It's a problem for the West. I also think it's very important that we learn, in the West, how to cope with people who are not like us. We tend to think that people should become democrats like we are democrats, and only then will we deal with them. If they are not democrats, like we are democrats, we will do everything we can to make them democrats. We will support people who want to make a revolution in their country, so they become like us. It's a very, very dangerous, dangerous way of thinking, and a destructive way of thinking.

I think that we in the West should study, maybe, a little more what is happening in other organizations not dominated by the West. I'm thinking about the BRICS, as one organization. I'm also thinking about the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, in which Asian countries are cooperating, and they are not changing each other. The Chinese are not demanding that we should all be Confucians. And the Russians are not demanding that all people in the world should be Orthodox Christians, etc. I think it's very, very important that we bear in mind that we should cope with each other like we are, and not demand changes. I think it's a really dangerous and stupid game to play. I think the European Union is also very active

in this game, which I think is very, very—Well, this way of thinking, in my point of view, has no perspective, no positive perspective at all.

%%Diplomacy to Avert Catastrophe

Michelle Rasmussen: Today, Presidents Biden and Putin will speak on the phone, and important diplomatic meetings are scheduled for the middle of January. What is going to determine if diplomacy can avoid a disaster, as during the Cuban Missile Crisis? Helga Zepp-LaRouche has just called this a “reverse missile crisis.” Or, if Russia will feel that they have no alternative to having a military response, as they have openly stated. What changes on the Western side are necessary? If you had President Biden alone in a room, or other heads of state of NATO countries, what would you say to them?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I would say, “Look, Joe, I understand your concerns. I understand that you see yourself as a champion of freedom in the world, and things like that. I understand the positive things about it. But, you see, the game you now are playing with Russia is a very, very dangerous game. And the Russians, are a very proud people; you cannot force them. It’s not an option. I mean, you cannot, because it has been American, and to some degree, also European Union policy, to change Russia, to very much like to change, so that they’ll have another president, and exchange Putin for another president.”

But I can assure you, if I were to speak to Joe Biden, I’d say, “Be sure that if you succeed, or if Putin dies tomorrow, or somehow they’ll have a new President, I can assure you that the new President will be just as tough as Putin, maybe even tougher. Because in Russia, you have much tougher people. I would say even most people in Russia who blame Putin, blame him because he’s not tough enough on the West, because he was soft on the West, too liberal toward the West, and many people

have blamed him for not taking the eastern southern part of Ukraine yet—that he should have done it.

“So, I would say to Biden, “I think it would be wise for you, right now, to support Putin, or to deal with Putin, engage with Putin, and do some diplomacy, because the alternative is a possibility of war, and you should not go down into history as the American president who secured the extinction of humanity. It would be a bad, very bad record for you. And there are possibilities, because I don’t think Putin is unreasonable. Russia has not been unreasonable. I think they have turned back. Because in 1991, it was the Russians themselves, who disbanded the Soviet Union. It was the Russians, Moscow, which disbanded the Warsaw Pact. The Russians, who gave liberty to the Baltic countries, and all other Soviet Republics. And with hardly any shots, and returned half a million Soviet soldiers back to Russia. No shot was fired at all. I think it’s extraordinary.

“If you compare what happened to the dismemberment of the French and the British colonial empires after World War II, the disbanding of the Warsaw Pact was very, very civilized, in many ways. So, stop thinking about Russia as uncivilized, stupid people, who don’t understand anything but mere power. Russians are an educated people. They understand a lot of arguments, and they are interested in cooperating. There will be a lot of advantages for the United States, for the West, and also the European Union, to establish a kind of more productive, more pragmatic relationship, cooperation. There are a lot of things in terms of energy, climate, of course, and terrorism, and many other things, where it’s a win-win situation to cooperate with them.

“The only thing Russia is asking for is not to put your military hardware in their backyard. I don’t think it should be hard for us to accept, certainly not to understand why the Russians think this way.”

And we in the West should think back to the history, where armies from the West have attacked Russia. So, they have it in their genes. I don't think that there is any person in Russia who has forgot, or is not aware of, the huge losses the Soviet Union suffered from Nazi Germany in the 1940s during World War II. And you had Napoleon also trying to—You have a lot of that experience with armies from the West going into Russia. So, it's very, very large, very, very deep.

Michelle Rasmussen: Was it around 20 million people who died during World War II?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: In the Soviet Union. There were also Ukrainians, and other nationalities, but it was around 18 million Russians, if you can count it, because it was the Soviet Union, but twenty-seven million people in all. It's a huge part, because Russia has experience with war. So, the Russians would certainly not like war. I think the Russians have experience with war, that also the Europeans, to some extent, have, that the United States does not have.

Because the attack I remember in recent times is the 9/11 attack, the twin towers in New York. Otherwise, the United States does not have these experiences. It tends to think more in ideological terms, where the Russians, certainly, but also to some extent, some people in Europe, think more pragmatically, more that we should, at any cost, avoid war, because war creates more problems than it solves. So, have some pragmatic cooperation. It will not be very much a love affair. Of course not. But it will be on a very pragmatic—

%%The Basis for Cooperation

Michelle Rasmussen: Also, in terms of dealing with this horrible humanitarian situation in Afghanistan and cooperating on the pandemic.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Of course, there are possibilities. Right now, it's like we can't even cooperate in terms of

vaccines, and there are so many things going on, from both sides, actually, because we have very, very little contact between—

I had some plans to have some cooperation between Danish and Russian universities in terms of business development, things like that, but it turned out there was not one crown, as our currency is called. You could have projects in southern America, Africa, all other countries. But not Russia, which is stupid.

Michelle Rasmussen: You wrote two recent books about Russia. One is called, *On His Own Terms: Putin and the New Russia*, and the latest one, just from September, *Russia Against the Grain*. Many people in the West portray Russia as the enemy, which is solely responsible for the current situation, and Putin as a dictator who is threatening his neighbors militarily and threatening the democracy of the free world. Over and above what you have already said, is this true, or do you have a different viewpoint?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Of course, I have a different point of view. Russia for me, is not a perfect country, because such a country does not exist, not even Denmark! Some suppose it is. But there's no such thing as a perfect society. Because societies are always developing from somewhere, to somewhere, and Russia, likewise. Russia is a very, very big country. So, you can definitely find things which are not very likable in Russia. Definitely. That's not my point here.

But I think that in the West, actually for centuries, we have—if you look back, I have tried in my latest book, to find out how Western philosophers, how church people, how they look at Russia, from centuries back. And there has been kind of a red thread. There's been a kind of continuation. Because Russia has very, very, very often been characterized as our adversary, as a country against basic European values. Five hundred years back, it was against the Roman Catholic Church,

and in the 17th and 18th Centuries it was against the Enlightenment philosophers, and in the 20th century, it was about communism—it's also split people in the West, and it was also considered to be a threat. But it is also considered to be a threat today, even though Putin is not a communist. He is not a communist. He is a conservative, a moderate conservative, I would say.

Even during the time of Yeltsin, he was also considered liberal and progressive, and he loved the West and followed the West in all, almost all things they proposed.

But still, there's something with Russia—which I think from a philosophical point of view is very important to find out—that we have some very deep-rooted prejudices about Russia, and I think they play a role. When I speak to people who say, "Russia is an awful country, and Putin is simply a very, very evil person, is a dictator," I say, "Have you been in Russia? Do you know any Russians?" "No, not really." "Ok. But what do you base your points of view on?" "Well, what I read in the newspapers, of course, what they tell me on the television."

Well, I think that's not good enough. I understand why the Russians—I very often talk to Russian politicians, and other people, and what they are sick and tired of, is this notion that the West is better: "We are on a higher level. And if Russians should be accepted by the West, they should become like us. Or at least they should admit that they are on a lower level, in relation to our very high level."

And that is why, when they deal with China, or deal with India, and when they deal with African countries, and even Latin American countries, they don't meet such attitudes, because they are on more equal terms. They're different, yes, but one does not consider each other to be on a higher level.

And that's why I think that cooperation in BRICS, which we talked about, and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, I

think it's quite successful. I don't know about the future, but I have a feeling that if you were talking about Afghanistan, I think if Afghanistan could be integrated into this kind of organization, one way or another, I have a feeling it probably would be more successful than the 20 years that the NATO countries have been there.

I think that cultural attitudes play a role when we're talking about politics, because a lot of the policy from the American, European side, is actually very emotional. It's very much like, "We have some feelings—We fear Russia. We don't like it," or "We think that it's awful." And "Our ideas, we know how to run a society much better than the Russians, and the Chinese, and the Indians, and the Muslims," and things like that. It's a part of the problem. It's a part of our problem in the West. It's a part of our way of thinking, our philosophy, which I think we should have a closer look at and criticize. But it's difficult, because it's very deeply rooted.

When I discuss with people at universities and in the media, and other places, I encounter this. That is why I wrote the latest book, because it's very much about our way of thinking about Russia. The book is about Russia, of course, but it's also about us, our glasses, how we perceive Russia, how we perceive not only Russia, but it also goes for China, because it's more or less the same. But there are many similarities between how we look upon Russia, and how we look upon and perceive China, and other countries.

I think this is a very, very important thing we have to deal with. We have to do it, because otherwise, if we decide, if America and Russia decide to use all the fireworks they have of nuclear [armament] power, then it's the end.

You can put it very sharply, to put it like that, and people will not like it. But basically, we are facing these two alternatives: Either we find ways to cooperate with people who

are not like us, and will not be, certainly not in my lifetime, like us, and accept them, that they are not like us, and get on as best we can, and keep our differences, but respect each other. I think that's what we need from the Western countries. I think it's the basic problem today dealing with other countries.

And the same goes, from what I have said, for China. I do not know the Chinese language. I have been in China. I know a little about China. Russia, I know very well. I speak Russian, so I know how Russians are thinking about this, what their feelings are about this. And I think it's important to deal with these questions.

%%'A Way to Live Together'

Michelle Rasmussen: You also pointed out, that in 2001, after the attack against the World Trade Center, Putin was the first one to call George Bush, and he offered cooperation about dealing with terrorism. You've written that he had a pro-Western worldview, but that this was not reciprocated.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes. Afterwards, Putin was criticized by the military, and also by politicians in the beginning of his first term in 2000, 2001, 2002, he was criticized because he was too happy for America. He even said, in an interview in the BBC, that he would like Russia to become a member of NATO. It did not happen, because—there are many reasons for that. But he was very, very keen—that's also why he felt very betrayed afterward. In 2007, at the Munich Conference on Security in February in Germany, he said he was very frustrated, and it was very clear that he felt betrayed by the West. He thought that they had a common agenda. He thought that Russia should become a member. But Russia probably is too big.

If you consider Russia becoming a member of the European Union, the European Union would change thoroughly, but they

failed. Russia did not become a member. It's understandable. But then I think the European Union should have found, again, a modus vivendi.

Michelle Rasmussen: A way of living together.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, how to live together. It was actually a parallel development of the European Union and NATO, against Russia. In 2009, the European Union invited Georgia, Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Azerbaijan, to become members of the European Union, but not Russia. Even though they knew that there was really a lot of trade between Ukraine, also Georgia, and Russia. And it would interfere with that trade. But they did not pay attention to Russia.

So, Russia was left out at this time. And so eventually, you could say, understandably, very understandably, Russia turned to China. And in China, with cooperation with China, they became stronger. They became much more self-confident, and they also cooperated with people who respected them much more. I think that's interesting, that the Chinese understood how to deal with other people with respect, but the Europeans and Americans did not.

%%Ukraine, Again

Michelle Rasmussen: Just before we go to our last questions. I want to go back to Ukraine, because it's so important. You said that the problem did not start with the so-called annexation of Crimea, but with what you called a coup against the sitting president. Can you just explain more about that? Because in the West, everybody says, "Oh, the problem started when Russia annexed Crimea."

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, if you take Ukraine, in 2010 there was a presidential election, and the OSCE [Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe] monitored the election, and said that it was very good, and the majority voted for Viktor Yanukovich. Viktor Yanukovich did not want Ukraine to

become a member of NATO. He wanted to cooperate with the European Union. But he also wanted to keep cooperating with Russia. Basically, that's what he was like. But it's very often claimed that he was corrupt. Yes, I don't doubt it, but name me one president who has not been corrupt. That's not the big difference, it's not the big thing, I would say. But then in 2012, there was also a parliamentary election in Ukraine, and Yanukovych's party also gained a majority with some other parties. There was a coalition which supported Yanukovych's policy not to become a member of NATO.

And then there was a development where the European Union and Ukraine were supposed to sign a treaty of cooperation. But he found out that the treaty would be very costly for Ukraine, because they would open the borders for European Union firms, and the Ukrainian firms would not be able to compete with the Western firms.

Secondly, and this is the most important thing, basic industrial export from Ukraine was to Russia, and it was industrial products from the eastern part, from Dnipropetrovsk or Dniepro as it is called today, from Donetsk, from Luhansk and from Kryvyj Rih (Krivoj Rog), from some other parts, basically in the eastern part, which is the industrial part of Ukraine.

And they made some calculations that showed that, well, if you join this agreement, Russia said, "We will have to put some taxes on the export, because you will have some free import from the European Union. We don't have an agreement with the European Union, so, of course, anything which comes from you, there would be some taxes imposed on it." And then Yanukovych said, "Well, well, well, it doesn't sound good," and he wanted Russia, the European Union and Ukraine to go together, and the three form what we call a triangular agreement.

But the European Union was very much opposed to it. The eastern part of Ukraine was economically a part of Russia.

Part of the Russian weapons industry was actually in the eastern part of Ukraine, and there were Russian speakers there. But the European Union said, "No, we should not cooperate with Russia about this," because Yanukovych wanted to have cooperation between the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia, which sounds very sensible to me. Of course, it should be like that. It would be to the advantage of all three parts. But the European Union had a very ideological approach to this. So, they were very much against Russia. It also increased the Russian's suspicion that the European Union was only a stepping-stone to NATO membership.

And then what happened was that there was a conflict, there were demonstrations every day on the Maidan Square in Kiev. There were many thousands of people there, and there were also shootings, because many of the demonstrators were armed people. They had stolen weapons from some barracks in the West. And at this point, when 100 people had been killed, the European Union foreign ministers from France, Germany and Poland met, and there was also a representative from Russia, and there was Yanukovych, a representative from his government, and from the opposition. And they made an agreement. Ok. You should have elections this year, in half a year, and you should have some sharing of power. People from the opposition should become members of the government, and things like that.

All of a sudden, things broke down, and Yanukovych left, because you should remember, and very often in the West, they tend to forget that the demonstrators were armed. And they killed police also. They killed people from Yanukovych's Party of the Regions, and things like that. So, it's always been portrayed as innocent, peace-loving demonstrators. They were not at all. And some of them had very dubious points of view, with Nazi swastikas, and things like that. And Yanukovych fled.

Then they came to power. They had no legitimate government,

because many of the members of parliament from these parts of the regions which had supported Yanukovych, had fled to the East. So, the parliament was not able to make any decisions. Still, there was a new president, also a new government, which was basically from the western part of Ukraine. And the first thing they did, I told you, was to get rid of the Russian language, and then they would talk about NATO membership. And Victoria Nuland was there all the time, the vice foreign minister of the United States, was there all the time. There were many people from the West also, so things broke down.

%%Crimea

Michelle Rasmussen: There have actually been accusations since then, that there were provocateurs who were killing people on both sides.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Yes, exactly. And what's interesting is that there's been no investigation whatsoever about it, because a new government did not want to conduct an investigation as to who killed them. So, it was orchestrated. There's no doubt in my mind it was an orchestrated coup. No doubt about it.

That's the basic context for the decision of Putin to accept Crimea as a part of Russia. In the West, it is said that Russia simply annexed Crimea. It's not precisely what happened, because there was a local parliament, it was an autonomous part of Ukraine, and they had their own parliament, and they made the decision that they should have a referendum, which they had in March. And then they applied to become a member of the Russian Federation. It's not a surprise, even though the Ukrainian army did not go there, because there was a Ukrainian army. There were 21,000 Ukrainian soldiers. 14,000 of these soldiers joined the Russian army.

And so, that tells a little about how things were not like a normal annexation, where one country simply occupies part of

the other country. Because you have this cleft country, you have this part, especially the southern part, which was very, very pro-Russian, and it's always been so. There's a lot of things in terms of international law you can say about it.

But I have no doubt that you can look upon it differently, because if you look at it from the point of people who lived in Crimea, they did not want—because almost 80-90% had voted for the Party of the Regions, which was Yanukovych's party, a pro-Russian party, you could say, almost 87%, or something like that.

They have voted for this Party. This Party had a center in a central building in Kiev, which was attacked, burned, and three people were killed. So, you could imagine that they would not be very happy. They would not be very happy with the new government, and the new development. Of course not. They hated it. And what I think is very critical about the West is that they simply accepted, they accepted these horrible things in Ukraine, just to have the prize, just to have this prey, of getting Ukraine into NATO.

And Putin was aware that he could not live, not even physically, but certainly not politically, if Sevastopol, with the harbor for the Russian fleet, became a NATO harbor. It was impossible. I know people from the military say "No, no way." It's impossible. Would the Chinese take San Diego in the United States? Of course not. It goes without saying that such things don't happen.

So, what is lacking in the West is just a little bit of realism. How powers, how superpowers think, and about red lines of superpowers. Because we have an idea in the West about the new liberal world order. It sounds very nice when you're sitting in an office in Washington. It sounds very beautiful and easy, but to go out and make this liberal world order, it's not that simple. And you cannot do it like, certainly not do it like the way they did it in Ukraine.

Michelle Rasmussen: Regime change?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, regime change.

%%The Importance of Cultural Exchanges

Michelle Rasmussen: I have two other questions. The last questions. The Russian-Danish Dialogue organization that you are a leader of, and the Schiller Institute in Denmark, together with the China Cultural Center in Copenhagen, were co-sponsors of three very successful Musical Dialogue of Cultures Concerts, with musicians from Russia, China, and many other countries. You are actually an associate professor in cultural differences. How do you see that? How would an increase in cultural exchange improve the situation?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, it cannot but improve, because we have very little, as I also told you. So, I'm actually also very, very happy with this cooperation, because I think it's very enjoyable, these musical events, they are very, very enjoyable and very interesting, also for many Danish people, because when you have the language of music, it is better than the language of weapons, if I can put it that way, of course. But I also think that when we meet each other, when we listen to each other's music, and share culture in terms of films, literature, paintings, whatever, I think it's also, well, it's a natural thing, first of all, and it's unnatural not to have it.

We do not have it, because maybe some people want it that way, if people want us to be in a kind of tense situation. They would not like to have it, because I think without this kind of, it's just a small thing, of course, but without these cultural exchanges, well, you will be very, very bad off. We will have a world which is much, much worse, I think, and we should learn to enjoy the cultural expressions of other people.

We should learn to accept them, also, we should learn to also

cooperate and also find ways—. We are different. But, also, we have a lot of things in common, and the things we have in common are very important not to forget, that even with Russians, and even the Chinese, also all other peoples, we have a lot in common, that is very important to bear in mind that we should never forget. Basically, we have the basic values we have in common, even though if you are Hindu, a Confucian, a Russian Orthodox, we have a lot of things in common.

And when you have such kind of encounters like in cultural affairs, in music, I think that you become aware of it, because suddenly it's much easier to understand people, if you listen to their music. Maybe you need to listen a few times, but it becomes very, very interesting. You become curious about instruments, ways of singing, and whatever it is. So, I hope the corona situation will allow us, also, to make some more concerts. I think it should be, because they're also very popular in Denmark.

Michelle Rasmussen: Yes. As Schiller wrote, it's through beauty that we arrive at political freedom. We can also say it's through beauty that we can arrive at peace.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes, yes.

%%The Role of Schiller Institute

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, its founder and international President, are leading an international campaign to prevent World War III, for peace through economic development, and a dialogue amongst cultures. How do you see the role of the Schiller Institute?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Well, I know it. We have been cooperating. I think your basic calls, appeals for global development, I think it's very, very interesting, and I share the basic point of view. I think maybe it's a little difficult. The devil is in the details, but basically, I think

what you are thinking about, when I talk about the Silk Road, when I talk about these Chinese programs, Belt and Road programs, I see much more successful development that we have seen, say, in Africa and European countries developing, because I have seen how many western-dominated development programs have been distorting developments in Africa and other parts of the world. They distort development.

I'm not uncritical to China, but, of course, I can see very positive perspectives in the Belt and Road program. I can see really, really good perspectives, because just look at the railroads in China, for instance, at their fast trains. It's much bigger than anywhere else in the world. I think there are some perspectives, really, which I think attract, first and foremost, people in Asia.

But I think, eventually, also, people in Europe, because I also think that this model is becoming more and more—it's also beginning in the eastern part. Some countries of Eastern Europe are becoming interested. So, I think it's very interesting. Your points of your points of view. I think they're very relevant, also because I think we are in a dead-end alley in the West, what we are in right now, so people anyway are looking for new perspectives.

