

Den kommende mobilisering: Modstå og bekæmp den grønne 'New Deal'

25. januar (EIRNS) – EIR og Schiller Instituttet vil snart begynde at cirkulere en stærk afsløring af de finansielle oligarkers såkaldte "Green Deal"-plan, samt det strategiske modtræk med finansiering af højteknologisk udvikling til at besejre den. Denne rapport bygger på specialrapporten, som vi offentliggjorde i maj sidste år, "LaRouche-planen for genåbning af den amerikanske økonomi: Verden har brug for 1,5 milliarder nye produktive job", der stadig er den eneste fulde skitse for virkelig at vende de forfærdelige økonomiske effekter af COVID-19-pandemien, og forsvare os mod den næste.

EIR's 'Alert Service' har advaret om, at Det verdensøkonomiske Forums fem dages konference, 'Davos Agenda', der startede i dag, involverer en plan – "Great Reset" eller "Green Deal" – udarbejdet af britiske oligarker og bankfolk fra City of London, Wall Street og de største centralbanker om at forbyde "urene" moderne energiteknologier og bruge titusinder af milliarder på "nye", i realiteten primitive energiteknologier. Processen vil reducere den menneskelige befolkning, dens frihed og dens velfærd på måder, der er meget ubehagelige for milliarder af de "andre 99%". Kun inderkredsen omkring de britiske kongelige vil indrømme, at det er deres mål.

Med chok har den sydafrikanske regering måttet erfare, at dens nye kulkraftprojekter annulleres, og at den er under pres for, i indeværende årti, at lukke mange af kulkraftværkerne, der leverer størstedelen af elkraften til hele landet. Verdens største fondsforvaltningsselskab, Wall Streets BlackRock, Inc., har presset Sydkoreas førende energitekniske firma, som bygger de sydafrikanske energi-komplekser, til at opgive dem. Andre projekter i Indonesien og Filippinerne er underlagt

samme trussel. I Kenya forsvinder finansieringen til udvikling af et oliefelt, der var nøglen til en ny jernbane- og havnekorridor, der forbinder den nordlige del af landet med sine naboer. Præsidenten i Ghana kommer under hårdt pres for at droppe planerne om et atomkraftanlæg, der skulle være kernen i hans udviklingsprogram.

I London bekendtgør regeringsinstitutioner arrogant et tilbud på 1 mia. \$ til hele Afrika og Indien som compensation for nedlukning af kul og olie!

I USA er halvdelen af alle kulkraftværkerne i løbet af fem år nedlagt af BlackRocks og Sir Michael Bloombergs kampagne, "Beyond Coal", til trods for præsident Donald Trump.

I Tyskland eller USA indebærer den fortsatte indførelse af en "Green New Deal" enorme priser på elkraft, industrielt kaos, blackouts... Men i Afrika, Indien eller hvilket som helst udviklingsland indebærer det befolkningsreduktion med millioner af unødvendige dødsfald.

Den siddende britiske kongelige malthusianske prins Charles og hans hold af øko-rådgivere og bankvenner i City of London mener, at de nu, efter 30 år med "Earth Summits", Davos-konferencer og Green New Deals, endelig har fået sat et finansielt kvælergreb ind mod menneskeskarerne og de "snavsede" fossile brændstoffer og "farlige" nukleare teknologier, der har gjort det muligt for den menneskelige befolkning at vokse. De jubler over afskedigelsen af præsident Donald Trump, som var den mest magtfulde modstander af deres Green New Deal, og som trak USA ud af den økonomisk dræbende Paris-klimaaftale. Nu mener de, at regeringerne ikke vil modsætte sig dem og storfinanserne, og at "the Green Finance", som de kalder det, vil udsulte disse, de mest produktive energiteknologier, for al kapital til at eksistere. Joe Biden tager Det hvide Hus med sig ind i deres lejr.

Men vi har også gjort det klart, at denne plan kan stoppes. I

høj grad på grund af Kinas indflydelse, modsætter de asiatiske nationer sig; og det gør Putins Rusland også.