And what you come up with, I think, is very, very interesting, certainly. What it may be in the future is difficult to say because things are difficult.

But the basic things that you think about, and what I have heard about the Schiller Institute, also because I also think that you stress the importance of tolerance. You stress the importance of a multicultural society, that we should not change each other. We should cooperate on the basis of mutual interests, not changing each other. And as I have told you, this is what I see as one of the real, real big problems in the western mind, the western way of thinking, that we should decide what should happen in the world as if we still think we

are colonial powers, like we have been for some one hundred years. But these times are over. There are new times ahead, and we should find new ways of thinking. We should find new perspectives.

And I think it goes for the West, that we can't go on living like this. We can't go on thinking like this, because it will either be war, or it'll be dead end alleys, and there'll be conflicts everywhere.

You can look at things as a person from the West. I think it's sad to look at Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and those countries, Syria to some extent also, where the West has tried to make some kind of regime change or decide what happens. They're not successful. I think it's obvious for all. And we need some new way of thinking. And what the Schiller Institute has come up with is very, very interesting in this perspective, I think.

Michelle Rasmussen: Actually, when you speak about not changing other people, one of our biggest points is that we actually have to challenge ourselves to change ourselves. To really strive for developing our creative potential and to make a contribution that will have, potentially, international implications.

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: Yes. Definitely

Michelle Rasmussen: The Schiller Institute is on full mobilization during the next couple of weeks to try to get the United States and NATO to negotiate seriously. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche has called on the U.S. and NATO to sign these treaties that Russia has proposed, and to pursue other avenues of preventing nuclear war. So, we hope that you, our viewers, will also do everything that you can, including circulating this video.

Is there anything else you would like to say to our viewers before we end, Jens Jørgen?

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: No. I think we have talked a lot now. Only I think what you said about bringing the U.S. and Russia to the negotiation table, it's obvious. I think that it should be, for any prudent, clear-thinking person in the West, it should be obvious that this is the only right thing to do. So of course, we support it 100%.

Michelle Rasmussen: Okay. Thank you so much, Jens Jørgen Nielsen

Jens Jørgen Nielsen: I thank you.

Ny dokumentar: Genoplivelsen af det Amerikanske System med kinesiske Karaktertræk af Peter Møller

Udgivet af LaRouche-organisationen i USA den 17. august 2021.

Hvordan kineserne lærte om økonomisk udvikling fra Det amerikanske System, der var promoveret af Lyndon LaRouches organisation, som amerikanerne har glemt.

18. august 2021 – I går udgav LaRouche-Organisationen en ny dokumentar med titlen: „Genoplivelsen af det Amerikanske System med kinesiske Karaktertræk“, som er et bidrag til at få USA til at deltage i Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ (BVI) og endelig løsrive sig fra det britisk centrerede, geopolitiske system. Videoen viser hvordan dette ikke blot er det rigtige at gøre, men at BVI er baseret på de samme principper der ligger til grund for det der historisk er kendt som det

'Amerikanske System' – hvis USA afviser BVI, ville det dermed afvise sin egen historiske identitet.

Videoen begynder med fejringen af hundredårsjubilæet for Uafhængighedserklæringen i Philadelphia i 1876, som var centralt i udbredelsen af det Amerikanske System til resten af verden. Den viser adskillige eksempler på dette – blandt andet i Kina – og hvordan det Britiske Imperium manøvrerede for at stoppe denne eksistentielle trussel til deres maritimt dominerede kontrol over verdens begivenheder, ved at spille alle de nationer, som deltog i det, ud mod hinanden – en konflikt der er nu er kendt som 1. Verdenskrig.

Videre viser den genoplivelsen af det Amerikanske System, først med livsværket af Sun Yat-sen – grundlæggeren af det moderne Kina – og hvordan Deng Xiaoping – efter ødelæggelsen forårsaget af 2. Verdenskrig, den kinesiske borgerkrig og kulturrevolutionen – i hvert fald implicit, videreførte Suns vision for Kina, som derefter begyndte at udvikle sig til en moderne, industriel nation.

Med sammenbruddet af Sovjetunionen begynder Lyndon og Helga LaRouche en kampagne for Den eurasiske Landbro og opfinder navnet 'Den nye Silkevej'. Dette program, baseret på idéerne fra Henry C. Carey og det Amerikanske System, blev vedtaget af det kinesiske lederskab og genkendes i dag i af Bælte- og Vejinitiativets omsiggribende succes.

Men spørgsmålet forbliver: Vil USA blive en del af dette "Amerikanske System"-initiativ, eller vil det afvise sin egen historiske identitet og fortsætte sin underdanighed til en britisk centreret, geopolitisk ideologi, der allerede er ved at bringe verden tættere og tættere på en krig, som kun få ville overleve længe nok til at berette om? Det kapitel er stadig ikke nedskrevet – et kapitel som vi alle spiller en mulig rolle i.

LaRouche Legacy Foundations konference – Verden bør lytte til Lyndon LaRouches kloge ord.

Se også panel 2 her:

Resumé:

14. august (EIRNS) – Kan den menneskelige race overleve den krise, der nu truer selve menneskeheden? Vil vi som en race betragtet fortsætte nedgangen til global atomkrig, en pandemi uden for kontrol, en hyperinflationær ødelæggelse af midlerne til livets opretholdelse, et kulturelt sammenbrud i en ny mørk tidsalder? Eller kan denne eksistentielle krise tjene til en genopblussen af menneskelig kreativitet hos tilstrækkeligt mange borgere i verden til både at afslutte det vanvid, der bragte os til dette punkt, og iværksætte et nyt paradigme, der forener verdens nationer i at stræbe efter menneskehedens fælles mål – fred gennem udvikling? Svaret ligger ikke blot i hvad folk tænker, men hvordan de tænker. Kan vi inspirere til kreativitet i en befolkning, der er blevet degraderet gennem videnskabeligt bedrageri, narkotika, pornografi, evindelig krigsførelse og økonomisk forfald?

Dette var temaet for konferencen i dag, den første der er sponsoreret af 'LaRouche Legacy Foundation'. Helga Zepp-LaRouche fik selskab af ledere fra hele verden – politiske ledere, økonomer, musikere, forskere og unge – fra Rusland, Kina, Slovakiet, Tyskland, Frankrig, Østrig, Argentina, Filippinerne, Mexico, Trinidad & Tobago, Peru, Colombia og

Ukraine, i en dialog om "LaRouches opdagelser" og om "Jordens næste halvtreds år" under temaet: "Nå, er du så endelig villig til at lære om økonomi?" LaRouche Legacy Foundation er i gang med at udgive 'LaRouches Complete Works', hvoraf del 1 nu er tilgængeligt

(se <https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org/collected-works>)

Det var for halvtreds år siden, den 15. august 1971, at Lyndon LaRouche blev ganske berømt, men også blev mål for det, som tidligere statsadvokat Ramsey Clark beskrev som "en kompleks og gennemgribende udnyttelse af retshåndhævelse, retsforfølgning, medier og ikke-statslige organisationer, fokuseret på at ødelægge en fjende... Formålet kan kun ses som ødelæggelsen – af mere end en politisk bevægelse, mere end en politisk skikkelse – det er begge dele; men det er en frugtbar idérig maskine, et fælles formål med at tænke og studere og analysere for at løse problemer, uanset indvirkningen på status quo eller på egeninteresser. Det var et overlagt formål at ødelægge dette for enhver pris".

På denne dag i 1971 ophævede præsident Richard Nixon Bretton Woods-systemet, som havde opretholdt udviklingen af verden i tiden efter Anden Verdenskrig, ved at afkoble den amerikanske dollar fra dens forankring til guld, hvilket gjorde den til genstand for spekulation og tillod alle verdens valutaer at flyde, så det britiske system for "frie markeder" og deregulering kunne erstatte det hamiltoniske 'Amerikanske System', der er baseret på ideen om målrettet kredit til at forbedre den generelle velfærd og forøge den produktive arbejdskraft.

EIR's økonomiredaktør, Paul Gallagher, forklarede tusindvis af deltagere i konferencen over hele verden (med samtidig oversættelse til spansk, fransk, tysk og russisk), at Bretton Woods, der blev vedtaget efter Franklin Roosevelts død, ikke var det system, der var tiltænkt af FDR. Roosevelt havde snarere insisteret på, at de tidligere europæiske kolonier efter krigen skulle tildeles fuld uafhængighed, og at det

amerikanske systems produktion af de kapitalgoder, der var nødvendige for at industrialisere hele verden, ville drive amerikansk produktion og samtidig endegyldigt afslutte kolonitiden. Men Harry Truman, som LaRouche karakteriserede som en 'lille mand, der tjente Wall Street', hjalp europæerne med at genoprette deres kolonier, mens USA blev indadvendt. Det efterfølgende fokus på intern forbrugerkultur gennem gæld, frem for eksport af kapitalgoder, ville – som forudsagt af LaRouche, på enestående vis blandt økonomer – forårsage tilbagegang og sammenbruddet af Bretton Woods. Dette var kun den første af LaRouches prognoser, som alle viste sig at blive fuldstændigt forudseende. En video af en tale af LaRouche i 2001, beskrev hans mange prognoser og understregede, at han "stod alene" blandt økonomer, der var indfanget i britisk monetaristisk ideologi, tænkte på penge, ikke den fysiske transformation af naturen eller livsbetingelserne for den menneskelige race.

Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedtale gav et stærkt indblik i hendes mand Lyndon LaRouches evne til at inspirere mennesker fra alle forskellige samfundslag, fra statsoverhoveder til peruanske fiskere og italienske skomagere, til at forstå en anden måde at tænke på – at man ikke kan adskille politik, videnskab og kultur, og at alle aspekter af livet falder ind under den centrale rolle af kreativitet, som kendetegnende for forskellen mellem menneske og dyr, og som driver videnskaben om fysisk økonomi som den sande videnskab om menneskelig fremgang. Hun bemærkede senere, at alle, der mødte LaRouche, oplevede en opvågning af deres egne fornuftsmæssige åndsevner, gennem kreativiteten i LaRouches sind, der ansporede dem.

Zepp-LaRouche afdækkede sin mands gæld til Platon, Leibniz, Kepler og andre af historiens giganter i forbindelse med hans egne opdagelser. Hun gennemgik de nye metrikker til måling af fremskridt, som han skabte – "relativ potentiel befolkningstæthed" og "energi-gennemstrømningstæthed" – og sammenhængen mellem disse afgørende begreber. Hun behandlede

Lyns første beslutning om at bekæmpe Norbert Wiener og John von Neumann statistiske metode til systemanalyse, der opfatter sindet som en computer og fremmer kunstig intelligens som en erstatning for sindet. Dette falske begreb om menneskets natur er i dag vokset til vanvid i "modellerne", der driver klimasvindlen, finansielle spekulationer og det oligarkiske samfund. Hun sluttede med at opfordre til "at udskifte idéerne om informationsteoriens kvaksalveri med LaRouches idéer på alle universiteter".

Den førende kinesiske økonom, Ding Yifan, der har skrevet om LaRouches ideer i flere bøger, bemærkede, at LaRouche havde fokus på to forbrydelser fra slutningen af Bretton Woods: Misbruget af valutaer gennem flydende valutakurser, hvilket tillod spekulanter at angribe nationale valutaer; og deregulering af det finansielle system, som gjorde det muligt for spekulanterne at tage over. Han noterede sig to begivenheder i kinesisk historie, første gang under Han-dynastiet for 2000 år siden, og sidenhen i den mongolske æra i 1300-tallet, hvor lignende ignoreren af forskellen mellem penge og realøkonomien førte til dynastiernes sammenbrud. Nutidens QE og anden hyperinflationær pengeudstedelse, sagde han, skaber en kræft i økonomien – en demonstration af LaRouches advarsel om entropi som følge af den manglende udvikling af realøkonomien.

Jozef Miklosko, den tidligere vicepremierminister i Tjekkoslaviet og tidligere slovakisk ambassadør i Italien, beskrev sin ven LaRouche som den mest veluddannede mand, han nogensinde har kendt, og bemærkede at 80 sider af sin bog handlede om LaRouche og hans organisation. Han beskrev sin rejse for at besøge LaRouche i fængslet, hvor dennes optimisme og agapē (menneskekærlighed, *red.*) var uforstyrret. Han gennemgik også uretfærdigheden ved LaRouches fængsling, og den verdensomspændende mobilisering af verdensborgere, der forenede sig for at protestere mod denne uretfærdighed. Han beskrev LaRouche som "Amerikas Sakharov" og opfordrede til en

ny revolution af kristen agapē. Han anbefalede, at der blev produceret en "kort bog" på alle sprog om LaRouches ideer, hvilket blev hilst velkommen af Helga Zepp-LaRouche og ordstyrer Dennis Small fra LaRouche Legacy Foundation, alt imens han iagttog, at det virkeligt ville være ganske svært at indfange LaRouches ideer i en "kort" bog.

Dr. Natalia Vitrenko, formand for det Progressive socialistiske Parti i Ukraine og tidligere parlamentariker og præsidentkandidat, holdt et lidenskabeligt oplæg med titlen, "Saving Mankind: Is It a Mission-Possible?," om hendes samarbejde med Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Hun påpegede, at topmødet mellem Biden og Putin korrekt indikerede den farlige strategiske krise, men advarede om at dette møde ikke tog fat på de grundlæggende årsager til krisens systemiske ødelæggelse af verdens økonomiske og finansielle system. Hun gennemgik verdensøkonomiens frygtelige tilstand og de nødvendige løsninger formuleret af LaRouche. Hun kaldte det vestlige banksystems tilstand en "spekulativ kæmpeblæksprutte" der suger rigdommen ud af verden. Hun gennemgik også ødelæggelsen af Ukraine efter kuppet i 2014, som drev landet fra at være en af de ti bedste økonomier i verden til den nu fattigste i Europa med 10 millioner sultne og et befolkningsfald på over 20% siden 1990. Hun afsluttede: "Bliver vi til en kirkegård med vindmøller i stedet for kors?"

Dr. Kirk Meighoo, tidligere senator i Trinidad & Tobago samt forfatter og en politisk aktivist, beskrev hvordan han blev udviklingsøkonom gennem sin uddannelse (i Toronto, Jamaica og Storbritannien), men først efter at have opdaget LaRouche via internettet indså, at hans dybtgående ideer var blevet censureret på alle universiteterne. Han beskrev, hvordan fremkomsten af Kina, Indien og Rusland som store økonomier burde have ført til en ny verdensorden, og at G20 havde gjort en indsats i den retning, men mislykkedes, alt imens BRICS nu er blevet revet fra hinanden. Pandemien ødelagde økonomier rundt om i verden, sagde han, mens penge bliver trykt i

uhyrlige mængder for at redde bankerne og "overføre rigdom fra de fattige til de rige". Løsning af denne krise kan kun opnås ved helt at afslutte det neoliberale system, bemærkede han, og roste LaRouche-organisationen for at lede denne indsats.

Universitetslektor Yekaterina Fyodorovna Shamayeva fra Rusland, talte om "Design og ledelse af bæredygtig udvikling samt tværfaglig syntese af de grundlæggende ideer indenfor Lyndon LaRouches og Pobisk Kuznetsovs metodelære." Afdøde Pobisk Kuznetsov var en af Ruslands førende forskere og filosofiske tænkere, der blev en nær ven og samarbejdspartner med Lyndon LaRouche efter Sovjetunionens fald. Han foreslog, at en ny måleenhed for fysiske økonomiers fremgang skulle baseres på LaRouches dobbeltbegreb for relativ potentiel befolkningstæthed og energi-gennemstrømningstæthed, og at enheden skulle kaldes "La" efter LaRouche. Shamayeva beskrev den fortsatte indsats i Rusland for at skabe en syntese af ideerne fra Kuznetsov og LaRouche, og understregede at økonomi ikke kan adskilles fra naturlovene. Hun opfordrede til, at flere af LaRouches værker blev oversat til russisk (et stort antal af LaRouches større skrifter er allerede tilgængelige på russisk).

Det første panel sluttede med videopræsentationer og oplæsninger om LaRouche fra flere mennesker, der er døde siden hen, blandt dem: tidligere statsadvokat Ramsey Clark om justitsmordet i forfølgelsen af LaRouche; Dr. Enéas Carneiro, et tidligere medlem af det brasilianske parlament og præsidentkandidat, om hvorfor LaRouche fik æresborgerskab i byen São Paulo; Mexicos tidligere præsident José López Portillo, der i 1998 opfordrede verden til at "lytte til de kloge ord fra Lyndon LaRouche"; og tidligere udenrigsminister i Guyana, Fred Wills, der i 1976 opfordrede FN's generalforsamling til at vedtage LaRouches idé om en ny international økonomisk orden

Fascinerende dialog under spørgerunden drejede sig om tre spørgsmål fra publikum: 1) Hvad er forskellen mellem

"prognoser" og "forudsigelser?" 2) Truer nye teknologier og robotter med at forårsage arbejdsløshed? 3) Hvad er forskellen mellem marxisme, neoliberalisme og kristen socialisme?

Hele konferencen kan ses på <https://www.larouchelegacyfoundation.org/news/august-15>

Trailer: Schiller Instituttet: Fred gennem økonomisk udvikling (4 min.)

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark tog initiativet til at lave video for at forklare, hvem vi er på en kort og spændende måde. Schiller Institut medlemmer i Frankrig, Tyskland og Canada hjalp til.

Del gerne videoen så bredt som muligt

De seneste år har været vidne til en optrapning af alvorlige og turbulente kriser.

Økonomisk kaos, flygtningekriser, COVID-19-pandemien, samt væbnede konflikter.

Der er snak om 'Den store Nulstilling' (The Great Reset), "alting-boblen", katastrofale storme og sågar atomkrig.

Men, heldigvis, er der håb for vores fælles fremtid.

Schiller Instituttet er en international, politisk

organisation og tænketank, etableret i 1984 af den tyske politiske leder og Friedrich Schiller-ekspert, Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Den amerikanske økonom, statsmand og filosof, Lyndon LaRouche, har inspireret os med sin idé om fred gennem økonomisk udvikling.

Vi går lidenskabeligt ind for skabelsen af en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden, gennem at uddanne og involvere borgere i de påtrængende, internationale problemer og at bidrage med løsninger.

Ved hjælp af vores lange erfaring i international politik har Schiller Instituttet organiseret hundredvis af internationale konferencer, for at forene de intellektuelle og moralske kræfter fra hele verden, fra det højeste akademiske, kulturelle og politiske niveau til bekymrede borgere, samt ungdommen på gaden og på universiteterne.

Vi er engageret i at skabe global opmærksomhed om Lyndon LaRouches Fire økonomiske Love, herunder:

- En global Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling
- Nationalbank-kreditskabelse til produktive investeringer
- Samt programmer for rumfart og fusionsenergi.

Schiller Instituttet kæmper for etableringen af et Nyt Bretton Woods-kreditsystem og for at udvide Den nye Silkevej til Verdenslandbroen – et nyt niveau af forbundenhed.

Kina har gjort brug af mange af disse idéer til at løfte 800 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, og andre nationer kan gøre det samme.

Vi arbejder hårdt på at harmonisere USA's og Europas relationer med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig, og opfordrer til et topmøde mellem stormagterne, herunder USA, Rusland og Kina.

Vores vision for en ny, retfærdig, økonomisk verdensorden kan opnås gennem et samarbejde om økonomisk og infrastrukturel udvikling, samt opbygningen af moderne sundhedssystemer, i hvert land, inklusiv i Afrika, Asien og Sydamerika.

Schiller Instituttet bestræber sig på at skabe intet mindre end en kulturel renæssance og et afgørende politisk skifte til et nyt paradigme – grundlaget for en fredelig fremtid.

Vi opfordrer dig derfor til seriøst at reflektere over dette.

Lyt til dit moralske kompas.

Slut dig til vores mission for "menneskehedens fælles mål", for at forbedre vores verden og vores univers.

Sammen kan vi skabe en bedre fremtid!

Bliv en del af Schiller Instituttet i dag!

**Lyndon LaRouche: Et talent,
der blev brugt godt;
live stream med
mindehøjtidelighed på 2-året
for hans død**

14. februar (EIRNS) – 12. februar 2021 markerede toårsdagen for Amerikas største statsmand og filosof, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr, der døde på Abraham Lincolns fødselsdag i 2019 i en alder af 96 år. LaRouche-organisationen og Schiller Instituttet, som blev grundlagt af hans hustru Helga Zepp-LaRouche, fejrede dagen med en 19-timers live stream af Lyndon LaRouches taler og foredrag; dagen blev indledt og afsluttet med den mindeværdige koncert, der blev afholdt i New York City den 8. juni i året for hans død.