World Economic Forum udsendte et strategipapir til deres konference i denne uge, hvori det hævdede, at 30 billioner \$ i kapitalfonde har forpligtet sig til "grøn finansiering"; at forhindre investeringer i fossile brændstoffer eller atomkraft. De vil angiveligt kun investere i miljømæssige, sociale og regeringsmæssige formål – øregas! Men de indrømmede, at kun 0,8% af denne "grønne økonomi" var i Asien!

I virkeligheden fører prinsen og hans oligarker en europæisk krig imod økonomisk fremskridt rettet mod Asien og Afrika. Kinesiske banker finansierer tre fjerdedele af kulkraftprojekterne i alle udviklingslande, og alt imens dets ledere bruger sproget i Paris-klimaaf-talen, planlægger Kina stadig at producere halvdelen af sin elkraft fra kul i 2050 – med meget af den anden halvdel fra kernekraftværker. Indien og Rusland er lige så engagerede i kulkraft, atomkraft og det internationale lynprogram for fusionskraft, som Putin opfordrede til i juli 2018, samt til rumforskning og rumvidenskab.

Vi ved, hvordan denne form for udvikling kan finansieres uden nogen grønne finans- eller centralbankfolk – ved at skabe nationale bankinstitutioner efter Hamiltons principper i hvert land. Som en første opgave skal der opbygges et moderne sundhedsvæsen og et offentligt sundhedssystem i alle lande.

Vi er nødt til at kæmpe med Biden-administrationen for denne industrialiserings- og udviklingspolitik, som den uforlignelige økonom for det amerikanske system, Lyndon LaRouche, udtænkte den. Smid den store nulstilling ud. Afvis Bidens ideer om "Earth Day" -topmøder, fordi det er at spille det britiske oligarkis spil. Vi må kæmpe for en konference til at iværksætte LaRouches "Nye Bretton Woods." EIR's kommende hvidbog vil være det indledende våben i denne kamp.

LaRouche-organisationen er grundlagt

25. december 2020 (EIRNS) –02 LaRouche-bevægelsen i USA har den 23. december dannet en ny organisation kaldet The LaRouche Organization (TLO), LaRouche-organisationen, som fremover er bevægelsens reference i USA sammen med tidsskriftet Executive Intelligence Review. Vi har ikke længere forbindelse med The LaRouche Political Action Committee (LPAC), som har truffet andre politiske valg end vi har. LaRouche-organisationens formål er at løse den globale eksistentielle krise, som menneskeheden i sin helhed står over for, hvilket var Lyndon LaRouches hensigt og livsværk. Hjemmesiden er www.laroucheorganization.com.

Vi opfordrer alle mennesker af god vilje til at gå til den nye hjemmeside i denne tid, tilmelde jer for at modtage vores opdateringer, for at lytte til Harley Schlangers daglige "Morning Briefing", video-opdatering og Helga Zepp-LaRouches ugentlige webcast, og til at bidrage med jeres tid og indsats og jeres kreative evner til at mobilisere for at etablere det nye paradigme, som vi så desperat har behov for i det nye år.

Det internationale Schiller Institut:

Formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche, som repræsenterer Lyndon LaRouches idéer og interventionsmetoder.

Hjemmesiden er her.

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark: Formand Tom Gillesberg

LaRouche-organisationen udgiver et stiftende dokument: 'Hvem vi er'

23. december 2020 (EIRNS) – "The LaRouche Organization" udgav følgende stiftende dokument i dag, som også kan findes på dens hjemmeside, www.LaRoucheOrganization.com

Hvem vi er

Formålet med LaRouche-organisationen (TL0) er alene at udbrede Lyndon LaRouches idéer og udbredelsen af hans livsværk, hans analytiske og videnskabelige tankegang, med intentionen om at realisere de løsninger han tilbød for at løse de mange kriser menneskeheden nu står over for.

Lyndon LaRouche (1922–2019) identificerede som bekendt den skæbnesvangre handling af præsident Richard Nixon den 15. august 1971 for at afslutte Bretton Woods-systemet, ved at erstatte de faste valutakurser med flydende kurser og afkoble dollaren fra en guldstandard, som en fremgangsmåde, der uundgåeligt ville føre til et systemisk sammenbrud af det finansielle system, en ny fascisme og i sidste ende fare for krig. Fra 1973 og fremefter konstaterede han også, at indvirkningen af den monetære politik og dens dertil knyttede nedskæringspolitik i de såkaldte udviklingslande – nemlig ved at sænke adskillige generationers immunsystemer på flere kontinenter – ville forårsage faren for en genopblussen af gamle sygdomme, og at der ville opstå nye, f.eks. pandemier. Den nuværende tilstand af et håbløst bankerot transatlantisk finanssystem (som siden 2008 kun er blevet holdt i gang af enorme mængder af centralbankernes "kvantitative lempelser"), virkeligheden af Covid-19-pandemien, den overhængende fare for nye pandemier, og en hungersnød af "bibelske dimensioner", som truer 270 millioner liv i det kommende år, har vist, at LaRouches prognoser absolut har ramt plet.

TL0 ser det derfor som sin opgave at arbejde hen imod

gennemførelsen af de løsninger, både nationalt og internationalt, som LaRouche var forkæmper for, da han var i live, en mission, som nu er blevet taget op af hans enke og nærmeste politiske medarbejder i et halvt århundrede, Helga Zepp-LaRouche. USA må gå tilbage til det amerikanske system for økonomi, som blev udviklet af USA's første finansminister, Alexander Hamilton, ved at fremme den fysiske økonomi til gavn for det fælles bedste. Det var denne tradition, fortsat af Henry Clay, Friedrich List, Mathew og Henry C. Carey og genoplivet af Franklin D. Roosevelt og hans New Deal-politik, som gjorde det muligt for USA at overvinde den Store Depression.

TLO vil eftertrykkeligt fremme den idé, som LaRouche viede hele sit liv til, nemlig at USA, sammen med andre industrilande, vil agere for at overvinde underudvikling og fattigdom i den såkaldte udviklingssektor ved hjælp af avancerede teknologier. Denne økonomiske politik er i overensstemmelse med Franklin Roosevelts oprindelige hensigt med Bretton Woods-systemet om at øge levestandarden for alle mennesker på planeten, som den eneste levedygtige forudsætning for varig fred – en politik der aldrig blev realiseret på grund af Roosevelts alt for tidlige død.

I denne ånd siger vi: Det nye navn for fred er udvikling!

Mange amerikanere har på det seneste taget afstand fra dette centrale grundprincip i LaRouches livsanskuelse og metode, og afvist sådanne internationale spørgsmål indtil "efter den vigtigere kamp internt i USA er vundet". Men denne kamp, herunder den rasende kamp om forsvaret af den amerikanske forfatning og præsidentskabet, kan aldrig vindes på anden måde, end den der er foreskrevet af LaRouche: Ved en international kamp for at besejre en international fjende, hvor USA spiller en ledende rolle baseret på "the better angels of our nature" ("de bedre sider af vores natur" – citat fra Abraham Lincolns første indsættelsestale i 1861 –red.)

Dette er hvem vi er.

USA må deltage i skabelsen af et nyt paradigme for internationale forhold, der er baseret på alle nationers perfekte suverænitet, og princippet om at acceptere forskelligheder i sociale systemer, som arbejder sammen om at skabe det fælles bedste for hele menneskeheden. En præcedens for denne tilgang til udenrigspolitik er John Quincy Adams' (USA's udenrigsminister 1817–1825 og 6. præsident 1825–1829) princip: "Men USA drager ikke udenlands, på jagt efter at tilintetgøre monstre". USA bør dog søge partnerskab med andre stormagter, såsom Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre for at overvinde faren for imperier af alle slags, i dag centreret omkring det britiske imperium.

De problemer, der er så store i dag kan kun løses gennem et tæt samarbejde mellem især de to største økonomier i verden, nemlig Kina og USA. Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ er fortsat et åbent tilbud om at samarbejde med alle nationer, som USA straks burde acceptere.