Livestream'en indeholdt nogle af LaRouches mest afgørende, historieforandrende interventioner – men for dem, der kender ham og hans arv, ville det være nødvendigt med langt mere end 19 timer til at gense blot en brøkdel af de taler og lektioner han holdt, der ændrede historien. I den henseende var Lyn en ægte videnskabsmand, der altid udfordrede dagens fremherskende antagelser, inklusive sine egne, og udviklede en "højere hypotese".

For dem der begyndte at se med, uanset på hvilket tidspunkt i løbet af den daglange begivenhed, var det "næsten umuligt at løsrive sig", sagde flere af LaRouches medarbejdere, inklusive denne skribent. At tillade sig selv, gennem denne videotur, at tilbringe timer i nærværelse af et sådant sind, var en velkommen og glædelig kontrast til det forræderiske og bedrageriske skuespil, der fandt sted i USA's Senat i den anden rigsretssag mod tidligere præsident Donald Trump; retssagen er endeligt afsluttet med den forventede frifindelse, men fortsætter i pressen.

Lige så foruroligende er de nylige bemærkninger fra 'StratCom'-kommandør Adm. Charles Richard om nødvendigheden af at forberede sig på muligheden for atomkrig samt den fortsatte dæmonisering af Rusland og Kina. Den nye COVID-nødhjælpslov ville af LaRouche blive betragtet som en syg vittighed, og er blot en yderligere bekræftelse af hans 'Triple Curve'-funktion fra 1996, som blev illustreret i dagens næstsidste video.

Selv efter at have set blot et par minutter af Lyndon LaRouche, eller fra andre at have hørt om den dybtgående indflydelse han havde på deres liv, er det klart, at USA lider meget under manglen på en sådan inspirerende ledelse, som LaRouche legemliggjorde i årtier, herunder i særdeleshed gennem sine otte præsidentvalgkampagner. Og USA lider fortsat under hans uretfærdige, femårs fængselsdom som politisk fange, og det faktum, at han den dag i dag ikke er blevet renset og frifundet.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche beskrev sin afdøde mand i hendes introduktion til sin videoerklæring for 'LaRouche Legacy Foundation, så udviklede Lyndon LaRouche fra starten af en analyse af, på den ene side hvad der gik galt med systemet, og på den anden side den nødvendige løsning: "Jeg tror, at en af de vigtigste opfattelser var, at han i 1975 for første gang præsenterede en omfattende idé om, hvordan et sådant nyt verdensøkonomisk system skulle se ud: Den internationale Udviklingsbank – ideen om, at der skulle være en overførsel af teknologi til en værdi af 200 mia. dollar hvert år til at overvinde underudvikling gennem store projekter. Denne idé greb øjeblikkeligt om sig. I 1976 traf de "Alliancefrie landes Bevægelse" på deres sidste konference i Colombo grundlæggende en mere eller mindre endelig beslutning om vedtagelsen af denne politik, ord for ord.

"I de følgende år arbejdede Lyn sammen med Indira Gandhi og med López Portillo om disse idéer. Jeg synes, det er en meget rig historie. Vi rejste i disse årtier til mere end fyrre lande. Vi mødtes med ledere fra praktisk taget hvert eneste land på planeten. Fra min egen erfaring kan jeg forsikre jer om, at alle disse mennesker så på Lyn med et utroligt håb om, hvad USA kunne være".

Videoen kan ses her

Se en videomaratton, der fejrer Lyndon LaRouches liv og arbejde i dag den 12. februar

Se en videomaratton, der fejrer Lyndon LaRouches liv og arbejde i dag den 12. februar

Til minde om Lyndon LaRouches bortgang den 12. februar 2019, inviterer vi dig til at stifte bekendtskab med, eller gense, LaRouche, et sind og en personlighed som var et af de største genier i de sidste 100 år.

Genialitet uden skønhed er slet ikke genialt.

Deltag i vores LaRouche-maraton, og tag dine venner med, både store og små. Den 24-timers videomaratton begynder kl. 12 dansk tid.

Live streaming 24-timers Beethoven 250 års fødselsdag fest! 16.-17. december

Videoarkivet bliver klart om 2 dage. Klik her på FFRCC's hjemmeside.

Vi inviterer dig til at nyde en 24-timers international fejring af Ludwig van Beethoven, fra den 16.-17. december 2020, datoen for hans 250 års fødselsdag. Fejringen blev præsenteret af Schiller Instituttets Venner, The Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture (Fond for genoplivning af klassisk kultur). Deltag! De delte hilsner fra hele verden; videohyldest af forskellige typer; og for det meste hans herlige musik, der fejrer hans sind, kunstneriske vision og mission. Det var levende arrangeret med særlige gæster, kommentarer og sjældne optagelser af Beethovens værker.

"Jeg vil tage skæbnen i kraven; den vil aldrig bøje mig helt efter dens vilje."

– Ludwig van Beethoven

Fra arkivet: Video: Grønland og udviklingen af Arktis

Fra 2010

2. del:

3. del:

Se foredragsrækken om LaRouches liv: Jordens sidste 50 år og Jordens næste 50 år

1: Oversigt: Den enkeltes rolle i historien. [Klik her.](#)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche. En person kan ændre historien, og den mest magtfulde kraft i historien er ikke våben, penge eller hære: det er ideer. Lyndon LaRouche udnyttede denne indsigt og brugte den til at ændre verden. I dag ses frugterne af hans årtier lange organisering, sammen med mange kolleger og hans kone Helga i potentialet for internationalt samarbejde, som eksemplificeret af det kinesiske Bælte- og Vejinitiativ. For at undgå den truende mørke tidsalder, som atomkonflikten mellem USA og Rusland udgør, er det vigtigt med en forståelse af den nødvendige renæssance.

2: LaRouches ufuldendte krig for en ny økonomisk verdensorden. [Klik her.](#)

Dennis Small. Historien om kampen for en retfærdig, ny økonomisk verdensorden (NWE0), baseret på nord-syd-samarbejde og udvikling, er et perfekt eksempel på hvordan ideer, og faktisk udelukkende ideer, skaber historien. De ideer, omkring hvilke de første kampe for en NWE0 blev udkæmpet, især i perioden 1979-1983, og begrebet om hvordan man fører denne krig, blev udviklet af Lyndon LaRouche.

Han påviste, at denne politik ville være til gavn for både nord og syd. Hans metode var at fremlægge de underliggende filosofiske begreber og det videnskabelige fysisk-økonomiske grundlag for at bevise, at en sådan tilgang rent faktisk kan fungere. De politiske relationer mellem de store hovedpersoner i denne kamp, Mexicos José López Portillo og Indiens Indira Gandhi, blev også bevidst fremmet af LaRouche. Og da en flanke opstod, da Ronald Reagan overtog præsidentskabet i USA i januar 1981, kastede LaRouche sig over den for at bringe de

kræfter, der rent faktisk kunne besejre fjenden og vinde den strategiske krig, ind i kampen. Dette er genstand for en lektion i uafsluttet krig.

#3: Lyndon LaRouches unikke bidrag til videnskaben om universel historie. Klik her.

Will Wertz. I et essay han skrev, som blev udgivet i foråret 1993 med titlen »Om Gud«, skrev han: »Hvis vi måler historien med standarden, at hver person er imago viva Dei, får vi en komplet anderledes opfattelse af historien, end det, som er beskrevet i vores tåbelige lærebøger fra universiteterne og lignende steder«. I et efterfølgende essay, udgivet i tidsskriftet Fidelio i efteråret 1993 med titlen »Historie som videnskab«, fortsatte Lyndon LaRouche: En rigoristisk definition af begrebet »historie« begynder med det faktum, at den fortsatte eksistens af den menneskelige art er styret af et princip, som ikke eksisterer for andre arter.«

#4 (18. maj): Italiensk Videnskab og Kultur. Klik her.

Liliana Gorini og John Sigerson. LaRouches ideer afspejler i Italien et fremskridt for den videnskabelige og kunstneriske revolution i det 15. århundredes florentinske renæssance. Dette fremskridt omfatter en tilbagevenden til en naturlig musikalsk stemning, hvilket Giuseppe Verdi krævede for mere end et århundrede siden; Italiens nylige skridt til at gennemføre LaRouches forslag om en Glass/Steagall-banklovgivning, en tilbagevenden til Hamiltons principper om økonomisk politik; og Italiens dristige beslutning om at tilslutte sig Kinas Bælte og Vejinitiativ for verdens udvikling.

Klassisk musik: Den tyske dirigent Furtwängler blev den ledende inspiration for LaRouches insisteren på at musik ikke udfoldes i lyd, men i det riemannske komplekse domæne.

5. Det amerikanske system, LaRouche-Riemannsk økonomi, og et Måne-Mars projekt. Klik her. Den findes nederste på siden.

Ben Deniston og Paul Gallagher. Den 23. marts 1983 traf

præsident Reagan en beslutning – trods stærk modstand fra sine rådgivere – om at gøre LaRouches strategiske forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) til USA's politik. Det var en del af LaRouches rumprojektforeslag for en ny æra af potentielt set ubegrænset fremskridt.

Alle kan også ses på LaRouchePAC's hjemmeside. [Klik her.](#)

Se og del: Dokumentarfilm om at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn.

Skriv gerne under for at rense LaRouches navn: [klik her.](#)

Læs også afskriftet (på engelsk) nedenunder.

Trailer:

Den 21. juni offentliggjorde LaRouchePAC en 80-minutters dokumentarfilm, som opfordrer til at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn, "Hvorfor Lyndon LaRouches navn skal renses" (primært med uddrag af de uafhængige høringer fra 1995 om justitsministeriets embedsmisbrug – med Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, USA's fhv. justisminister Ramsey Clark, og LaRouches sagfører Odin Anderson).

Hjælp med at få denne nye video til at gå viralt.

I samarbejde med Helga LaRouche lancerer vi en international mobilisering for at få så mange som muligt (medlemmer, tilhængere, aktivister, kontakter osv.) til at dele, promovere og sprede videoen.

Kan du gøre en særlig indsats for at nå ud til kontakter med vigtige e-mail-lister, hjemmesider, blogs, Twitter, Facebook osv. og bede dem om at cirkulere dokumentaren. (Du kan naturligvis også hjælpe ved at promovere det via dine egne lister/sociale medier/eller hjemmeside)

Med den rette koordinerede indsats kan vi få videoen til at gå viralt.

Afskrift på engelsk:

The Case of LaRouche: Robert Mueller's First Hit Job

The Case for the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

June 21, 2019

[music]

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The most important in history is ideas, especially those ideas which move mankind forward; which are ideas which make the life of generations to come more human.

For me, the biggest crime of what happened to my husband is not that he was innocently in jail. I'm not saying it was not a hard time, because it was. But the lack of the ability to have important ideas govern history; that is the biggest crime. Lyn, while he was incredibly courageous of producing creative work while he was in prison – I mean, he did more in prison than any of us outside, and he put us to shame.

But nevertheless, I will only give you one example. In 1989, he was already in jail for nearly one year, when the borders of Europe opened. He, from his prison cell, designed a great vision of how to integrate Eastern Europe, Western Europe, China, the whole Eurasian continent, which would have been a groundbreaking conception which would have put the entire history of the 20th century on a totally new basis. Because economically, to integrate that economic space as one would have given opportunities and freedom to the states of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the Asian countries. But because Lyn was in jail, this idea did not become as effective as if he would have been free.

Now, I'm saying this because to put a man of great ideas into jail is a crime all by itself, because of the ideas. The reason why we were able to mobilize hundreds of parliamentarians and thousands of VIPs from around the globe – why would people from Africa sign the parole request for Lyndon LaRouche? Why would people from Latin America do this? Why would people from around the world, from Russia; why would people come out of completely different cultural worlds to fight for this man? Well, because we not only said this man must be free and his innocence must be proven, but they, many of them told me and others that they understand that the kind of change in global policy my husband is standing for, the kind of just new world economic order which allows the economic development of Africa; which allows the economic development of the developing countries, of Eastern Europe, they say is the only hope for them, for their nation, as far away as it may be.

So, the reason why we must win is not because it's a personal affair. But as my husband was saying, we are going into a period of crisis, which most people are completely unaware of. The kinds of changes have to be big, and they have to be done with the help of the United States, because the world cannot be saved against the United States.

So, it is an historical necessity. And I think in a certain sense, given the experience I have from eight years of fighting this, given the fact that more and more people around the globe are united around this and understand that mankind is sitting in one boat this time; that either we solve all our problems at once, or nobody will live. I think we can win, and I think we must have that attitude. [applause]

NARRATOR: On August 31st and September 1st, 1995, a series of extraordinary hearings were convened in Tysons Corner, Virginia, to investigate gross misconduct by the U.S. Department of Justice. The hearings were chaired by former U.S. Congressman James Mann of South Carolina and J.L. Chestnut of Alabama – the great lawyer and icon of the Civil Rights movement. The hearings focussed on abuses by the U.S. Department of Justice, highlighting the onslaughts of targetted criminal cases against black elected officials in the United States – dubbed “Operation Fruehmenschen” according to FBI whistleblowers and Congressman Merv Dymally of California; as well as the case of Lyndon LaRouche.

LYNDON LAROUCHE: My case may be, as Ramsey Clark described it, the most extensive and the highest level of these cases, in terms of the duration and scope of the operation.

NARRATOR: Witnesses included: LaRouche’s attorney, Odin Anderson; former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had been LaRouche’s defense attorney in his appeal; Lyndon LaRouche’s wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche – from whom you just heard; and Lyndon LaRouche himself. The panel was comprised of leading national and international political figures, including the former Vice Premier of Slovakia, Jozef Miklosko; numerous state senators and other elected officials from

across the United States; as well as Chor-Bishop of the Maronite Church, Monsignor Elias el-Hayek. Numerous international observers were present, including legendary Civil Rights heroine Amelia Boynton Robinson of Selma, Alabama.

As you will hear, these hearings demonstrated not just the injustice which was perpetrated against leading U.S. political officials by the Department of Justice because of their political views – exemplified by the case of Lyndon LaRouche – but the inherent danger at that time that such abuses, if left unchecked, could subsequently threaten the very existence of our Constitutional republic itself; a fight we see playing out today as we speak at the very highest level of our government, in the form of the attempted takedown of the U.S. Presidency.

[from Oct. 6, 1986]

NEWS REPORTER 1: The raid command post, about three miles from town, was busy all night. Just before dawn, Virginia State Police moved out. It was a combined strike force, including FBI, Internal Revenue Service, Secret Service, and other Federal and state agents. As FBI agents approached LaRouche's estate in Leesburg, Virginia, 50 miles from Washington, police lined up outside.

NEWS REPORTER 2: Good evening. Federal and state agents today raided the Leesburg, Virginia headquarters of political activist Lyndon LaRouche.

NEWS REPORTER 3: Today, it was a law enforcement assault here in Leesburg that set this town buzzing.

NEWS REPORTER 4: Scores of state and local police joined Federal agents in a coordinated, nationwide raid.

NARRATOR: On October 6, 1986, four hundred FBI, state police, IRS, ATF agents, and the national news media descended on Leesburg, Virginia, to search offices associated with the LaRouche political movement. At a farm outside Leesburg, where Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche were staying, heavily armed agents dressed in full tactical gear patrolled the perimeter as armored personnel carriers surrounded the property, and helicopters buzzed constantly overhead.

In addition the materials specified in the Federal search warrant, according to later court testimony, the FBI case agent in charge was searching for evidence by which to obtain an arrest warrant for Lyndon LaRouche himself and a search warrant to allow armed entry to the farm. A plan was in place to provoke a firefight with LaRouche's security guards, to take out LaRouche, which was admitted years later.

During the evening of October 6th, moves to implement that plan seemed to begin with news stations broadcasting that now an assault was about to occur on the farm. A telegram was sent in LaRouche's name to President Ronald Reagan, seeking his intervention to call off the raid. Coincidentally, at exactly the same time, President Reagan was in Reykjavik, Iceland, refusing to back down in negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev on his commitment to the so-called SDI – the Strategic Defense Initiative. The same SDI that Lyndon LaRouche had worked for years alongside top officials in the Reagan Administration to craft and support.

LAROUCHE: A first-generation of strategic ballistic missile defense ...

NARRATOR: Only after this telegram to Ronald Reagan was sent did the forces surrounding the farm begin to dissipate and recede. However, this was merely the opening chapter, in a concerted campaign involving elements within the Justice Department to target and dismantle the political operation of Lyndon LaRouche. A campaign which astute observers of this case would readily compare to the operation underway, today, against none other than President Donald J. Trump. There are striking similarities between the LaRouche case and the present attempt to prosecute or impeach Donald Trump.

The first one is that both cases with a British call for prosecution and criminal investigation. In LaRouche's case, British intelligence sent a letter to the FBI in 1982, demanding investigation because LaRouche, the British claimed, was an agent of Soviet disinformation. At the same time, Henry Kissinger and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board triggered a counterintelligence investigation of LaRouche under Executive Order 12333. In the Trump case, the British government began demanding Trump's head as early as 2015; and have bragged to the {Guardian} and other British newspapers that their spying was the origin of Russiagate.

Both cases shared a legal hit man in the form of prosecutor Robert Mueller. And, both cases involved the employment of the criminal law enforcement and intelligence capacities of the United States to defeat and silence a political opponent for political reasons; something which violates the very core principles of the U.S. Constitution. In LaRouche's case, the effort was to permanently demonize him, in order to bury his ideas, precisely as Helga LaRouche stated in her testimony.

As can be seen, the failure to challenge the gross abuses of justice, perpetrated by the Justice Department in the case of Lyndon LaRouche, has now brought us to the point, where the very Constitutional system on which our republic depends is

being threatened.

REP. JAMES MANN: All right, the session will come to order.

NARRATOR: Let's hear from Lyndon LaRouche's lawyer, Mr. Odin Anderson of Boston, Massachusetts.

MANN: As we attempt to study the broad subject of misconduct by the Department of Justice ... we cannot overlook the case that is perhaps the most pervasive (and I'm stealing the words from Ramsey Clark, I think), most pervasive course of misconduct by the Department of Justice, in the history of this country: broader-based, longstanding, abuse of power beyond expression, abuse of power through the use of Federal agencies, including, even, a Bankruptcy Court.

Throughout the days of the LaRouche ordeal of criminal charges, Odin Anderson, a lawyer from Boston, has been the solid rock of criminal defense and counsel, far and above any other person. He can, therefore, speak to the subject of misconduct, or such facets of that as he may choose to discuss, better than anybody, with the possible exception of Lyndon and Helga. He has, literally, devoted a major portion of his life in the last 7 or 8 years, 8 or 9 years, to that task. And we appreciate him taking the time to be here from Boston, to make some such statement as he wishes to make, and be responsive to questions.

Thank you.

ODIN ANDERSON: Thank you, Congressman, honorable panel. It's I who thank you for this opportunity to speak about the LaRouche case.

I'm thankful, as I looked up and counted names, there are only 11 of you. If there had been a 12th, I would have been tempted to re-try this case in front of you, assured, I think, that Mr. LaRouche would finally get a fair trial...

I have represented Lyndon LaRouche since 1984, at which time he was directly targetted by the Department of Justice, through its U.S. Attorney's office in Boston, although there is a history of many years of harassment prior to that...

Back in the late '60s, you probably all remember a student organization called the Students for a Democratic Society, (SDS); very active on campuses, particularly around the Vietnam War, but on many other issues of political importance to the United States; economic, social, a broad range of issues.

Mr. LaRouche, and a number of political associates of his, became involved in those very same issues. But they had a difficulty with SDS, and essentially founded their own group, which became known, originally as a faction of SDS, the Labor Committees. They ultimately became known as the National Caucus of Labor Committees, which was and remains a political association ... of people who share like political views.

Probably the best way to demonstrate the government's venal behavior, and the unconstitutional activities undertaken, directed out of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, is to show you their own documents, and read to you their own words. And, by way of history, I'd like to have No. 1 put up on the screen.

What you see before you, is an FBI memorandum from the SAC, the Special Agent-in-Charge, of the New York Field Office of the FBI, to the Director. It's dated March 1969. And, it

requests authorization of the Director to issue a false leaflet, to stir up antagonisms between these various aspects of SDS. Now, I'm sure that's a tactic familiar to all of you, if in slightly different form. They want to disseminate this leaflet under false cover, to various of these groups, and stir up as much controversy between them, hopefully, undermining their ability to act in concert, and getting them into faction fights, which would destroy their efficiency and cohesion.

Well, if you put up No. 2, you'll see that they got that authority from the Director of the FBI, and his blessing: "Authority is granted to anonymously mail copies of the leaflet submitted." Now, I'm not going to bother to show you the leaflet, because it's a piece of scurrilous garbage. It's available for anyone who would like to see it. It was called "The Mouse Crap Revolution," but its intent and purpose was exactly as defined in the letters. {This} is the Department of Justice, {this} is the FBI at work in the 1960s, under – if you look at the bottom – what was called "Cointelpro," or "Counterintelligence Program."...

So in 1969 and the 1970s, this was the kind of activity which was going on against the LaRouche political movement, and many others, including people you're well acquainted with personally.