I denne bestræbelse på at sigte USA's udenrigspolitik på at bidrage til skabelsen af en ny, smukkere æra for menneskeheden, er TLO fuldstændig inspireret af LaRouches intellektuelle arbejde i løbet af de sidste halvtreds år af sit liv, samt hans vision om Jordens næste halvtreds år, der forudser fremtiden for den menneskelige art, ikke ud fra sin nuværende kapacitet, men ud fra fremtidens potentiale, som omfatter frigørelsen af det kreative potentiale for hver enkelt person på planeten. Dette må indebære den bedst mulige udvikling af nationer i Afrika, Asien og Latinamerika, samt de dele af USA og Europa, som endnu ikke har været i stand til at realisere deres potentiale gennem industrialisering og udvikling af moderne landbrug. Dette kræver samarbejde mellem alle større industrinationer, baseret på en genoplivning af de bedste klassiske kulturelle traditioner i hver nation. Lyndon LaRouche holdt stejlt på, at det vil være skønheden i den klassiske musik, som Ludwig van Beethovens, og det ophøjede

menneskesyn af de store digtere som William Shakespeare og Friedrich Schiller, der vil få menneskeheden ud af denne nuværende dybe civilisationskrise.

De principper, som LaRouche fremlagde i sit "Udkast til et aftale-memorandum mellem USA og Sovjetunionen" (https://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/1991/eirv18n02-19910111/eirv18n02-19910111_026-the_larouche_doctrine_draft_memo-lar.pdf) i 1984, som en platform for samarbejde om den fælles gennemførelse af Det strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI), er stadig gyldige i dag. Han siger i afsnit 1 af dette dokument med underoverskriften, "Generelle betingelser for fred":

"Det politiske grundlag for varig fred skal være: a) Den ubetingede suverænitet for hver eneste nationalstat og b) samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater om at fremme ubegrænsede muligheder for at deltage i fordelene ved teknologiske fremskridt til gensidig fordel for hver eneste nation.

"Det vigtigste træk ved den nuværende gennemførelse af en sådan politik for varig fred er en gennemgribende ændring i de monetære, økonomiske og politiske forbindelser mellem de dominerende magter og de relativt underordnede nationer, der ofte klassificeres som "udviklingslande". Medmindre ulighederne i kølvandet på den moderne kolonialisme gradvist afhjælpes, kan der ikke være nogen varig fred på denne planet.

For så vidt som USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og andre nationer anerkender udviklingen af de produktive arbejds kræfter i hele verden til at være af vital strategisk interesse for hver og alle, er disse magter – og andre der vil slutte sig til dem – forpligtede i denne grad og på denne måde af en fælles interesse. Dette er kernen i den politiske og økonomiske politik i praksis, der er nødvendig for at fremme varig fred blandt disse magter.

Forøgelsen af de produktive arbejds kræfter kræver relativt

høje investeringer i teknologisk progressive former for kapitalgoder (maskiner, produktionsmidler) i alle produktionsområder. Der er tre generelle kategorier af videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt, som menneskeheden må sætte sin lid til i den kommende periode:

1. Meget høj energigennemstrømningstæthed, kontrollerede termionukleare plasmaer, karakteriseret ved udvikling af "kommerciel" fusionsenergiproduktion, den nye, vigtigste energikilde for menneskeheden, både på Jorden og i udforskning og kolonisering af det nærliggende rum,
2. Det internationale samarbejde om udforskning af rummet og kolonisering blandt de nuværende rumfarende nationer, samt inddragelse af andre nationer der ønsker at deltage i at opdage hemmelighederne i vores univers samt terraformning (at omdanne til jordlignende forhold) af Månen, Mars, og andre planeter i fremtiden, og
3. Forskning og anvendelse af biofysik og undersøgelse af princippet om livet som sådan.

Covid-19-pandemien og de allerede truende nye pandemier har gjort det klart, at der ikke er nogen lokal eller regional sikkerhed mod sygdomme: Hver nation skal have et moderne sundhedsvæsen. Ved at deltage i oprettelsen af sådanne systemer, herunder den nødvendige infrastruktur, kan USA begynde at levere stigende mængder af højteknologiske kapitalgoder til udviklingslandene og på denne måde fremme en øget omsætning i vores egne mest avancerede produktive sektorer.

Bortset fra spørgsmålet om den fortjeneste, der tilfalder USA fra en sådan eksport, som et biprodukt af sådanne øgede omsætningsrater, hastigheden for forbedring af teknologien vil øges på en sådan kvalitativ måde, at den amerikanske økonomi vil blive fuldstændig genopbygget. Alle ovennævnte kategorier vil i realiteten betale for sig selv, da den kredit, der ydes

ved at vende tilbage til et kreditsystem baseret på Alexander Hamiltons principper, vil finansiere den fremtidige produktion, hvilket vil øge produktiviteten i hele økonomien med fuld beskæftigelse. Det er kendetegnende for det amerikanske økonomiske system, at skatteindtægterne fra denne øgede produktion altid er større end den oprindelige kredit, der blev ydet til investeringen på grund af den tilføjede fysiske økonomiske og teknologiske værdi, der således er skabt.

Alt dette kræver en øjeblikkelig konkursbehandling af det transatlantiske finansielle system, med dets spekulative boble på næsten 2 trillioner \$, som City of London og Wall Street forsøger at bevare og forsvare, selv på bekostning af milliarder af menneskeliv. (Se Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love).

USA vil kun have en lys fremtid, når vi vender tilbage til at opretholde principperne i den amerikanske Uafhængighedserklæring og forfatning. Karakteren af USA må være som en republik, ikke en underordnet partner i samme imperium, som vi kæmpede og vandt Uafhængighedskrigen imod. Det er på høje tid, at USA vender tilbage til at være en kraft for det gode i verden, og igen bliver et fyrtårn af håb og et tempel for frihed. Ved at samle os omkring Lyndon LaRouches idéer, vil denne stolte tradition opleve en renæssance, som vil inspirere hele verden til at deltage i en virkelig menneskelig fremtidig civilisation.

december 2020

Beethoven 250 år og

menneskehedens æstetiske opdragelse

Afskrift af en tale Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand for Schiller Institut i Danmark, holdt ved Schiller Institut i Danmarks videokonference: Verden efter valget i USA, den 8. december 2020

Se hele konferencen her.

Vi har en civilisationskrise: en konfrontationspolitik, som kan føre til krig med Rusland og Kina, en COVID-19-pandemi, økonomiske og finansielle kriser og en voksende sultkatastofe i Afrika.

Vil vi etablere en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden eller vil det ende i kaos og krig?

Det er en kamp mellem helt forskellige menneskesyn.

LaRouche understregede altid: hvad er forskellen mellem mennesker og dyr?

Er vi dyriske?

Eller har vi en iboende kreativ erkendelsesevne, som gør os i stand til at opdage nye principper – noget nyt, som ingen andre har tænkt på.

I videnskab opdager vi nye naturvidenskabelige principper.

I kunst opdager vi nyt om vores egne kreative evner, som kan deles med andre, som i et orkester eller kor eller med tilhørerne.

Skønhed, som Schiller sagde, forædle vores følelser og vores intellekt –

ikke kun rå følelser som dominerer os uden intellekt, ikke kun intellekt uden medfølelse og næstekærlighed.

Men gennem at lege, speciel gennem kunst, at spille, kan de to gå op i en højere enhed, som vi kalder en æstetisk tilstand, når vi er omfavnet af skønhed.

Det var Schillers løsning efter den franske revolution, som ikke endte som den amerikanske, men i et blodbad.

Platon skrev, at den vigtigste uddannelse for sjælen var musik – at fylde sjælen med skønhed og gøre den skøn.

Mennesket ville så lovprise skønhed, modtage den med glæde i sin sjæl, og blive til en skøn sjæl.

Den 16. december fejrer vi Beethoven 250-års fødselsdag.

Vi fejrer ham, som en af de mest kreative sjæle i historien, men vi fejrer også menneskehedens erkendelsesmæssige evner.

Studér Beethoven for bedre at forstå, hvad vi mennesker er.

Beethoven, selv da han ikke var i stand til at høre sin egne musik, hørte den alligevel i sit sind, og udfordrede sig selv til at lave det ene gennembrud efter det anden.

Der var ingen stilstand eller entropi, men hvad LaRouche kalder ikke-entropi.

At viljemæssigt blive mere og mere bevist om, at kende sine egne erkendelsesmæssige evner, og presse dem til det yderste for at kunne stige op til det næste niveau, og som han skrev, at nærme sig Guds egen skaberkraft.