If we could move on to the next overlay [No. 3]. This is to the Director, again from the SAC in New York, regarding the named subject, Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr., also known as Lynn Marcus, as they suggest. This is one of the most incredible pieces of FBI material that I have ever seen....

What this suggests, is that the Communist Party has let the FBI know, that they want to eliminate Lyndon LaRouche, for their political reasons. They consider him to be a "politically dangerous person," and the Communist Party wants to eliminate him.

If you look at the bottom, "New York proposes submitting a blind memorandum to the {Daily World}," to foster these efforts. Here's the FBI climbing in bed with the Communist Party, in order to effect the elimination of Lyndon LaRouche from the political scene. I think we all know what that means. And they go on to say, that it's believed, that once LaRouche is eliminated, the political effectiveness of the National Caucus of Labor Committees will, thereby, be diminished, and it will cease to be of any political significance. Here, again, is the FBI, in the '70s, in operation.

Years went by, and the members of the National Caucus of Labor Committees continued their political efforts. Now, they are considered, Mr. LaRouche is considered, extremely controversial by many. Those he's considered controversial by, tend to be those whose policies are inconsistent with his, or those that he has named as operating against the best interests of the society and peoples of the United States. And we all know, that those people tend to be very powerful people....

Henry Kissinger, who we all know by name, and some probably remember by reputation and actions, was a very powerful man. Mr. LaRouche took exception with his policies, which he considered to be genocidal, particularly in the context of the financial policies, and the conditionalities imposed on the Third World in order to get money from the World Bank, and got into a serious row with Mr. Kissinger.

And Mr. Kissinger writes to (on his letterhead) William Webster, the Director of the FBI [Exhibit No. 4]. They had recently had a lovely social occasion together at the place called the Grove, where these powers associate, and frolic around, in various curious ways. And after that, he [Kissinger] appreciates having seen him there, and asks for the assistance of Bill Webster in dealing with "the LaRouche menace."...

Here is [Exhibit No. 5]— within the short period thereafter, “Buck” Revell, who was the head of counterintelligence for the FBI, at the time, is sent this memorandum by William Webster, who had been contacted by David Abshire of PFIAB, that’s the President’s Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. And these same parties, Henry Kissinger and his colleagues, are now raising before PFIAB, the question as to whether LaRouche, because he seems to have funding from sources that they don’t understand, is operating as a foreign intelligence agent, and they want them to look into this.

Now, what that does, and the words are bad enough, but the reality is terrifying. This triggers the Executive Order I referred to earlier, Executive Order 12333, which allows virtually *{any form of conduct, any activity}*, to be undertaken, as long as it’s under this national security cover. So, this was the beginning of a national security-covered operation against Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues....

The common denominator between all of these cases is twofold. It’s, as I said, political targetting, and it’s the Criminal Division of the Justice Department.

You probably also know, from your own experiences with colleagues who have run afoul of the situations that have been discussed, that the first place they try you, is in the press. Only *{then}* do they try you in the courts, once they’ve set the stage, once they’ve poisoned all the minds in the community against you, then, they haul you into court, where you can’t get a fair trial, because the jurors who are sitting there, have been told for days, months, years, or millennia, what a bad person you are, and what horrible offenses you’ve committed against the moral or social fabric of the community.

Well, that’s precisely what happened in the LaRouche case, probably more so than in any other case.... In the LaRouche case, the press began, not by accident, because we all know

who owns the press: It's not owned by individuals, and as a matter of fact, there's an awful lot of ownership of the press which represents certain political and financial interests.

So, the fact is that beginning in the same period of the 80s, a private financier in New York City, John Train, with reach into the media community, by virtue of his social and financial circumstances, convened a group of media types in a salon that he hosted in his apartment, to plan a press campaign against LaRouche, and his political movement. Their objective was threefold: to tar and feather Lyndon LaRouche and his colleagues as best they could; to advocate and press for prosecutions of any kind, in any place; and, ultimately, to destroy and jail LaRouche, and destroy the political movement which he headed.

Among those who attended this meeting – and there were several of them, that we have evidence of, collected over a period of years, and admissions by people under oath – were members of and persons associated with the intelligence community, as well as people with political axes to grind against Mr. LaRouche, such as the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, who has, historically, done everything it could, financially and editorially, to label Mr. LaRouche as an anti-Semite, as a fascist, as a racist, as a "Hitler," a "little Hitler," and some of the most scurrilous names we can imagine hurling in another person's face without basis.

All of these parties, collectively, – and unfortunately, this is the way these things operate; they don't operate above board, they operate under the table where you can't see them, because they don't flourish well in the light of day, but they grow well in darkness. They get together, and in fact, this has been referred to by others as part of the "secret government": The powers that be that operate in conjunction with official agencies but are never seen or heard of. ...

I want to move on briefly and specifically to the LaRouche

cases, which are, in fact, a series of cases, that began in 1984.

In 1984, Mr. LaRouche, under his name, sued NBC and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, in Federal court in Alexandria, Virginia, on libel charges, on the basis of the accusations which I've already told you about.

We tried that case. NBC lied through their teeth, in terms of what information we had. In fact, we had FBI documents that indicated that the NBC reporter had received proprietary and non-public information from four agencies of the federal government, with reference to Mr. LaRouche.

So they make the stories up, and then they leak them to people who want to use them against you. ...

We sued NBC in Alexandria, Va. As soon as that case was over, NBC in Boston, on the very day – I had finished our presentation and was packing up to go back to Boston, published a so-called “investigative series” of theirs, alleging that certain persons associated with the LaRouche political campaign, had made false credit charges against certain contributors. And they [NBC] had a couple of contributors who got up and said, “you know, I met these people, and I gave them 35 bucks, and the next thing I knew, there was 100 bucks charged to my credit card.”

Well, I'll say one thing. Mr. LaRouche is very controversial. And people who contributed to them, frequently came under various types of criticism for that contribution. It could be their wife who says, “what're you giving \$100 away? We need to buy new shoes for the kids.” Or, it could be a neighbor, or a child. And many times, the amounts of money were larger, so the reasons for opposing the contribution were even greater.

But, if you know anything about credit cards, the only way a person can re-capture money charged to his credit card, which has been charged to the account, is to say “it was

unauthorized.” Those are the magic words. If you don’t use the magic words, you can’t collect the \$100. So, in order to reverse a credit card charge, one must say, “I never authorized it.”

Therefore, what you’re alleging in that case – although the intent was probably not to make the allegation – but in fact you’re alleging that the person did it without your authority, which could be a criminal act.

Now, they started an investigation around this, which they conducted for two years. It ultimately culminated in a trial in Boston.

Of course, another thing you’ll all recognize from your personal experiences, is that when they want to charge you and they don’t have anything, they charge you with conspiracy; because then, they don’t have to prove anything! They just go around, tell a bunch of stories, and hope that the jury is poisoned against you, is going to link it all up somehow, and convict you. So “conspiracy” is the vehicle, and that’s precisely what happened in Boston: LaRouche and his colleagues were charged with conspiracy, with a few other specific charges linked on as an afterthought.

We tried the case for seven months. We weren’t even through with the government’s case, when the case mis-tried. The reason it mistried, is that the jury had been led to believe that the case would have been over long before, which it would have, had we been able to concentrate on the evidence. But, because of the hearings that the judge was forced to conduct for literally months and months, on governmental misconduct, the case dragged on, and the jury sat in the jury box.

The jury ultimately got frustrated and ... wanted to go home, and the case mistried.

This is an article from the {Boston Herald} that printed that day. [Exhibit No. 6] I’m only showing it to you for one

reason, not because of the highlight, “LaRouche Jury Would Have Voted ‘Not Guilty.’” – although that’s true, and those come out of the words of the jury foreman, who was interviewed – but, in the first line of text, there are some very important words, from the foreman:

“‘We would have acquitted everybody at this point, and that’s based on prosecution evidence’, said foreman Dashawetz. “There was too much question of government misconduct in what was happening to the LaRouche campaign.’”

“Government misconduct.” Very seldom do you get a jury to see it, because the government fights you *{nail and tooth}*. They lie, they cover up evidence, they, in fact, deny information to their own agents, so that the agent won’t be in a position to have to intentionally not disclose it. These are common tactics, and that’s what happened here. Fortunately, in our case, we were able to show enough of it to the jury, so that the jury got the smell.

However, the government wasn’t about to quit, particularly having taken what was a serious public relations beating at that point in time. So, they decided to switch forums, come down to a much more favorable forum, – *{the}* most favorable forum – the Eastern District of Virginia: the so-called “rocket docket,” the home of almost every government agency, and government contractor in the country, with a few other pockets here and there.

They brought the case down to there, indicted the case, and brought us to trial. New charges, new defendants. LaRouche was also indicted, so he was one of the few who was also charged the second time – and forced the case from indictment to trial in 28 days.

There’s a great book, and it’s not a novel, it’s a factual book. It is the history of the case shown by the documents of the case; it’s called *{Railroad!}* and I commend it to your

attention. If you're to see how that system worked in this particular case, it's all there, and it's not somebody else's words, it's the words from the court documents.

In any event, LaRouche was convicted, as were all of his co-defendants, {again}, on conspiracy charges. That was the seminal charge, the rest were just tacked on. This time it wasn't credit cards. It was allegations of wire fraud, the allegation being that loans were taken from contributors, without intent to repay, or with reckless disregard of that fact that payment wouldn't take place.

Now, these were political loans, made in the political context, by political people, to a political candidate, and his political candidacy. Everybody knew that...

Back in Boston, the grand jury that was investigating the case, held certain businesses associated with Mr. LaRouche in contempt of court, for not producing documents which were under subpoena, which were being fought during a period of time based on various privacy grounds.

Twenty million dollars' worth of contempt sanctions were imposed. The government then sought to collect that \$20 million, by filing an involuntary bankruptcy against these organizations in Alexandria, Virginia, just prior to – not just prior – but at some point prior to the Alexandria indictments.

They also did this, {ex parte}. The government was the {only} creditor – in violation of federal law. But, by virtue of their {ex parte} petition to the judge, they were able to effect the closing of these four businesses, all of which were engaged in First Amendment advocacy and publication. These businesses were closed. They were seized by Federal marshals. They never reopened. The publications were never reprinted.

The \$20 million the government sought, was a ruse. In fact, what they intended to do, and what they did do, was close the

conspiracy that they alleged in the Alexandria indictments, on the very day that they filed the bankruptcy. The point of the bankruptcy being that from the moment a bankruptcy is filed, an order issued, that no one can pay any debts without order of the court. So it was physically impossible for any debts to be repaid after that, thereby creating a pool of persons who were owed money, who couldn't be repaid. They [the government] got five or six of these people to come forward and say, "I was promised repayment and didn't get it," and that was the basis of the conviction for loan fraud.

In any event, I want to say that we have fought as vigorously as anyone can through the appeals process, without success and through the {*mandamus*} process, 2255s in federal court. And are now at a stage, where, Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, who has been with me on all of the appeals, – he joined the effort just after the sentencing of Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues in 1990. Recently, he wrote a letter to the Attorney General, asking for a departmental review of the LaRouche case. I'd like to read you some portions of his letter. He'll be here tomorrow to speak to you personally. I'd like to leave you with the following words of Ramsey Clark:

"Dear Attorney General Reno,

I have been an attorney in this case since shortly after the defendants were sentenced in January 1989 and appeared as co-counsel on appeal and on the subsequent motions and appeals in proceedings under 28 U.S.C. sec. 2255 and F.R. Cr.P. Rule 33. I bring this matter to you directly, because I believe it involves a broader range of deliberate and systematic misconduct and abuse of power over a longer period of time in an effort to destroy a political movement and leader, than any other federal prosecution in my time or to my knowledge. Three courts have now condemned the Department's conduct in this prosecutorial campaign. The result has been a tragic miscarriage of justice which at this time can only be

corrected by an objective review and courageous action by the Department of Justice.”

MANN: The session will come to order. The session will come to order.

We are pleased and honored to have with us today, the former Attorney General of the United States Ramsey Clark, who will make such presentation as he may choose. Attorney General.

RAMSEY CLARK: Thank you very much. It's a good feeling to be here with you again this year. I wish I could say it's been a good year for freedom and justice under law, but I can't say that. But at least, in this company, you know that the struggle goes on, and that we shall overcome.

I will, probably, unless my mind wanders, which it does, talk about three cases primarily. And I'll start and end, with the case of Lyndon LaRouche and his co-defendants. not because it's the Alpha and Omega, although it's about as close as a case gets to the potential perfidy of justice, but because it shows how bad it can be, and yet, it has, as so very, very few of these cases ever do, a positive side that we have to consider.

I came into the case after the trial. As a person who lives in the country and pays attention to these things, I followed it carefully. I knew something about the ways of the judicial district in which the case was filed and the meaning of filing a case there. To call it the “rocket docket” is a disservice, unless you identify the rocket, because if there's a rocket in present use that would be similar, it would be the so-called depleted uranium-tipped missile, the silver bullet used in Iraq.

In other words, it's a lethal rocket. It's not a rocket that sought truth or intended justice. ...

I was prepared, therefore, for what might happen. I had followed the earlier case in Boston, which, by any measure, was an extremely peculiar case, both in its charges and its prosecution, and in its history. I knew the judge there as a fellow Texan. His brother, Page Keeton, had been dean of the law school where I started out, down at the University of Texas. And he's one of the old school, that doesn't like tricks, falsity, or injustice. He became outraged with the prosecution, and did a lot. I can't tell you he did all that a judge could have done. I believe Odin would agree, though, he did a lot. And not many judges, who come through a political conditioning process, who have the courage to stand up to the power of the Executive Branch, to the FBI and others, and say the things that he did. And, that was almost an early end to a malicious prosecution.

But, in what was a complex and pervasive a utilization of law enforcement, prosecution, media, and non-governmental organizations focussed on destroying an enemy, this case must be number one. There are some, where the government itself may have done more and more wrongfully over a period of time. But the very networking and combination of federal, state, and local agencies, of executive and even some legislative and judicial branches, of major media and minor local media, and of influential lobbyist types – the ADL preeminently – this case takes the prize.

The purpose can only be seen as destroying—it's more than a political movement, it's more than a political figure. It {is} those two. But it's a fertile engine of ideas, a common purpose of thinking and studying and analyzing to solve problems, regardless of the impact on the {status quo}, or on vested interests. It was a deliberate purpose to destroy that at any cost. ...

And yet, all this law enforcement was coming down on them. We didn't have that kind of violence, that physical violence, in the LaRouche case. But the potential from one side was entirely there. The day they went out to seize 2 million documents, as I recall (I may be off a million or 2 million), a big warehouse! These people produce a lot of paper, and it's not trash; it's not bureaucratic paper-keeping; you may not agree with it, but it's all saying things. They had several times more agents, armed, than the ATF force that initially attacked the Mount Carmel Church outside Waco on Feb. 28, 1993. They just didn't have people on the other side, who were shooters....

I guess I'm really still caught with the idea, the old idea of the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, that is ingrained in a lot of Americans, in particular, young lawyers, who are kind of idealistic and believe in the idea of freedom and the power of the word and the truth. I believe the truth can set us free. I think that's the struggle. The real struggle, is whether we can see the truth in time.... The truth can set us free.

In the LaRouche case, they're book people. (I have to confess to an intellectual weakness: I find reading easier than thinking, so I read constantly, nearly blinded myself from too much reading. I've got 15,000 books at home, read most them, unfortunately. As you can tell, I haven't learned much, but I haven't stopped yet.) These are book people. They had publishing houses going on. Important publications. Non-profit stuff.... **And the government comes in a completely** – these are just some of the peripheral things, that Odin and others might not have explained to you, but these are what they were about: {ideas}, information, social change! Meeting the needs of human people all over the world, humanity all over the world.

We're going to have a billion more people before the end of this millennium, century, decade, and the vast majority, 80%

of them are going to have beautiful, darker skin. And they're going to live short lives, {*short lives*} of sickness, hunger, pain, ignorance, and violence, {*unless we act radically*}. And these books have ideas! Some will work, some won't work, but they're ideas. They can be "tested in the marketplace," as we used to say.

And they [the government] come in with a {*false*} bankruptcy claim, against a non-profit publishing houses, and {*shut 'em down!*} What's the First Amendment worth, you know? "We'll silence you, you'll have no books out there."

And not only that: then they take people who were contributing and supposed to be paid back their loans to the publisher, and try to prosecute, falsely, on it. They put on witnesses, to give false testimony. From the tens and tens of thousands of contributors, and thousands of people who gave loans, they came up with a baker's dozen, roughly – 13, 14, 15 people – who got their feelings hurt, perhaps. And some who were mean-spirited enough to lie about it, and who didn't get their money back, although they were being paid back. Because anybody can have financial crunch, where you can't pay back.

Imagine what would happen to political campaigns in this country, if you enforced law strictly against those who are raising money like this, by inquiring about all the people who gave money; whether they got what they wanted, what they expected, and whether they were misled about it. Nobody could run for office.

We know in this society that we are plutocracy, that money dominates politics, absolutely dominates it: Read this new book {*The Golden Rule*} by Thomas Ferguson, University of Chicago Press, about the role of money in our democratic society, how it absolutely controls not just the elections, and not just the politicians, but the whole shebang! The media, the military, the industry, everything. And we call it "democracy."

We need some ideas, we need the good words out there. And that's why it had to be stopped, and that's why they came after him.

I read the record – in addition to reading books, I read lots of records of trials. Absolutely no evidence to support a conviction there, if you take it all, if you exclude the parts that were false or venomous, there's not even a shell. But they had to say that this noble enterprise, agree or not with it, was corrupt. Corrupt – have nothing to do with it! It's corrupt! Nobody respects financial or other corruption. Destroy 'em that way.

They were put to trial, without any chance to prepare their case, and they made a valiant effort. And got consecutive sentences – unbelievable...

We've been trying in every way we can, others much more than I, to make the LaRouche case known. I personally have appeared at meetings in Europe and North America. There have been books and pamphlets and there's a constant flow of literature and verbal communication.

We've tried, for I can't tell you how many years right now, but several years, maybe four even, to explore the possibility of fair hearings in the Congress.

Hearings are risky in a highly political environment like that. ...

There's a continuing effort. I think it will bear fruit. We've asked the Department of Justice for a comprehensive review. Lyndon LaRouche has always asked for a review, not only of his case, but of all cases where there are allegations of serious misconduct, and usually names a bunch of 'em. And so, we've always done that. That's his vision. It happens to be my vision, too, of how you correct things.

But the capacity of the Department of Justice for self-

criticism, is of a very low order. It has two offices that are charged with the responsibility. One's called the Office of Professional Responsibility, and one's called the Office of the Inspector General, and neither have ever done anything very serious that I'm aware of. Maybe someone was caught stealing pencils, or something, taking home for the kids. That's about the dimension of their address.

So our efforts to secure a review of injustice; we've tried in the courts. We sought *{habeas corpus}*, which is the grand English – it's the Writ of Amparo; in the Dominican Republic, it's the grand old way of reviewing injustice and wrongful conviction – and we got short shrift. We had to go back to the same judge who gave us the fast shrift the first time!

The **[inaudible 54:09]** rocket docket.

So, we have to find solid means. The media's a great problem. The media's controlled by wealth and power that prefers the *{status quo}*, and it's very sophisticated in how it manages these matters. I can take a cause that they're interested in, that's virtually meaningless, and be on prime time evening news. And I can take on a cause of what I consider to be international importance of the highest magnitude, that they oppose, and shout from the rooftops, and you'd never know I existed. That's the way it works.

That's one reason that publications – the books and magazines and newspapers that spread the word – even though they're minor compared with the huge international media conglomerates that we're confronted with, but they reach thinking people, and they spread the word.

I think we'll get our hearing in time, and I think it'll be a reasonably short time, but I think to be meaningful, it's going to take a regeneration of moral force in the American people.

I'm both an optimist and an idealist, so you have to take what

I say with a grain of salt. But I believe that the civil rights movement was the noblest quest of the American people in my time. I think it was real, and vital, and passionate. And I think it consumed the energies and faith of some few millions of people. I mean, we really believed in it! We were marching and singing and doing! And then it kind of dribbled out. So that now we have this vicious fights that divide us.

We have to have a moral regeneration and energy and commitment and faith and belief, that we can overcome; that equality is desirable; that justice is essential; that a life of principle is only worth living; then we'll get our hearings. Then we won't need our hearings, but we'll have to keep on.

MANN: The session will come to order.

If anyone needs an introduction to the next presenter, I suggest you see him after the meeting. [laughter] We're delighted to have Lyndon LaRouche.

LYNDON H. LAROUCHE, JR: Just for the record, I'll state a few facts which bear upon the circumstances in which certain events befell me.

I was born in Sept. 8, 1922, in Rochester, New Hampshire, lived there for the first 10 years of my life, lived for the next 22 years of my life in Lynn, Massachusetts, except for service overseas. I moved to New York City, where I lived until July of 1983, and, since that time, except for a period of incarceration, I have been a resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

I attended university a couple of times, before the war or at the beginning of the war, and after it; and then had a career in management consulting, which lasted until about 1972, tapered off, sort of.

My most notable professional achievement was developed during the years 1948-1952, in certain discoveries of a fundamental scientific nature in respect to economics, and my professional qualifications are essentially derived from that.

In the course of time, in 1964, approximately, I was persuaded that things were being done to change the United States, which, from my view, were the worst possible disaster which could befall this nation. And thus, while I had given up any hope of political improvement in this country before then, to speak of, I felt I had to do something. So I became involved part time, from 1966 through 1973, in teaching a one-semester course in economics, largely on the graduate level, at a number of campus locations, chiefly in New York City, but also in Pennsylvania.

In the course of this, a number of these students who participated in these classes, became associated with me, and, out of this association, came the birth of a nascent political organization, as much a philosophical organization as political. Our central commitment was Third World issues and related issues, that is, that economic justice for what is called the Third World is essential for a just society for all nations. I became particularly attached to this, during military service overseas in India, where I saw what colonialism does to people. And I was persuaded at the time, as I believe a majority of the people who were in service with me, was that we were coming to the end of a war, which we had not foreseen, but which we had been obliged to fight. And that if we allowed the circumstances to prevail that I saw in the Third World, we would bring upon ourselves some kind of disaster, either war or something comparable down the line.

And that was essentially our commitment as an association.

We became rather unpopular with a number of institutions, including McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation. About 1969, we made a mess of a few projects he was funding, by exposing

them. And we also became unpopular with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, perhaps on the behest of McGeorge Bundy.

In 1973, according to a document later issued under the Freedom of Information Act by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the New York Office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, acting at all times under supervision of Washington headquarters, hatched a plot to have me eliminated, or to induce the Communist Party U.S.A., that my elimination would solve a number of their problems. There actually was an abortive attempt on me during that period. I knew the FBI had been involved. I couldn't prove it then, but I knew it, and, later, a document appeared showing that.

From that point on, during the 1970s, until the end of COINTELPRO, we were constantly beset by the FBI. Our main weapon against the FBI was jokes. We used to make some jokes about the FBI, which we would pass around, to try to persuade them to keep off our tail, but they kept coming, and all kinds of harassment.

Then, in 1982, there was a new development. I sensed it happening, but I received the documents later: The events which led to my, what I would call, a fraudulently obtained indictment and conviction and incarceration.

It started, according to the record – of which I had some sensibility this was going on at the time – of Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State (with whom no love was lost between us), went to William Webster and others, soliciting an FBI or other government operation against me and my associates. This led, as the record later showed, to a decision by Henry Kissinger's friends on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, recommending an operation against me and my associates. This was adopted during the same month of January by Judge Webster, the Director of the FBI, who passed the implementation of this instruction along to his subordinate, Oliver "Buck" Revell, recently retired from the

FBI, I believe.

The first inkling I had of this, was in about April of 1983, at which time a New York banker, John Train, who is very intelligence-witting, shall we say, of the private bank of Smith and Train in New York City, held a salon at which various government agents, private individuals, the Anti-Defamation League, for example, and also NBC-TV News, the *{Reader's Digest,}* the *{Wall Street Journal}*, and others, were represented.

The purpose was to coordinate an array of libels, a menu of libels, which would be commonly used by the news media, in an attempt to defame me, and hopefully, from their standpoint, to lead to criminal action against me and my associates.

In January of 1984, this attack came into the open, launched by NBC-TV, which had been a participant in this salon of Train's, which launched the pattern, which was the pattern of coverage by all U.S. news media – major news media, and many minor news media. From the period of the end of January 1984, through the end of 1988, I saw no case of any significant coverage of me or mention of me, in the U.S. print media, particularly the major print media, the Associated Press, in particular, which was an active part of the prosecution, in fact, or in the national television media, network media, especially; not a single mention of me which did not conform to the menu of libels concocted by this salon, which had been established under John Train, as part of this operation.

This salon, including the Anti-Defamation League, NBC-TV, others, the Associated Press, actively collaborated, beginning sometime in 1984, with forces inside the government, which were determined to have a criminal prosecution against me and my associates. The criminal prosecution was launched at about the time of the 1984 presidential election, in October-November 1984. And from that point on, it was a continued escalation, until a Federal case in Boston led to a mistrial,

occasioned largely by government misconduct in the case, in May of 1988.

Following that, on or about October 14 in Virginia, a new prosecution was opened up, and that led to my conviction in December of 1988, and my sentencing, for 15 years, in January 1989. I believe Mr. Anderson has described the nature of the case. And that resulted in five years of service in Federal prison, from which I'm now released on parole.

The motivations of the case against us, I think, are, in part, obvious, perhaps partly not.

In 1982-83, there were two things which greatly excited my enemies. Number one, I had been involved, in 1982, in presenting a proposal which was based on my forecast in the spring of 1982, that a major debt crisis would break out in South America, Central America, and the expectation that Mexico would be the nation that would have a debt crisis. I'd been involved with many of these countries and personalities in them, in projecting alternatives to this kind of inequitable system, where the "colonial nation" had been replaced by the term "debtor nation." And the debt of South America, Central America was largely illegitimate, that is, it was a debt which had not been incurred for value received, but had been done under special monetary conditions, under the so-called floating exchange rate system, where bankers would come to a country, the IMF in particular, would say, "We just wrote down the value of the currency; we're now going to re-fund your financing of your foreign debt, which you can no longer pay on the same basis as before."

So I proposed, that the debt crisis be used as the occasion for united action, by a number of governments of South and Central American countries, to force a reform in the international debt relations, and to force a reform within international monetary relations. This report was entitled *{Operation Juárez}*, largely because of the relationship of

President Lincoln to Mexico during the time that Lincoln was President; with the idea that it was in the interest of the United States to accept and sponsor such a reform, to assist these countries in the freedom to resume development of the type which they had desired.

This report was published in August of 1982, ironically a few weeks before the eruption of the great Mexico debt crisis of '82, and was presented also to the U.S. government and the National Security Council, for the President's information at that time. There was some effort, on the part of the President of Mexico, to implement my proposal in the initial period of the debt crisis. He had, at that time, some support from the President of Brazil and the government of Argentina. But under pressure from the United States, the government of Brazil and Argentina capitulated, and President José López Portillo, the President of Mexico, was left, shall we say, "hanging out to dry."

As a result, in October of 1982, he capitulated to the terms which were delivered to his government and people around him, by people such as Henry A. Kissinger, who made a trip to Mexico at that time, to attempt to intimidate the Mexicans to submitting to these new terms. This was one issue between me and Kissinger, and his friends.

The second issue was, that sometime about December of 1981, a representative of the U.S. government approached me, and had asked me if I would be willing to set up an exploratory back-channel discussion with the Soviet government, because the Soviet government wanted, according to them, an additional channel to discuss things. And I said I didn't reject the idea, I said, but I have an idea on this question of nuclear missiles. It was becoming increasingly dangerous, forward-basing, more precise missiles, electromagnetic pulse, we're getting toward a first strike. It would be very useful to discuss what I proposed in my 1980 election campaign, with the Soviet government, to see if they'd be interested in

discussing such a proposal. This might prove a profitable exploratory discussion.

And so, from February of 1982, through February of 1983, I did conduct such back-channel discussions with representatives of the Soviet government in Washington, D.C. Those were somewhat fruitful, but ultimately abortive. Kissinger and others became aware of this discussion, during the summer of 1982, and their circles were very much opposed to that. The general view was expressed, that I was getting "too big for my britches," and I had to be dealt with: on the question of debt, which some of these people were concerned about, and on this question of strategic missile defense, where I had this proposal, which the President adopted, at least initially, in the form of what became known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. And when the Strategic Defense Initiative was announced by the President on March 23, 1983, there were a lot of people out for my scalp.

Those are the at least contributing factors, in what happened to me. But they may not be all. There probably are others, as well....

We have, in my view, a system of injustice whose center is within the Department of Justice, especially the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice. The problem lies not with one administration or another, though one administration or another may act more positively or more negatively. You have permanent civil service employees, like Deputy Assistant Attorney General Jack Keeney and Mark Richard, who are coordinators of a nest of institutions in the Criminal Division, which show up, repeatedly, as leading or key associates of every legal atrocity which I've seen.

This is the case with the so-called Fröhmschen operation, which is largely an FBI operation, but which cannot run without cooperation from these people. ...

We have an out-of-control Justice Department, in my view,

where the rot is not in the appointees, as much as it is in the permanent bureaucracy. We have a permanent sickness, in the permanent bureaucracy of part of our government.

In my case, when the time came that somebody wanted me out of the way, they were able to rely upon that permanent injustice in the permanent bureaucracy of government, to do the job. As in the Fröhmschen case, the Weaver case, the Waco case, the case of Waldheim, the case of Demjanjuk, and other cases. Always there's that agency inside the Justice Department, which works for contract, like a hitman, when somebody with the right credentials and passwords walks in, and says, "we want to get this group of people," or "we want to get this person."

My case may be, as Ramsey Clark described it, the most extensive and the highest level of these cases, in terms of the duration and scope of the operation. ...

So my case is important, in the sense it's more extensive, it's more deep-going, long-going. But when it came to getting me, it was the same apparatus, that, I find, in my opinion, was used in these other cases. And that until we remove, from our system of government, a rotten, permanent bureaucracy which acts like contract assassins, using the authority of the justice system to perpetrate assassination, this country is not free, nor is anyone in it. ... That's my view of the matter. Thank you. [applause]

MANN: Thank you.

J.L. CHESTNUT: You and I had a little chat in Selma, Alabama. ... I guess you can understand, that even somebody like me, sometimes, feels {overwhelmed}, and wonders whether or not America is just a lost cause. I hate to sound that way, but

after 40 years, I've got {serious} reservations about whether we can save this country, about whether this country even {wants} to be saved.

LAROUCHE: Well, I take an evangelical view of this. I've been associated with many lost causes in my life – as you have – and, once in a while, we win them. [laughter] ...

The problem of people, as I see it, is people don't trust the leadership; and I don't blame them for not trusting their leadership. I blame them for being too pessimistic. And it's up to us and others, to get enough people moving, to create a movement.

Like the case, just, of Martin Luther King. Now, I never personally met Martin Luther King, but I watched him closely. And I know something about Martin Luther King, from people who knew him, and his circumstances. And here was a man, he was a good man, he was a preacher, a Baptist preacher, I don't know. They run to this way and that way.

But one day, somebody appointed him, nominated him, to be a leader of the civil rights movement; out of a crowd, so to speak. He took the job, as an appointee, like a federal appointee! Only this was a civil rights movement. He went from crisis to crisis, in a few years, from the time that he received that appointment, until he went to his death, knowing he was facing death.

And in that period of time, he made a number of public speeches of great power and pith. Each of those speeches corresponded to a point of crisis in the history of the civil rights movement. And I saw, on television, and I read in the recorded speeches, I read a man who had gone into private, into his own Gethsemane, probably inspired by reading the New Testament, and said: "I will drink of this cup." And he came out with an {idea}, with a lot of people swarming around him. But he came out with the {idea}, and he presented a concept,

which took a whole people who were looking to him and the civil rights movement; and he {ennobled} them.

He said, “You’re not fighting for African-American rights. You’re fighting for everybody’s rights! You’re fighting to make the Constitution real!” And it was a new idea, a different idea. And, as he did with his “Mountaintop” speech that he gave just before he went – again, a man who had walked into Gethsemane and said, “Yes, Lord, I will drink of this cup, as my Savior before me.” And he went out, and he drank of the cup; and he inspired people.

Now, we don’t know who among us is going to be the great leader of this period. But we know, as the civil rights people of the 1960s, who had been at the civil rights business for many centuries, in point of fact, many of them with a conscious family tradition. They assembled together. They picked people from their midst as leaders; and among these leaders, was a Martin Luther King.

And I think, if enough of us assemble today around these kinds of issues, and show the nation that there {is} something moving, something which is of concern to the average citizen, that from among those we gather, together for that purpose, we will find the leaders we need.

[closing music]

Ny

LaRouchePAC

foredragsrække:

Koncepterne bag Lyndon LaRouches internationale Nye Bretton Woods-kreditsystem

Muligheden for, at LaRouches koncepter for, hvordan samarbejdet mellem nationer bør udfoldes, bliver gjort til virkelighed, er større end nogensinde. Samtidig har disse koncepter aldrig været mere nødvendige end nu. De kan blive til virkelighed gennem det fremspirende samarbejde mellem USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre ledende økonomiske magter.

Foredragstitlerne er følgende:

1. Det menneskelige sinds kreative ånd reflekterer universets underliggende kreative princip.
2. Nøglen til at forstå økonomi er videnskab og ikke matematik.
3. Eksistensen af nationalstater er en nødvendighed.
4. Hvad er kreativitet nøjagtigt, som er den sande kilde til økonomisk vækst?
5. Friedrich Schiller, frihedens digter.
6. Vladimir Vernadsky, Biosphæren og Noosphæren.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

```
<iframe width="560" height="315"
src="https://www.youtube.com/embed/cyGJstd52-4"
frameborder="0" allow="accelerometer; autoplay; encrypted-
media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture"
allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

**Schiller Instituttet holder
Kulturaften i Dresden,
Tyskland.
Med Helga Zepp-LaRouche**

**Lyndon LaRouche:
Martin Luther Kings liv og**

mission

... den store leder, som Martin, stiger til et højere niveau. De tænker på deres liv, som evangeliet fremlægger det, som en talent (mønt); livet er en talent, man har fået givet. Man fødes, og man dør. Det er ens talent; hvad man har i denne tidsperiode. Spørgsmålet er, man vil under alle omstændigheder give den ud; hvordan vil man give den ud? Hvad vil man bruge den til at sikre, i al evighed? Hvad vil man gøre, som en mission, som vil gøre én fortjent til den plads, man ønsker at have i evigheden?

Martin havde en klar fornemmelse af dette. Denne 'bjergtopstale' for mig, slog mig ligesom en klar forståelse af, hvad han sagde, hvad han sagde til andre.[1]

Livet er en talent. Det er ikke, hvad man 'får ud af' livet. Det er, hvad man lægger ind i det, der tæller. Martin havde dette.

»Vi har, mener jeg, to problemer, som bør være grundlag for at reflektere over Martins liv i dag. 1) Vi har en national krise. Jeg vil ikke lægge fingrene imellem eller tale ud fra det politiske partiapparat (Demokraterne); men kendsgerningerne skal frem: Denne nationaløkonomi er ved at kollapse. Situationen, med hensyn til USA's grundlæggende økonomiske infrastruktur i dag, er relativt set værre end i 1933, hvor Roosevelt i marts måned kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Det vil sige, hvis man undersøger infrastruktur, energi osv., livsbetingelserne for vort folk og i hele verden – lad være med at se på de store byer, hvor de går rundt med en facade og siger, alt går godt; men se på lokalsamfundene; Detroit, f.eks., har nu halvdelen af det indbyggertal, byen plejede at have. En industriby er forsvundet. Se på Birmingham, man ser det samme rapporteret; det var aldrig rigt, men deres oplevelse af tab, tab, tab; det er situationen i USA. Og der

er en ligegyldighed over for USA's problemer. Mindst 48 af de 50 stater er bankerot, håbløst bankerot; dvs., at staterne umuligt kan øge skatteindtægterne uden at sænke økonomien yderligere, for at imødekomme regeringens essentielle forpligtelser. Det er karakteristisk for mindst 48 stater, og det bliver værre. Hvis man ser på leveomkostningerne, stigningen i leveomkostningerne i forhold til det, der officielt rapporteres, se på priserne for mad hos købmanden hen over de seneste 6 måneder i USA. Se på det faktum, at den amerikanske dollar, som for ikke så længe siden kunne købe en euro for 83 cents; i dag koster det 1 dollar 26-28 cents at købe en euro. Den amerikanske dollar er ved at kollapse i værdi; det, der stiger, er den pengemængde, der associeres til hasardspil, og den mest omfangsrige form for hasardspil finder sted på Wall Street. Pengene går, for rent spekulative formål, til at drive separate hasardspilsindsatser på sidelinjen i økonomien i vejret, for at drive værdien af aktiepriserne op for visse selskaber; og så snart et eller andet selskab bliver rigt, kommer lederne af selskaberne i fængsel, ligesom i Enron; for vi er gået fra 'stålindustrien' til 'stjæleindustrien'! Det er arten af nationaløkonomien.

Vi er i vanskeligheder. Vi er i vanskeligheder på global skala. Siden januar 2002, da den nuværende præsident holdt en uheldig tale, i sin 'State of the Union'-tale. Holdningen over for USA er faldet hastigt, til det laveste niveau, jeg nogensinde har set; fra nationer i hele verden. I hele Eurasien; i de amerikanske lande, er USA nu foragtet, hvor det i det mindste var respekteret, eller endda elsket, før. Vi er i vanskeligheder. Og se på verden. Verden konfronteres med en stor krise; USA konfronteres med en stor krise, med den måde, det behandler verden på. De største befolkningskoncentrationer i verden, i Kina, f.eks., 1,3 mia. eller mere; Indien, Pakistan, Bangladesh og landene i Sydøstasien; dette er den største befolkningskoncentration på planeten. Det er en fremvoksende del af verden; spørgsmålet er, hvad er USA's relation til disse asiatiske folkeslag, der i det store og

hele repræsenterer forskellige kulturelle baggrunde i forhold til USA og Vesteuropa. Hvordan skal vi finde fred i en urolig verden; hvordan skal vi finde forsoning i en verden i vanskeligheder med lande, der har vendt sig mod os pga. Cheneys og et par andres krigspolitikker?

Vi står altså over for en situation. Lad os gå lidt tilbage til det tidspunkt, hvor Bill Clintons blev indsat som præsident. Tænk nu over noget, nogle af jer ved noget om; tænk på den sorte vælgerskares status, den lovgivende, sorte forsamling ... i 1993, da Bill Clinton kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Gå nu igennem listen over navnene; hvor er disse mennesker, og deres erstatninger, i dag? Der har været en udvælgelse af de politiske præstationer i hele landet af de sorte vælgerkredse/folkevalgte. Det er dette problem, jeg konstant konfronteres med, og fra 1996 blev det værre, accelererede brutalt.

Så vi konfronteres altså ikke med et nyt problem i dag, men med det samme problem, principielt, som Martin med succes konfronterede, og jeg vil fremføre, at, i arven efter Martin Luther King og hans liv, er der noget, vi kan lære i dag, som bringer ham tilbage i live, som om han stod her i dag, i live. Der er noget særligt ved hans liv, hans udvikling, som vi i dag bør indfange, ikke alene med hensyn til at adressere vor nations problemer, som er ved at blive forfærdelige, men problemerne med vore relationer med verden som helhed. Hvordan skal vi agere over for disse kulturer, der er forskellige fra vore egne? Med asiatiske kulturer, der er forskellige fra vore egne; med muslimske kulturer, der er over 1 mia. muslimer i hele verden; med Kinas kultur, der er forskellig fra vores; med kulturen i Sydøstasien, der er forskellig fra vores? De er alle mennesker, der har alle de samme krav og behov, men de er forskellige kulturer, de tænker anderledes, de responderer til andre (kan ikke høres) end vi gør. Men vi må have fredeligt samarbejde med disse mennesker, for at løse globale problemer. Så begynder man at tænke over en person som Martin, og jeg vil

indikere, i denne sammenhæng, hvad Martins betydning er i dag.

Vi havde ingen erstatning for Martin. Første lektie. Martin var en enestående person; han var ikke en talentfuld person, der tilfældigvis snublede over lederskab og let kunne erstattes af andre ledere, der havde lært jobbet og kunne tage over bagefter. Han havde ingen efterfølger; der var ingen, som befandt sig i en position til at efterfølge ham. Mange ønskede det; de havde det ikke.

Hvad var det, Martin havde? Hvad var essensen af Martin, der gjorde ham til noget specielt?

Lad os sammenligne tre tilfælde for forstå dette. Et tilfælde, Martin selv. Det andet er tilfældet med Frankrigs berømte heltinde Jeanne d'Arc, og jeg er godt bekendt med den faktiske historie af Jeanne d'Arcs tilfælde, som på en måde er sammenligneligt, på en særlig måde, med Martins tilfælde. Og så også med et fiktivt tilfælde, som peger på det problem, vi står overfor, tilfældet med Shakespeares Hamlet; især Hamlets monolog i 3. akt.

Hvad handlede det om? Martin var en sand Guds mand, på en måde, som meget få mennesker kan virkeliggøre i deres livstid. Det var ikke alene det, at han var en Guds mand, men at han voksede op til fuldstændigt at forstå, hvad det ville sige. Hans billede var selvfølgelig Kristus og Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Det var hans kilde til styrke. Han levede det. Han havde bestegit bjergets top, på et tidspunkt, hvor han vidste, hans liv var truet af magtfulde kræfter internt i USA. Og han sagde, 'jeg vil ikke vige tilbage fra denne mission, om de så dræber mig'; præcis som Kristus sagde, og jeg er sikker på, Martin tænkte på dette, på dette tidspunkt. Kristi korsfæstelsespassion er det billede, der er essensen af kristendom. Det er et billede i f.eks. Tyskland og andre steder, hvor Bachs Mattæus-passion opføres, en ca. to timer lang forestilling. Og i disse to timer genlever publikum, menigheden, sangerne, musikerne på en kraftfuld måde

Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Dette har altid været vigtigt, at genleve dette; at indfange essensen af, hvad Kristus betyder for alle kristne, og Martin viste dette.

Forskellen er det følgende; og jeg vil vende tilbage til Jeanne d'Arc; de fleste mennesker er tilbøjelige til at tro, jo, jeg vil gerne i himmelen, eller noget i den retning. Eller også er de ikke, de er ligeglade. Men de leder efter svar inden for rammerne af deres dødelige liv. De tænker på kødets tilfredsstillelse, den sikkerhed, de vil nyde godt af, mellem grænserne for fødsel og død; hvorimod den store leder, som Martin, stiger til et højere niveau. De tænker på deres liv, som evangeliet fremlægger det, som en talent (mønt); livet er en talent, man har fået givet. Man fødes, og man dør. Det er ens talent; hvad man har i denne tidsperiode. Spørgsmålet er, man vil under alle omstændigheder give den ud; hvordan vil man give den ud? Hvad vil man bruge den til at sikre, i al evighed? Hvad vil man gøre, som en mission, som vil gøre én fortjent til den plads, man ønsker at have i evigheden?

Martin havde en klar fornemmelse af dette. Denne 'bjergtopstale' for mig, slog mig ligesom en klar forståelse af, hvad han sagde, hvad han sagde til andre.[1]

Livet er en talent. Det er ikke, hvad man 'får ud af' livet. Det er, hvad man lægger ind i det, der tæller. Martin havde dette. Der er derfor, han var en leder, og jeg har kendt de andre ledere, der var med ham i denne periode. De havde ikke helt den samme gnist. De accepterede måske ideen, de troede måske på den, men det greb dem ikke på samme måde, som det greb Martin. Og det greb ham mere og mere, er jeg sikker på, i takt med, at han påtog sig større og større ansvar; som en leder føler man dette, man ser sit folk, man ser, hvad man må håndtere, man ser lidelserne, man ser farerne, og man må finde i sig selv styrken til ikke at vige tilbage, ikke gå på kompromis.

Lad os tage tilfældet Jeanne d'Arc, til sammenligning. Dette

er den sande historie; hun var en så signifikant person i det 15. århundrede, historien blev grundigt dokumenteret dengang og er blevet krydstjekket osv. Hun var en person i hele kristendommen; hun er en hovedperson i Frankrigs historie. Her er hun så, en ung kvinde (17), der kom fra bondestanden, og som havde forhåbninger om, at Frankrig måtte befries fra de normanniske ridders forfærdelige besættelse; at Frankrig måtte blive en sand nation, og at det måtte løftes ud af sin tilstand og blive en nation for at tage sig af disse problemer; at Gud ønskede, dette skulle ske. Så, gennem flere hændelser, henvendte hun sig til en prins, som var den nominelle arving til Frankrigs trone, og hun sagde til denne prins – jeg har glemt, der var diverse akkreditiver – 'Gud ønsker, at du skal blive konge'. Og han så på hende og sagde, 'Hvad ønsker du af mig?' Hun svarede, 'jeg ønsker ingenting af dig; Gud ønsker, at du skal være konge'. Og, på grund af hendes kraftfulde personlighed og hendes mission, gav kongen hende kommando over nogle soldater til en meget alvorlig kamp på det tidspunkt, idet han formodede, hun ville blive dræbt som leder af disse soldater, og det ville løse problemet. Men hun blev ikke dræbt, hun vandt slaget, som hun personligt anførte. Og Frankrig blev mobiliseret til sin uafhængighed; ideen var dets uafhængighed i det store og hele som et resultat. Så kom tidspunktet, hvor kongen blev kronet, prinsen blev kronet til konge: men så forrådte kongen hende, til Frankrigs fjender, til briterne, normannerne. Og hun blev retsforfulgt af inkquisitionen, som var en rædselsfuld ting, den værste form for uretfærdighed man kan forestille sig. Og under retssagen blev hun tilbudt lokkemad; hvis du trækker dig lidt, vil vi ikke brænde dig levende på bålet. Hun sagde nej; hun veg tilbage; måske skulle jeg gå på kompromis, hun havde præster, der forsøgte at få hende til at gå på kompromis. Hun sagde, 'jeg vil ikke gå på kompromis. Jeg kan ikke forråde min mission'. Hun havde besteget bjergets top; jeg vil ikke forråde min mission; jeg vil fastholde min kurs. Så de tog hende og bandt hende til en pæl; de stablede brændet op om pælen; de satte ild til bålet, mens hun var i live og kogte

hende ihjel. Så åbnede de brændestakken for at se, om hun var i live eller ej og fandt, at hun var død, og så fortsatte de processen og genantændte bålet og brændte hende til aske (hun var da 19, -red.)

Men ud af dette skete der to ting: Frankrig blev genoplivet og fik sin uafhængighed og fik senere den første, moderne nationalstat, under Louis 11 af Frankrig.

Betydningen af dette for os i dag, er, at pga. denne sejr, pga. det, der skete med Louis 11 af Frankrig, fik vi den første europæiske stat, i hvilken *hele* regeringen var ansvarlig for *hele* folkets almene vel. Det almene vel betyder præcis det, det betyder i 1. korintherbrev, kap. 13, hvor Paulus skriver om agápe, undertiden kaldet kærlighed eller godgørenhed. Det er denne egenskab; det er ikke loven, det er ikke lovbogen, der tæller; det er ens kærlighed til menneskeheden, der tæller; at man altid må leve for ens kærlighed til menneskeheden. Og derfor er en regering ikke legitim, undtagen som en regering, der officielt er forpligtet over for ikke alene det almene velfærd for *hele* folket, men også over for forbedringen af livsbetingelserne for deres efterkommere. Og for første gang i Frankrig, i denne stat, [fik man] princippet om forfatningsmæssig lov; at en regering ikke kan behandle nogle blandt befolkningen som menneskeligt kvæg. Det er ikke lovligt, det er ikke en nation, hvis den behandler nogle blandt sin befolkning som menneskeligt kvæg. Man skal tænke på *hele* befolkningens almene velfærd; det må være indfanget i forpligtelse over for *hele* folket, og over for deres efterkommere. For vi er alle dødelige, og for at vække i os selv de passioner, mens vi er i live, som vil tilskynde os til at gøre det gode, må vi have en følelse af, at forbruget af vort liv, brugen af vor talent, vil betyde noget for de kommende generationer. De bedste mennesker ser efter ting, ligesom Moses, som vil finde sted, når han ikke længere selv er der til at nyde dem! Denne fornemmelse for udødelighed er det, som de bedste forældre opofrer for deres

børn; det er det, som lokalsamfund opofrer for uddannelse til deres børn, for deres børns muligheder. Man gennemgår pinen ved lidelser og mangel, men man har en følelse af, at man er på vej fremad, at ens liv vil betyde noget, at man kan dø med et smil på læben; man har overvundet døden, man har brugt sin talent vist, hvorfor livet vil betyde noget bedre for de kommende generationer. Det var princippet. Det princip inspirerede den mand, der blev kong Henrik 7 af England, til at gøre det samme imod den onde kong Richard 3, og til at etablere England på det tidspunkt som den anden, moderne nationalstat. Det var på en måde, hvad Martin gjorde. Samme form for proces.

Men lad os nu tage den anden side af sagen. Lad os tage tilfældet Hamlet. Hamlet siger, vi har muligheden for at kæmpe og befri os selv fra forfærdelige tilstande, men, men – hvad sker der, når vi dør? Hvad sker der efter døden? Det er frygten for, hvad der sker efter døden, som gør folk til krystere. Og det er vores problem i USA i dag. Det er problemet med vores lederskab i det Demokratiske Parti; det er problemet med det Republikanske Parti, for det er ikke alle i det Republikanske Parti, der er dårlige, nogle af dem er meget gode, og jeg har til hensigt at inkorporere nogle af dem i min regering; jeg er ikke særlig partisk, når det drejer sig om regeringen. Jeg er partisk med hensyn til at få den etableret.

Det er pointen. Problemet her er det følgende: Tror vi rent faktisk på, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyrene? Tror I på, at, i skolerne i dag, i aviserne i dag; tror I på, at amerikanere tror på, på nogen som helst signifikant måde, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyret? Det er ikke det, vi underviser; se på vores standardpensum. Mange af jer ved noget om uddannelse. Vores uddannelsespolitik er en national forbrydelse. Man lærer ingenting; man lærer at bestå en prøve. Man spørger sig selv, om de, der udarbejder prøven, ved, hvad de taler om. Man har prøver at bestå i forskellige steder i landet, ikke for at teste, hvad man har gjort ved eleverne med

hensyn til, hvad de ved; undertiden kommer eleverne og siger, 'jeg ved ingenting, i mine skoleår lærte jeg ingenting'. Sådan, som man underviser nu. Det, man tester, er elevernes lydighedstræning i dette skoledistrikt eller den del af landet, målt ud fra underlødighed. Distrikterne konkurrerer om penge! Og præstationerne, som skoleelevernes hundetræning, bliver en standard for, hvor mange penge, og hvor mange udmærkelser, dette distrikt vil modtage det følgende år. Vi er ikke længere interesseret ... Vi tror som nation ikke længere på at udvikle mennesker! Vi er, ligesom det gamle Rom, blevet et samfund for 'brød og cirkus'; få din krumme, og lad dig underholde! Og underholdningen bliver mere og mere ond, som det skrider frem. F.eks., arbejder folk i dag; er deres mentalitet, at de skal arbejde? Tror de på arbejde, tror de på, at samfundet giver dem mulighed for at arbejde? Nej, det gør det ikke. Det giver dem mulighed for at få fat i nogle penge. Hvad er den største vækstindustri i USA? Hasardspil! Hvad er Wall Street? Hasardspil. Hvad er Enron? Hasardspil. Hvad er disse fyre, der kommer i fængsel i New York? Hasardspillere. Mentaliteten i landet er, at, hvis du sidder i held og vinder i lotteriet og vinder på væddeløbsbanen, så går det fremad for dig. Til trods for, at ens industri er ved at kollapse, ens landbrug er væk, byrådet ikke længere har råd til at sørge for centrale behov; vi er blevet et hasardspilssamfund. Vi er afhængige af hvad? Masseunderholdning. Hvilken form for masseunderholdning? Er dette noget, man i realiteten bør skamme sig over?

Vi anser ikke længere mennesker for at være mennesker. Vi forstår ikke længere, hvad menneskeligt er.

Jeg startede en ungdomsbevægelse for henved 4 år siden, der fokuserer på unge mennesker, 18-25 årige, dvs. aldersgruppen for universitetsstuderende. Som I ved, når folk bliver omkring 18 til 25 år, under normale betingelser, er de gået videre end til at tænke på sig selv som unge mennesker, halvt voksne, halvt børn, og til at blive voksne mennesker. De har den

voksnes selvtillid, den voksnes impulser osv. De er klar til at påtage sig ansvar i samfundet. I et velordnet samfund, ville alle have adgang til en kvalitetsuniversitetsuddannelse, for at udvikle den enkeltes talenter for at finde ud af, hvad deres mission i livet skal være, hvilken form for karriere, de skal satse på, og man giver dem muligheden for at gennemarbejde dette, finde ud af dette, finde ud af, hvem, der virkelig er som voksen, og at vælge deres fremtidige profession i livet på denne basis. Det, jeg understreger med denne træning, er, forstå forskellen mellem menneske og dyr.

Jeg bliver lidt teknisk omkring dette, for det er et vigtigt punkt. Hvad er forskellen mellem menneske og dyr? Kan man bevise, at mennesket ikke blot er et dyr? Og hvordan kan man bevise det? Hvis mennesket var en abe, f.eks., ville det menneskelige befolkningstal på denne planet aldrig have oversteget et par millioner individer. Så lad være med at gøre mennesket til en abekat (et fjols). Vi har nu over 6 mia. mennesker, vi skal sørge for, på denne planet, og tallet vokser. Pointen er, at mennesket har været i stand til at opdage, hvad intet dyr kan gøre, at opdage universelle, fysiske principper i universet, og at anvende disse opdagede principper til at frembringe forbedringer i samfundet, som øger menneskets magt over naturen; præcis, som man kan læse i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog: mand og kvinde skabt i Skaberens billede, efter hans lignelse; og ansvarlige for denne funktion. Det er, hvad vi er. Når vi underviser i fysisk videnskab; når vi underviser i klassisk kunst og den slags ting, når vi underviser i historie ud fra dette standpunkt, formidler vi i realiteten en fornemmelse af deres menneskelighed. De er i stand til at genopføre fortidens store principper, det være sig inden for kunst eller inden for fysisk videnskab. Når de kender dette, kender de forskellen på sig selv og dyret; de bryster sig af dette og siger, vi er menneskelige. Og de kan se på hinanden med kærlighed, en form for kærlighed, der kommer til udtryk inden for uddannelse med den rigtige form for undervisning, hvor eleverne er delagtige

i processen med at kæmpe sig igennem handlingen for sig selv at opdage et princip, der præsenteres for dem som en udfordring og et paradoks. Det vil sige, en kærlig relation, en klasse med typisk 15-25 universitets- eller skoleelever, hvor eleverne gives ansvaret for, gives en udfordring med at kæmpe sig igennem det for sig selv, og den gode lærer forsøger at fremkalde denne form for respons blandt eleverne; finde to til tre i klassen, der kan starte diskussionen og få hele klassen involveret i diskussionen, så det, der kommer ud af det, ikke er udenadslære fra en lærebog, men at det, der kommer ud af det, er en proces, hvor man i en social oplevelse opdager betydningen af et princip, som om de selv havde gjort den oprindelige opdagelse. Dette gøres, ikke ved at undervise den enkelte elev, selv om det nogen gange virker, men ved at få eleverne til at interagere i diskussionsprocessen. Det er derfor, man helst skal have en klassestørrelse på mellem 15-25 elever. Ikke for mange, som kan udelukke muligheden for, at alle kan deltage. Og ikke for få, så man ikke får stimulering til at starte diskussionen. Det er denne sociale proces med en relation mellem mennesker, der elsker hinanden i en højere forstand, fordi de har været fælles om processen med at opdage et princip. Eller ... noget om historie; men de var fælles om det, og ideen om at være fælles om menneskelig viden, som menneskelig viden, er den essentielle kærlighedshandling. Man elsker menneskeheden og er tilfreds med menneskeheden, når man har arbejdet sammen for at gøre en opdagelse sammen. Og man indser, man kan regne med dem til denne form for metode – har man et problem med dem? Gå tilbage til metoden. Tal med dem på samme måde, som man gør i klasseværelset. Og man kæmper sammen igennem det, disse unge mennesker kæmper til kl.3-4 om morgenen. Når jeg holder foredrag for disse fyre, er de over mig i henved fire timer. Jeg holder en præsentation på en times tid, de er over mig konstant. Men det er smukt, det er vidunderligt. Jeg tror, at alle, der har arbejdet med undervisning, ved, hvad jeg taler om. Det er smukt; det er vidunderligt.

Så problemet er dette: Vi har en befolkning, vi har en verden, der har en mangel på mennesker, der rent faktisk fuldt ud forstår forskellen mellem menneske og dyr; at mennesket, som det defineres i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog, er et væsen, der er skabt i universets Skabers billede. Det er os. Fordi vi overfører disse ideer, fordi vi overfører dette arbejde, som intet dyr kan, elsker vi hinanden; vi elsker de mennesker, der var før os; vi elsker dem, der kommer efter. Vi kerer os om dem, på en meget selvisk måde, for, idet vi bruger vores talent her i livet, vores skønhedssans beror på, hvad der kommer ud af vores liv, i de kommende generationer. Vi elsker børn af denne grund. Der er børn; vi elsker børnebørn endnu mere end børnene, undertiden, fordi vore børn var i stand til at producere disse børn, det er fantastisk! Man elsker dem især, for dem, der bliver bedsteforældre, de elsker specielt disse børnebørn af denne grund.

Men denne form for kærlighed mangler generelt i befolkningen, hos ledere.

Martin havde selvfølgelig dette. Martin var ét af de sjældne mennesker, på hans tid, som havde en dybtgående følelse af, hvad det vil sige at være et menneske; som havde en dybtgående forståelse af læren fra Kristi passion på korset. Han var i stand til at bringe dette ind i politik – han kom ikke ind i det som politik som sådan – han var en naturlig leder. En naturlig leder er ikke én, der kommer ud af den politiske proces som sådan, men ud af folket. Martin opnåede aldrig et politisk hverv. Og alligevel var han sandsynligvis en lige så betydningsfuld person i USA som nogen moderne præsident var. Det opnåede han. Hans myndighed som en leder kom fra folket. Han kæmpede mod folket og med folket for at befri dem. Han var en leder i ordets sande betydning. Hans indflydelse som en politisk kraft i nationen og i verden kom fra hans forhold til folket.

Og det er vores situation i dag, og grunden til, at jeg er så glad for denne lejlighed til at være sammen med jer, for I

typificerer dem, der kæmper med vanskeligheder, i dette land og uden for dette land, for den såkaldte 'glemte mand'; som Franklin Roosevelt, der i 1933 blev indkaldt til at være præsident. 80 % af befolkningen i USA i særdeleshed, og mange i hele verden, er den glemte mand og kvinde. Der er ikke rigtig nogen, der kerer sig om dem. Tag eksemplet med historien om sundhedssektoren; tag eksemplet med alle mulige ting. Den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan forny en nation, som Martin ydede et stort bidrag til en fornyelse af USA, er, at man må gå til den glemte mand og kvinde; især til de ubemidlede, og hvis man kan udtrykke en kærlig holdning over for problemet med de ubemidlede, dem, der befinder sig på den laveste side i livet, så er man i stand til at repræsentere det princip, på hvilket moderne regeringsførelse bør baseres; det samme princip, som Jeanne d'Arc på sin vis muliggjorde gennem sit bidrag til Frankrig som den første, moderne nationalstat, der var helliget det almene velfærd. Hvis man vil være en ægte politiker, må man være forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Man må være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, og for at være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, må man se på det menneske, der befinder sig i de værste omstændigheder, generelt, og løfte dem op. Så har man virkelig bevist, at man kerer sig om det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke går til disse mennesker, er man ikke *med* det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke har sine rødder i kampen for det almene velfærd, er man ikke i stand til at lede vores nation, som er en nation, der forfatningsmæssigt er forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Martin havde dette. Alle de store ledere i historien er som regel kommet fra denne form for baggrund; de fødtes ikke til at være ledere, de blev ikke valgt som ledere; nogle blev valgt i løbet af livet, men de startede ikke med at etablere deres lederskab ved at blive valgt. De etablerede deres lederskab ved at finde deres rødder i kampen for menneskehedens velfærd. De blev repræsentanter for en eller anden gruppe, der kæmpede for deres rettigheder, eller de blev fortalere for denne gruppe, der kæmpede for sine rettigheder. Og de kom frem til en lederposition, fordi de havde en

indbygget, moralsk karakter, i billedet af Kristi passion og korsfæstelse. Og jo mere, de kommer ind i det, og jo farligere, det bliver, i takt med, at de vinder mere indflydelse – livet *bliver* farligere i takt med, at man vinder mere indflydelse – så indser de, at de sætter deres liv på spil, og de må spørge sig selv: hvad er det, jeg vil risikere mit liv for; hvad er det for en sag, jeg ikke vil forråde, selv, hvis prisen er, at det koster mig mit liv? Og han kastes direkte tilbage til Kristi korsfæstelse og passion. Og dér er vi i dag. Martin havde dette; og problemet med USA og bevægelsen i dag, er, at bevægelsen er blevet, skal vi sige, for 'civiliseret' med hensyn til at bøje af for at komme ud af det med det politiske *establishment*, og hvor den tenderer mod at tro på, at vejen til succes er at bøje af for at komme ud af det med dem. Man fortaber passionen, som bør motivere den sande, politiske leder. Og passionen er denne helligelse; man har en talent, man har en fornemmelse af, hvad ens liv betyder, man har en fornemmelse af forpligtelse, af en mission i livet, for at opløfte nationen ved at løfte en bestemt del af befolkningen, eller hele befolkningen. Og man vil *ikke gøre noget som helst* for at forråde dette. Det giver én kraft. Det giver én kraft til at være et menneske, der er skabt i den levende Skabers billede. Man tapper ind i det. Martin tappede ind i det. Han var en Guds mand, ikke kun af Gud, men en Guds mand. Han var en mand, som, i løbet af livet, af skæbnen fik givet missionen at være en Guds mand. Og han havde styrken til at gøre det. Han havde styrken til at gå i Kristi fodspor; til at gennemleve Gethsemane; til at gennemgå korsfæstelsen. Han havde denne styrke. Som Jeanne havde på sin måde.

Og det er den lektie, jeg mener, må undervises, må blive forstået, hvis vi skal redde denne nation. Vi må tappe ind i denne kraft. Og som jeg siger, blandt alle de billeder af nylige, politiske ledere i USA, er Martin, både som en national leder og som en global leder, hvilket han også var med hensyn til sin indflydelse, det bedste eksempel på den form for personlighed, vi må have og må udvikle for at komme

ud at det forfærdelige, frygtindgydende rod, der i dag truer os.

Mange tak.«

[1] Hør hele Martin Luther Kings sidste tale, 'I have been to the mountain top', her
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixfwGLxRJu8>

BÆLT & VEJ-INITIATIVET: VORT ÅRHUNDREDES AFGØRENDE PROJEKT

EIR-video, 9. maj, 2017:

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: 'Hvis vi kan overbevise præsident Trump om at tage imod tilbuddet om at gå sammen med Kina og de andre nationer omkring den Nye Silkevej, så kan han blive en af de største præsidenter i USA's historie.' Dette initiativ, Bælt & Vej-initiativet, blev officielt lanceret af Kina i 2013. Det er en politik for gensidigt fordelagtig infrastrukturkonnektivitet, for fælles udviklingsprogrammer. Foreløbig omfatter programmerne og de igangværende arbejder flere end 60 nationer og berører flere end 4 milliard mennesker – flertallet af menneskeheden – og med planer om infrastrukturinvesteringer til \$20 billion. Dette er et enormt projekt. Disse programmer har potentialet til at fjerne fattigdom på planeten inden for én generation; fuldstændigt og totalt at fjerne lokal fattigdom overalt.

Jason Ross:

»Det ville være den største fejltagelse nogensinde, hvis USA

ikke benyttede sig af Bælt & Vej Forum, der finder sted i Beijing, Kina, om en uge (14.-15. maj) – den største fejltagelse nogensinde. Denne begivenhed vil samle repræsentanter fra over 100 nationer, inkl. den direkte deltagelse af næsten 30 statsoverhoveder, og man vil diskutere vor generations største projekt: Bælt & Vej-initiativet.

Foreløbig er der ingen meddelelse om, eller noget, der peger på, at præsident Trump eller andre repræsentanter for USA vil deltage, men:

(Helga Zepp-LaRouche)

'Hvis vi kan overbevise præsident Trump om at tage imod tilbuddet om at gå sammen med Kina og de andre nationer omkring den Nye Silkevej, så kan han blive en af de største præsidenter i USA's historie.'

Dette initiativ, Bælt & Vej-initiativet, blev officielt lanceret af Kina i 2013. Det er en politik for gensidigt fordelagtig infrastruktur-konnektivitet, for fælles udviklingsprogrammer. Foreløbig omfatter programmerne og de igangværende arbejder flere end 60 nationer og berører flere end 4 milliard mennesker – flertallet af menneskeheden – og med planer om infrastrukturinvesteringer til \$20 billion. Det udgør 2 til 3 gange den investering, det ville kræve totalt at genoplive den amerikanske infrastruktur. Det udgør 20 gange de \$1 billion, som Trump foreløbig har krævet. Dette er et enormt projekt. Disse programmer har potentialet til at fjerne fattigdom på planeten inden for én generation; fuldstændigt og totalt at fjerne lokal fattigdom overalt. I løbet af de seneste par årtier har Kina allerede undergået en fænomenal udvikling,

(udenrigsminister Rex Tillerson)

'Kina begyndte virkelig at føle sig entusiastisk på det tidspunkt, og med rette, de har opnået meget; de har flyttet 500 millioner kinesere væk fra fattigdom og ind

middelklassestatus.'

(præsident Trump)

'Og jeg havde et langt møde med Kinas præsident i Florida, og vi havde lange, lange diskussioner, i mange, mange timer. Han er en god mand.'

Kina springer fremad med sin egen udvikling og arbejder sammen med sine naboer gennem kinesiske investeringer, gennem staten, gennem foretagender, og gennem ny finansiering gennem institutioner som Asiatisk Infrastruktur-Investeringsbank (AIIB), Den Nye Udviklingsbank (BRIKS-banken) og Silkevejsfonden, som alle er mekanismer, der er skabt efter 2013; og store projekter i enorm skala er nu mulige.

(Richard Trifan)

'Dette er et historisk projekt, som I alle ved; det er sandsynligvis den største, globale præstation, der er analog med vores ekspansion ud i rummet og til Månen og andre planeter. Det er sandsynligvis det mest omfattende initiativ, som mange nationer vil samarbejde omkring.'

Lad os foretage en rundtur. Med udgangspunkt i Asien er der seks udviklingskorridorer, som Kina har foreslået, for veje, jernbaner, vandveje, elektricitet, kommunikation, sammen med blød kommunikation, såsom uddannelse, fælles toldsatser og kulturelle udvekslinger. Disse korridorer er i øjeblikket under opførelse i varierende grader. Lad os f. eks. se på den Økonomiske Kina-Pakistan-korridor: den er i øjeblikket under massiv opbygning; den vil bringe 10 gigawatt elektricitet til Pakistan – det rækker til millioner af mennesker, 10 millioner eller mere – en ny havn i Gwadar (ud til Oman Golfen), med hundrede tusinder af jobs undervejs, blot for dette ene byggeprojekt, og generelt mere udenlandsk investering i Pakistan, end denne nation samlet set har fået i de sidste par årtier.

Lad os se på havet: Det 21. Århundredes Maritime Silkevej, som bl.a. omfatter at udgrave en kanal gennem Kra-landtangen i Thailand. Dette er et enormt og nødvendigt projekt for at aflaste det overtrafikerede Malaccastræde, og for at bringe økonomiske muligheder til Thailand og Sydøstasien generelt. Denne idé, der har været foreslået i årtier, har nu en reel mulighed for at blive bygget inden for det nuværende årti.

Den Eurasiske Landbro, der når til Europa, transporterer stadigt voksende mængder af jernbanegods, med togafgange for godstog mod vest, der dagligt ankommer i Europa og vender tilbage til Kina med europæiske varer.

Hvis vi ser på Afrika, så har vi for nylig set åbningen af Addis Abeba-Djibouti jernbanen som blot et enkelt eksempel på den meget påtrængende nødvendige udvikling, som nu er mulig; som nu finder sted i Afrika, hvor investering i infrastruktur og industri og landbrug nu når nye højder, det meste af det fra Kina.

Hvis vi bevæger os mod øst, krydser vi Beringstrædet og bevæger os fra Asien og ind i Nordamerika, fra Rusland til Alaska. En rute over land, der muliggøres af denne Beringstrædeforbindelse, vil være hurtigere end transport med skib, og gør det muligt at udvikle området langs ruten. Det Arktiske Område har enorme resurser, der i øjeblikket er næsten fuldstændigt utilgængelige. Byggeriet af den nødvendige infrastruktur og selveste Beringstrædeforbindelsen vil være en storstilet infrastrukturpræstation. Dernæst vil et genopbygget, amerikansk infrastrukturfundament, et netværk af jernbaner, veje, en platform med ny, højdensitetskraftværker, kernekraft; havne, sluser, dæmninger; skoler og andre offentlige bygninger og offentlige værker, gøre det muligt for USA at opnå et nyt produktivitetsniveau, og have mere at bidrage med til verdenssamfundet og få fordel af verdenssamfundet.

Hvis vi nu bevæger os sydpå, så er der p.t. ingen

transportmuligheder over land fra Nord- til Sydamerika. Man kan ikke køre til Sydamerika – det er ikke muligt. Der er en afbrydelse, kendt som Darien Gap. Når vi endelig får bygget denne forbindelse på blot nogle få dusin mil, vil vi endelig forbinde de amerikanske kontinenter som helhed. I Mellemamerika er ny finansiering, også fra Kina, ligeledes i færd med at muliggøre en sekundær Panamakanal, kunne man sige, med igangværende byggeri og forberedelse i Nicaragua.

I Sydamerika er en bi-oceanisk korridor, der strækker sig fra Peru til Brasilien, fra Stillehavet til Atlanterhavet via Bolivia, på planlægningsstadiet.

Så stor en del af verden arbejder i øjeblikket sammen, med fælles udvikling og en fælles fremtid med fremgang, værdighed og videnskabelige præstationer som mål. Vil USA tilslutte sig? Vi er blevet inviteret med åbne arme:

(Meifang Zhang)

'Sidst, men ikke mindst, vil jeg gerne citere Xi for at sige, at Kina byder USA velkommen til at deltage i samarbejdet inden for rammerne af Bælt & Vej-initiativet ... Begge lande bør virkelig gribe disse muligheder.'

Lad os tage imod denne invitation. Om et hundrede år vil USA i tilbageblik være så lykkelig for, at vi gjorde det.«

**Schiller
Koncert:**

Instituttets

En musikalsk dialog mellem kulturer, Kbh., 17. feb. 2017

Dialogen mellem kulturer, mellem selve sponsorerne, førte til den store succes – Schiller Instituttet, organisationen Russisk-Dansk Dialog, det Russiske Hus i København og det Kinesiske Kulturcenter. Koncerten afholdtes i det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur, som repræsenterer den Russiske Føderations myndighed for forbindelse til Fællesskabet af Uafhængige Stater (fra det tidligere Sovjetunionen), russere i udlændighed og det internationale humanistiske samarbejde (Rossotrudnichestvo).

Følgende musikalske indslag er ikke vist i videoen: The following parts of the program are not shown in the video:

Gitta-Maria Sjöberg, sopran, Sverige/Danmark. Sweden/Denmark. Hun sang Rusalkas »Sangen til Månen« af Dvořák.

She sang Rusalka's Song to the Moon by Dvořák accompanied by **Christine Raft**, pianist from Denmark.

Idil Alpsoy, sopran, Sverige/Danmark, Sweden, Denmark: sang sange fra Sibelius' Op. 37 og 88.

She sang songs from Sibelius' Op.37 and 88, accompanied by **Christine Raft**.

Programmet/Program:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Video: En Ny Æra for USA: LaRouches Fire Love. Fuld dansk tekst

Forestil jer, at vi lever i et samfund, der har forpligtet sig til at opnå fusion og implementere dens fordele.

Hvordan ville det, at være en del af et sådant samfund, forme dets borgeres selvopfattelse? Et menneskeliv har konsekvenser og betydning, der varer ud over den fysiske død – i det mindste potentielt. Ved at vedtage en mission for opnåelse af fusion, omsætter vi et af Hamiltons mål i praksis, hvor han skriver, at, »at værdsætte og stimulere det menneskelige intellekts aktivitet gennem at mangfoldiggøre objekterne for foretagsomheden, er ikke blandt de mindst betragtelige af de midler, ved hvilke en nations rigdom kan fremmes. Selv ting, der i sig selv ikke er fordelagtige, bliver det undertiden gennem deres tendens til at fremprovokere en anstrengelse. Enhver ny scene, der åbnes op for menneskets beskæftigede natur for at vække det og hævde sig, udgør en tilgang af ny kraft til lageret af bestræbelse.« – Få det til at ske!

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Download (PDF, Unknown)

»Den Nye Silkevej bliver til

Verdenslandbroen«, en guidet rundtur

Video; introduktion v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Der er stadig mange mennesker, der siger, at denne vision blot er en drøm – at det er umuligt. De nationer, hvor nutidens stormagter kæmper mod hinanden i geopolitiske stedfortræderkrige, såsom Yemen og Syrien, vil imidlertid fortælle dig, at det er det nuværende paradigme, der er umuligt og ikke kan fortsætte.

Opførelsen af Verdenslandbroen ville betyde en økonomisk og kulturel renæssance for planeten, et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden. Projekterne og de økonomiske hovedkoncepter, der præsenteres i denne rapport, er i sandhed det udkast, ud fra hvilket førende regeringer i hele verden arbejder; udfordringen består nu i at bringe USA tilbage til sine rødder og transformere det til en magtfuld allieret for denne nye, økonomiske orden.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

**»Med Verdenslandbroen
vil alle have et job.«
Lyndon LaRouche**

Det følgende videoklip er et meget kort uddrag af en tale, som

hr. LaRouche holdt ved et forum i Washington i 1997 i sammenhæng med *EIR's førsteudgave* af specialrapporten om den Eurasiske Landbro. Denne præsentation var en del af en række af såkaldte »udviklingskonferencer«, der blev afholdt i Washington i løbet af disse år – 1996, 1997 og 1998 – og jeg vil mene, at det, I får at se i denne video, er Lyndon LaRouches »marchordrer«. Det var på en måde hans kreative vision om, hvilken rolle, som Kina, med den Nye Silkevej, og ligeledes hvilken rolle Rusland ville komme til at spille i den totale omformning af den strategiske geometri i verden.

Her følger det korte uddrag:

Lyndon Larouche: Der er kun to respektable nationer tilbage på planeten, dvs. nationer med en respektabel magt: det er USA, nærmere bestemt ikke det USA, der repræsenteres af Kongressen, men af præsidenten. Det er USA's identitet, der udgør en politisk magt, ikke en eller anden sammenkædning af dens bestanddele. USA repræsenteres i dag udelukkende af dets præsident, som en politisk institution. Kongressen repræsenterer ikke USA; de er ikke helt sikre på, hvem, de repræsenterer nu om stunder, eftersom de ikke har besøgt deres vælgere for nylig.

Præsidenten som institution er legemliggørelsen af USA i internationale relationer. Det kan Udenrigsministeriet ikke gøre; Justitsministeriet kan ikke gøre det; intet andet ministerium kan gøre det; kun USA's præsident kan, under vores forfatning, repræsentere USA som en enhed – hele dets personlighed, dets sande interesse, dets hele folk.

Der findes kun én anden magt på denne planet, der kan være ligeså respektløs (arrogant) over for andre magter, og det er Den kinesiske Folkerepublik. Kina er i øjeblikket engageret i et stort projekt for konstruktion af infrastruktur, i hvilket min hustru og andre i en årrække har haft et uophørligt engagement. Der finder en stor reform sted i Kina, som er en »reform af vanskeligheder«. De forsøger at løse et problem.

Det betyder ikke, at der ikke er et problem. Men de forsøger at løse det.

Hvis derfor USA, eller USA's præsident(skab), og Kina, deltager i at begunstige *dette* projekt, der undertiden kaldes Silkevejsprojektet, undertiden Landbro-projektet, som, hvis dette projekt med udviklingskorridorer over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika, ind i Nordamerika, udvides, så er dette projekt tilstrækkeligt til at sætte hele denne planet på en kurs for økonomisk genrejsning. Jeg vil gå lidt i detaljer med dette for at gøre det mere konkret.

Kina har i nogen tid haft et samarbejde med Irans regering. Iran har faktisk været i gang med at fuldføre en række jernbaneforbindelser, der er en forlængelse af Kinas Landbro-program (eller Silkevejsprojekt). For nylig har vi fra Indien set, at det indiske lederskab er mødtes med repræsentanter for Kina for at påbegynde en indledningsvis rute, blandt landruterne, under Landbro-programmet. En rute går ind i Kunming i Kina. Under Anden Verdenskrig, i dette område, Myitkyina (Burma/Myanmar), havde vi fly, der fløj ind i Kunming, »over Knolden«, som de plejede at sige dengang. Jeg er ganske godt bekendt med dette område.

Men, hvis man har vandvejsforbindelser, kanalforbindelser, og jernbaneforbindelser fra Kunming gennem Myitkyina – dette område – tværs over Bangladesh og ind i Indien, igennem Pakistan og ind i Iran, op til området lige over Teheran, syd for det Kaspiske Hav – så har man en forbindelse til Mellemøsten; man har forbindelse til Centralasien; man har forbindelse til Tyrkiet; man har forbindelse igennem til Europa.

Dernæst er der den nordlige rute, der stort set er den samme rute som den transsibiriske Jernbane, der blev bygget under amerikansk indflydelse og amerikansk rådgivning, af Rusland. Så har man en mellemliggende rute, der er i færd med at blive udviklet, i Centralasien, med Kina og Iran.

Indien arbejder på en plan, der blot involverer at tilføje nogle få hundrede kilometer jernbanelinje – der var mange andre forbedringer langs med den lige linje – og som ville forbinde området nord for Teheran, gennem Pakistan, gennem Indien, gennem Bangladesh, gennem Myanmar og ind i Kunming, ind i Thailand, ind i Vietnam, ned gennem Malaysia og Singapore, over stræderne via en stor bro og ind i Indonesien.

Der er ligeledes en plan for udviklingen af jernbanelinjen gennem det, der var det nordlige Sibirien, over Beringstrædet og ind i Alaska, og herfra ned og ind i USA. Der er en forbindelse til Mellemøsten – flere forbindelser – fra Europa, og også fra Kina; men fra Kina en forbindelse til Mellemøsten og ind i Egypten, ind i hele Afrika.

Så hvad vi har her er en række projekter, som ikke blot er transportprojekter, ligesom den transkontinentale jernbane i USA, der var forløberen for denne idé tilbage i slutningen af 1860'erne og 1870'erne. Man har »udviklingskorridorer«, hvor man i et område, der strækker sig 50-70 kilometer på hver side af jernbaneforbindelsen, har olie- og gasledninger, og så fremdeles. Man udvikler dette område med industri, minedrift, alle sådanne ting. Og det er sådan, man *betaler* for transportforbindelsen, pga. al den rige, økonomiske aktivitet, der skabes. Med en indbyrdes afstand på nogle kilometer langs hele denne forbindelse foregår der noget, en eller anden økonomisk aktivitet. Folk, der arbejder, folk, der bygger ting, folk, der gør ting. For at transformere denne planet ved hjælp af store projekter for byggeri af infrastruktur, som vil skabe store industrier, nye industrier, nyt landbrug og de andre ting, vi har så desperat brug for. *Der er ingen som helst grund til, at noget menneske på denne planet, der kan arbejde, skulle være arbejdsløs.* Så enkelt er det. Og dette projekt er midlet til dette mål.

Hvis nationerne – som nu omfatter Rusland, Iran, Indien og andre nationer – kommer overens med Kina, og engagerer sig i en forpligtelse til dette projekt, som de bygger hver dag;

hvis USA – dvs. USA's præsident, Clinton – forsætter med at støtte denne indsats, som han har gjort, i det mindste rent politik, hvad får man så? Man får USA og Kina og nogle andre lande, der går i samlet flok op imod den største magt på denne planet, som er Det britiske Imperium, kaldet det Britiske Commonwealth (statssamfund). Det er fjenden!

Lad os sige, at, en skønne dag, f. eks. en søndag morgen, præsidenterne for hhv. USA og Kina og et par andre, efter et weekend-møde siger: »Vi har denne weekend besluttet, at vi, baseret på vore rådgivere samt den kendsgerning, at det internationale finansielle og monetære system er håbløst bankerot, som ansvarlige statsoverhoveder, af hensyn til almenvellet må erklære disse bankerotte institutioner konkurs og sætte dem under konkursbehandling. Og det er i vores interesse, at vi samarbejder om dette som nationer, for at undgå at skabe kaos på denne planet.«

Resultatet vil så være, at en sådan meddelelse en skønne søndag morgen med sikkerhed vil få »snakkehovederne« på Washington Tv til at 'spinne'. Men bortset fra det, så betyder det, at hele systemet, fra dette øjeblik, har været en tur i guillotinen, og at hovedet ruller hen ad gaden. Alan Greenspans hoved, måske.

Det betyder, at vi nu har tilskyndelsen til omgående at opbygge et nyt finansielt og monetært system. Når man skal genrejse et selskab, der er bankerot, til en levedygtig form, hvad gør man så? Man må finde de erhvervsaktiviteter, som selskabet skal gøre, hvilket danner grundlaget for at skabe den nye kredit, der skal få firmaet til at køre igen.

Programmet for Landbroen, med sine globale implikationer, er det store projekt, der direkte og indirekte vil afkaste tilstrækkelig med aktivitet, så at sige, i alle dele af verden til, at vi atter kan få denne verden tilbage på et sundt fundament.

Matthew Ogden: Som man kan høre, så afslører denne tale stor forudviden; og det er i realiteten Lyndon LaRouches aktive indgriben, med rejser til Rusland, med hans hustrus rejser til Kina i denne periode, og med udgivelsen af *EIR's* specialrapport om den Eurasiske Landbro, der har formet den nuværende situation, vi befinder os i. En ting, der er interessant at fremhæve, er de kort, I så. Dengang var mange af disse jernbanelinjer og andre olie/gasledninger blot forslag; men nu er flere af dem faktisk under opførelse.

Jeg mener, at det, 20 år senere, står klart, at dette er det dominerende system, der er ved at vokse frem på denne planet. Samtidig står det transatlantiske system foran en umiddelbar nedsmeltning. En umiddelbart forestående implosion af gæld og eksponering til derivater i betalingsstandsning til billioner af dollars projiceres nu ind i alle storbanker i hele det transatlantiske system.

For et engelsk udskrift af hele fredags-webcastet, se <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=14279>

Temavideo: 'Gør fremskridt – eller dø' Dansk udskrift

Progress – or die

LPac Video

Med dansk udskrift

På grund af emnets aktualitet udlægger vi denne LaRouchePAC-video, som er fra 13. april, 2012:

... den første atombombe blev kastet over Hiroshima, en militærbase ... Vi vil fortsætte med at bruge den, indtil vi fuldstændig har ødelagt Japans evne til at ...

Kennedy 1963: » ... i Berlin eller på Cuba vil en krig i dag eller i morgen, hvis den blev en atomkrig, ville den ikke være som nogen anden krig i historien. En fuldt optrappet udveksling af atomvåben, der varede under 60 minutter, kunne, med de våben, der nu findes, udslette mere end 300 millioner amerikanere, europæere og russere, såvel som utalte millioner andre steder, og de overlevende, som formand Khrusjtjov advarede det kommunistiske Kina om, de overlevende ville misunde de døde. Hvis blot én termionuklear bombe blev kastet på en amerikansk, russisk eller anden by, hvad enten den blev udløst ved et uheld eller med overlæg, af en galning eller af en fjende, af en større nation eller af en mindre, fra et hvilket som helst hjørne af verden, kunne denne ene bombe udløse mere destruktiv kraft over denne ene, hjælpeløse by end alle de bomber, der blev kastet under Anden Verdenskrig.«

2012: I dag, næsten halvtreds år efter disse ord af præsident Kennedy, hænger den termionukleare krigs sky stadig over vore hoveder. Konfronteret med sammenbruddet af verdens monetaristiske system er Det britiske Imperiums fremstød for generel krig allerede i gang. Fra mordet på Gaddafi i Libyen til fremstødet for en militær intervention i Syrien, og til Israels fremstød for et angreb på Iran, skubbes verden frem mod randen af generel krig. I en æra med termionukleare våben betyder generel krig en termionuklear krig. Det betyder ikke blot utænkelige mængder af død og ødelæggelse; det er en trussel mod vor arts blotte eksistens. Men denne aktuelle, dødbringende tingenes tilstand behøver ikke at eksistere.

(*Ronald Reagan*) »... lad os vende os mod videnskab og teknologi, der har frembragt vor storslåede industribasis og givet os den livskvalitet, som vi i dag nyder. Hvad, om frie mennesker kunne leve trygt i visheden om, at deres tryghed ikke hvilede på truslen om amerikanernes evne til at levere et omgående gengældelsesangreb for at afskrække et sovjetisk angreb, hvis vi kunne opfange og ødelægge strategiske ballistiske missiler, før de nåede frem til vor eller vore allieredes jord? Jeg ved, at dette er en formidabel teknisk opgave, en opgave, som ikke ville blive fuldført før ved slutningen af dette århundrede, men er det ikke enhver investering værd at befri verden fra truslen om atomkrig? Det ved vi, at det er. Jeg opfordrer vort lands videnskabelige samfund, som gav os atomvåben, til nu at anvende deres storslåede talenter i verdensfredens tjeneste, til at give os midlerne til at gøre disse atomvåben impotente og overflødige.«

Lyndon LaRouche: »Den fremgangsmåde, vi må anvende, hedder 'trinvis strategisk ballistisk missilforsvar'. Den første forsvarslinje er laservåben, hvis opgave er at ødelægge sovjetiske missiler i samme øjeblik, disse missiler udløses ...« Det strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ, udviklet af Lyndon LaRouche og vedtaget af Ronald Reagan, var på randen af at blive til virkelighed, et fælles amerikansk-sovjetisk, rumbaseret, ballistisk missilforsvarssystem, der tog nye fysiske principper i anvendelse, såsom de sovjetiske stråle-partikkel-lasere, samt andre, endnu ikke opfundne teknologier, der ville gøre våbnene overflødige. Men SDI blev ikke til noget. Det britiske Imperiums hånd greb ind for at standse menneskets fremskridt. Gennem Det britiske Imperiums sovjetiske marionetter, Yuri Andropov og Mikael Gorbatsjov, sammen med de britiske marionetter i USA, blev SDI-forslaget lukket ned, og i stedet for et program uden fortilfælde med videnskab som drivkraft, fik vi London-Wall Street svindelnummeret, et svindelnummer, som nu har bragt hele det transatlantiske område på denne planet til en elendig tilstand af fysisk-

økonomisk sammenbrud, et svindelnummer, der har bragt os til randen af termonuklear krig.

»Skønsmæssigt 30.000 mennesker marcherede gennem Athen i torsdags i den anden protestbølge mod ... Molotov-cocktails, to tønder med gas, og sten flyver gennem luften«

Lyndon LaRouche: »Hvis SDI ikke var blevet droppet, ville vi ikke befinde os i dette rod i dag. Vi havde ret; jeg havde især ret, og de, der ikke lyttede til mit budskab, mislykkedes, og var fiaskoer, og alle de ting, som de ikke gjorde, og som de skulle have gjort, var det, der muliggjorde den aktuelle trussel om den omgående udslettelse af den menneskelige art.«

Der findes mere end 20.000 atomsprænghoveder. Hvad, hvis de blev taget i anvendelse? Vore ubåde af Ohio-klassen symboliserer USA's ødelæggelseskapacitet. Hver af disse ubåde kan rumme op til 24 Trident-missiler, missiler, der kan flyve med en hastighed af over 13.000 mil i timen og ramme mål 7.000 mil borte. Hvert missil er udstyret med 4-8 atomsprænghoveder; enten W-76 sprænghovedet med en ladning på 100 kiloton, eller den mere destruktive W-88 med en ladning på 475 kiloton. Til sammenligning havde Littleboy, atombomben, der blev kastet over Hiroshima, en ladning på 14 kt, og Fatman, der blev kastet over Nagasaki, 23 kt. De var atombomber. I dag har vi at gøre med termonukleare bomber, der hver er 8-40 gange kraftigere end Hiroshima. Med 4 W-88 sprænghoveder i hver Trident-missil, og med 24 missiler på hver ubåd, og med 14 amerikanske ubåde, der er bevæbnet med disse, bliver det til næsten 400 sprænghoveder med hver en ladning på 475 kt – en kolossal ødelæggelsessevne.

I Rusland har deres interkontinentale missil, SS-27, en rækkevidde på 6.500 mil og bærer en ladning på 550 kt. Eller tag Ruslands SS-18, med kælenavnet 'Satan', af hvilke man har kendskab til 6 eksisterende, og som har en rækkevidde på 10.000 mil og kan levere et enkelt sprænghoved med en ladning

på 8.000 kt! Hvis 'Satan' blev udløst over New York City, ville storbrandens radius, inden for hvilken alle mennesker ville dø inden for 24 timer, være omtrent 4 mil.

I Kina har de DF 5A, der kan udstyres med et enkelt sprænghoved med en ladning på 4.000 kt eller med 4-6 sprænghoveder med hver sit mål, og hver med en ladning på mellem 150 og 300 kt; dette interkontinentale ballistiske missils rækkevidde er på 8.000 mil, hvilket gør USA's vestkyst til et meget let mål.

Hvis vi kom ind i en global, termonuklear konflikt, ville vi på få minutter gøre en ende på civilisationen, som vi kender den. Storbyer over hele kloden ville forsvinde fra landkortet; milliarder af mennesker vil være døde, og som Kennedy citerede, ville 'de levende misunde de døde'. Men betyder dette udslettelse? Ud over død og ødelæggelse på jordens overflade har en termonuklear krig evnen til at transformere Jordens klima. Ligesom eksplosionen fra en stor vulkan, som Tamboras udbrud i 1815 i Indonesien, der lukkede sollyset ude og frembragte 'året uden sommer', således kan også eksplosionerne fra termonukleare våben forårsage globale klimaforandringer. Man skønner, at udveksling af blot 15 bomber af Hiroshima-størrelse mellem Pakistan og Indien, hvilket udgør langt mindre end 1 % af verdens atomarsenal, ville skabe klimaforandringer uden fortilfælde i menneskehedens historie, hvis de blev kastet over kæmpebyer i hvert af disse lande. 5 mio. tons sort kulstofrøg ville blive sluppet ud i den øverste troposfære, og ville dernæst, når den først blev opvarmet af Solen, blive løftet endnu højere op, i stratosfæren. Man skønner, at denne røg ville sprede sig i løbet af 49 dage og lægge en dyne over hele Jorden og lukke tilstrækkeligt af for sollyset til at skabe et klima som i den lille istid. Hvis verden kom ind i en global konflikt, hvor man brugte en tredjedel af verdens atomarsenal, ville der dannes så meget røg, at Solens stråler ville blive udelukket fra at nå Jordens overflade og få temperaturerne til at falde

under frysepunktet i månedsvis over hele kloden og dræbe praktisk talt alle fotosyntese-processer, og dermed alt liv, der er afhængig af dem. Hvor svovlpartiklerne fra et vulkanudbrud forbliver luftbårne i omtrent 2 år, kunne røgen fra atom-eksplikationer vare i et årti. Oven i død og ødelæggelse af storbyer over hele kloden, ville selve Jordens biosfære, den skrøbelige indpakning, som det har taget milliarder af år at udvikle frem til det stadie, hvor menneskeligt liv kunne eksistere, blive ødelagt. Vi taler virkelig om masseudslettelse af den menneskelige art.

Men det behøver ikke ske.

Alt imens de monetaristiske nationer smuldrer, bevæger nationer som Rusland og Kina sig væk fra en monetaristisk økonomi og satser på en politik med skabelse af fysisk rigdom, storstilet økonomisk udvikling og pionerprojekter inden for den arktiske udviklings og menneskets kolonisering af rummets nye, fremskudte grænser. Rusland har inviteret USA til at gå sammen med sig i eventyret om denne nye, fremskudte grænse. Rusland har ikke alene foreslået et fælles program til udvikling af Beringstrædet, men Rusland har tilbudt principperne om 1980'ernes SDI tilbage til USA i form af Det strategiske forsvar af Jorden. Foreløbig har USA valgt at klamre sig til sine fantasier om Wall Street og City og London.

(Den britiske dronning) »... i dag er USA fortsat vor vigtigste allierede ... «

I stedet for at tage imod Ruslands tilbud om fælles økonomisk udvikling, spiller USA rollen som syndebuk for det smuldrende, Britiske Imperium. Alt imens Rusland og Kina nægter at underkaste sig imperiesystemet, bruger Det britiske Imperium USA's våbenarsenal til at forsøge at true dem til underkastelse. Det er dette sammenstød mellem imperiesystemet og kampen om den menneskelige arts overtagelse af styringen af planeten, som driver os frem mod krig.

Hvis vi fjerner Barack Obama fra Det hvide Hus, fjerner vi USA's våbenarsenal fra briterne kontrol og vælter skakbrættet. Ved at fjerne Barack Obama åbner man op for, at USA kan arbejde seriøst med både Rusland og Kina, og for, at Amerikas pionerånd, som gav verden 'et frihedens tempel og et håbets fyrtårn', atter kan blive udløst.

(JFK) »Verden har før været tæt på krig, men nu har mennesket, som har overlevet alle tidligere trusler mod sin eksistens, taget evnen til at udslette sin egen art mere end syv gange i sine dødelige hænder. I aften står jeg her, med ansigtet mod vest, på det sted, der engang var den store, fremskudte grænsepost; fra det land, der strakte sig 3000 mil bag os, opgav pionererne deres sikkerhed, deres tryghed og undertiden deres liv for at bygge vort nye Vesten. De holdtes ikke tilbage af deres egne tvivl, eller var fanger af en gevinst for sig selv. De var fast besluttet på at skabe den nye verden, stærk og fri, et eksempel for verden, på at overvinde dens farer og dens vanskeligheder, og besejre de fjender, der truede indefra og udefra. Nogle ville sige, at denne kamp er forbi, at alle horisonterne er udforsket, at alle kampene er blevet vundet, at der ikke længere er nogen fremskudt, amerikansk grænse, men jeg er sikker på, at ingen ville erklære sig enig i denne stemning, for alle problemerne er ikke løst, og alle kampene er ikke vundet, og vi står i dag på randen af en ny, fremskudt grænse, 1960'ernes fremskudte grænse, med ukendte muligheder og farer, uopfyldte håb og uopfyldte veje; den nye, fremskudte grænse er her, hvad enten vi søger den eller ej; denne nye, fremskudte grænse er de områder i rummet, der ikke er kortlagt, uløste spørgsmål om fred og krig, uvidenhedens og fordommenes ubesejrede provinser, ubesvarede spørgsmål om fattigdom og overskud. Men jeg er overbevist om, at tiden kræver forestillingsevne og mod og vedholdenhed. Jeg beder hver af Jer om at være pioner i denne nye, fremskudte grænse. Min opfordring er til de unge af hjertet, uanset alder, til de stærke i ånden, uanset parti, til alle, der imødegår skriftens opfordring: 'Vær stærk og

modig, vær ikke bange, lad dig ikke skræmme'. Hvis vi har modet og viljen, kan vi komme igennem en tid, hvor vi ikke alene vil blive vidne til nye gennembrud inden for ødelæggelsesvåben, men også et kapløb om herredømmet over himlen og regnen, havene og tidevandet, den fjerne side af rummet og menneskets egen ånd, det er spørgsmålet om den nye, fremskudte grænse, det er det valg, som vor nation må træffe, hele menneskeheden afventer vor beslutning, en hel verden ser hen til, hvad vi vil gøre, og vi kan ikke svigte denne tillid, og vi kan ikke undlade at forsøge.« (Bifald)

Den nye, fremskudte grænse er ikke en række løfter, det er en række udfordringer. Det appellerer til vor stolthed, ikke til vor tryghed. Det kræver forestillingsevne og mod og vedholdenhed. Se, hvad menneskeheden er i stand til. Vi er en mægtig, geologisk kraft. Hvordan kan det være, at termonuklear fusion kun er blevet anvendt til at skabe masseødelæggelsesvåben? Hvorfor har vi ikke anvendt den som middel til at drive et bemannet rumfartøj til Mars? Hvorfor er vi aldrig vendt tilbage til Månen? Hvorfor opgav vi Kennedys drømme om den nye, fremskudte grænse? For da briterne myrdede Kennedy-brødrene, underkastede vi os de regler, som oligarkiet fastlagde. I dag står vi på randen af en ny, fremskudt grænse; men for at opnå den må vi tilintetgøre det oligarkiske princip. Det holder os ikke alene tilbage; det truer med at udslette vor art.

Det er nu, vi må vælge enten at gøre videnskabelige fremskridt – eller dø.

Video: Vand for Livet

Animeret infografik

Dansk udskrift

Hvor meget vand er der i den globale vandcyklus?

Af alt det vand, der findes på jorden, er kun 2,5 % ferskvand.

Af dette ferskvand findes 68 % indesluttet i indlandsisen og gletsjerne.

30 % findes som grundvand, og kun 1,2 % er overfladevand.

Hvordan foregår strømmen af dette vand?

Groft regnet fordampes 413.000 km³ af Solen hvert år, hvoraf 373.000 km³ falder direkte tilbage i havet, og kun 40.000 km³ når landjorden, hvor det falder som nedbør. Andre 11.000 km³ fordamper over land og falder igen over land som nedbør; men planteliv gør mere end dette, idet det sender 62.000 km³ tilbage til atmosfæren, hvorfra det atter falder som nedbør over landjorden.

Med andre ord, så når 90 % af vandet, der fordamper over havene, aldrig frem til landjorden; men når det først befinder sig over landjorden, vil vandet fordampe eller transpirere og atter vende tilbage til landjorden som yderligere nedbør. Hvis man alligevel ser på den totale mængde ferskvand, som Solen producerer, så strømmer der 10 gange så meget vand fra havene op i atmosfæren gennem fordampning, end fra alle Jordens floder tilsammen. Dette svarer til 75 Mississippi-floder, der strømmer fra havene op i himlen, uafbrudt hele året. Men kun 8 af disse floder deponerer deres vand over landjorden.

Hvordan kan vi forbedre disse vandcyklusser?

Lad os undersøge tre metoder:

Afsaltning

Vejrmodifikation

Transport af overfladevand

Først: Afsaltning.

Vidste du, at havene udgør kilden til alt dit ferskvand? Omkring 60 mio. gigawatt energi fra Solen når havoverfladen, hvor det afsalter 413.000 km³ ferskvand om året. Dette svarer til en gennemsnitlig effektivitet på 1.300 kWh energi pr. 1 m³ ferskvand, der produceres. Mennesket anvender imidlertid kun 3 kWh til at producere 1 m³ ferskvand, ved at anvende omvendt osmotisk afsaltning, hvilket gør mennesket 430 gange så effektivt som Solen, når det drejer sig om produktion af ferskvand.

Den energi, der kræves for at afsalte vand til de store californiske kystbyer, ville kun udgøre 50 watt pr. person i hele delstaten og ville levere to tredjedele af borgernes aktuelle forbrug og 10 % af hele delstatens samlede forbrug, inklusive landbrug og andre anvendelsesområder.

Hvordan kan afsaltning forøge den globale vandcyklus? (Se grafik).

Den anden fremgangsmåde til forbedring af vandcyklussen: Vejrmodificering

Husk, at 413.000 km³ vand strømmer op i atmosfæren fra havene årligt, svarende til 10 gange de 40.000 km³, der flyder gennem alle verdens floder. Dette udgør en enorm ressource, der

venter på at blive udnyttet. Atmosfæriske ioniseringssystemer er i årtier blevet anvendt med held til at stimulere kondensering af atmosfæriske vanddampe, inklusive nedbør.

En version af atmosfærisk ioniseringsteknologi blev udviklet i Rusland i midten af 1980'erne og bragt til Mexico, hvor kommercielle foretagender fra slutningen af 1990'erne til 2008 resulterede i en forøget nedbørsmængde i hele stater på mellem 5 % og 50 %, genopfyldning af reservoirer og reduktion i antal skovbrande.

I Israel fyldte operationer mellem 2011-2013 således 7 reservoirer til deres fulde kapacitet for første gang i de fyrré år, reservoirerne havde været i brug.

En anden version af atmosfærisk ioniseringsteknologi blev udviklet i Schweiz og blev taget i anvendelse i De forenede arabiske Emirater.

Prøveforsøg med disse systemer i Australien mellem 2007 og 2010 forøgede vedvarende nedbørsmængden med mellem 10 % og 20 %, og et femårigt prøveprogram i Oman, der startede op i 2013, har forøget nedbørsmængden med 18 % i løbet af forsøgets første to år.

Lad os se på, hvordan ionisering kan forøge den globale vandcyklus.(Se grafik).

En tredje måde at forbedre vandcyklussen på: Styring af overfladevand, eksemplificeret af Det Nordamerikanske Vand- og Elektricitetssamarbejde (NAWAPA).

I den vestlige del af Nordamerika er distribueringen af vand vildt ujævnt fordelt, hvilket skaber en stor diskrepans i det vestlige område. Dette ses ved at sammenligne den årlige afstrømning af de nordvestlige floder med den årlige afstrømning af de sydvestlige floder. Det udgør 1.509 km³ for

de nordlige floder mod 113 km³ for de sydlige floder. Det samme kontinent, og den samme kyst. Hvordan kan vi adressere denne store diskrepans i vesten?

NAWAPA XXI-projektet ville være det største vandprojekt i verdenshistorien, som ville omdirigere vand fra den nordvestlige del, hvor det findes i overflod, til den sydvestlige del, hvor der er en desperat mangel. En opdateret version af programmet kunne transportere groft regnet 10 % af afstrømningen i den nordvestlige del, 150 km³ om året, ned gennem den sydvestlige del, før dette vand atter vendte tilbage til havet. Tilføjelsen af denne vandmængde kunne fordoble det sydvestlige områdes fotosyntetiske produktivitet og forøge produktiviteten af hele cyklussen, uden at forandre dens nettovolumen.

Samlet set går afsaltning, vejrmodifikation og transport af overfladevand sammen om at muliggøre en forbedret og udvidet vandcyklus. Ved at integrere disse metoder kan menneskeheden forøge produktiviteten af eksisterende cyklusser, udvide eksisterende cyklusser, samt skabe helt nye vandcyklusser.

Intet af alt dette opbruger begrænsede vandforsyninger, men udgør i stedet en bedre styring af det cykliske system. Lad ikke nogen fortælle dig noget andet:

Vandet findes; lad os udvikle det!

Produceret af LaRouchePAC: Vand til Fremtiden.