Og han havde et formål: at opløfte den trængende menneskehed.

Han var bevidst om musikkens rolle med at forædle menneskene.

Gennem at spille, synge eller lytte, kan Beethovens kreativitet deles med andre –

nodeerne på papiret, er ikke kun toner, men nøglen til Beethovens kreative sind.

Og dermed kan andre mennesker bekræfte et positivt menneskesyn, som også havde en politisk dimension for Beethoven – stræben efter frihed.

Som Schiller sagde, vejen til frihed går gennem skønhed.

For at fejre Beethoven så lyt til eller syng og spil hans værker. Genoplev hans åndelige gennembrud, bekræft den

menneskelig kreativitet, skab et samfund, hvor vi kan genopdage den tabte kunst at skabe skøn musik, måske endnu mere kreativ end Beethoven, og udvikle vores erkendelsesmæssige evner, for hele menneskehedens skyld.

Så blev der spillet den første del af 2. sats af Beethovens 7. symfoni, dirigeret af Wilhelm Furtwängler, som eksempel. Ud fra en enkel begyndelse tilføjes flere og flere stemmer for at skabe noget stort og opløftende.

Se også Deadlines indslag om Beethoven 250 år den 7. december 2020 14,

Klik her og så 14:46 minutter inde i programmet

International undersøgelseskommission for sandfærdighed i forbindelse med valg

Schiller Instituttet har indkaldt en "International undersøgelseskommission for sandfærdighed i forbindelse med valg", som mødes lørdag den 28. november 2020 fra kl. 18 – 21 (dansk tid). Et panel med fremtrædende internationale jurister vil høre rapporter fra kvalificerede amerikanere forbundet til den igangværende valgproces i USA, hvilken er genstand for stor international opmærksomhed og bekymring. Dette er ikke et partipolitisk problem. Nogle af deltagerne er efter deres egne politiske synspunkter pro-Trump; nogle er anti-Trump. Men hvad der bringer dem sammen er et langt større emne: En bekymring

over den universelle betydning af sandfærdighed i forbindelse med valg og behovet for at holde USA på samme høje standard som dens egen forfatning kræver.

Rapporterne vil dække både uregelmæssigheder i denne valgproces samt cyber-funktioner, der vides at eksistere, og som er blevet brugt i fremmede lande i de senere år, og som muligvis er blevet brugt i USA for første gang i 2020. Rapporterne vil blive leveret af blandt andre:

1) William Binney, tidligere teknisk direktør i USA's Nationale Sikkerhedsagentur.

2) Oberst Richard H. Black (fhv.), erhvervsadvokat og tidligere formand for kriminalretten i det amerikanske forsvarsministerium, Pentagon.

3) Advokater involveret i efterforskningen af stemmesvindler i Michigan, Pennsylvania og andre stater (ubekræftede).

En international kommission af jurister vil høre rapporterne og tage stilling til de fremlagte beviser. Panelet kan også vælge at udpege en referent og efterfølgende udsende en rapport om deres resultater. Paneldeltagerne inkluderer:

1) Marino Elsevyf (Den dominikanske Republik): advokat; medlem af 1995 Luther King International Tribunal (med Ramsey Clark, Amelia Boynton Robinson og andre).

2) Simón Levy (Mexico): Doktor i retsvidenskab fra National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM); tidligere viceminister for turisme i Mexico; post-doktorand i kunstig intelligens, UC Berkeley.

3) David Meiswinkle (USA): Advokat med over 10 års erfaring i sager om stemmesvindler i staten New Jersey; præsident /administrerende direktør for advokatudvalget for undersøgelse af 11. september.

4) Juan Francisco Soto (Argentina): Forfatningsadvokat;

juridisk rådgiver for Yacyretá Binational Entity (paraguayansk-argentinsk Yacyretá Dam).

Udvalgte medier vil blive opfordret til at deltage, som afholdes over Zoom med simultantolkning til spansk og andre sprog. Arrangementet streames også live over Schiller Instituttets YouTube-kanal.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche webcast: Stop den amerikanske valgsvindel for at besejre det grønne, globale bankdiktatur

Mens kampen for at stoppe valgsvindlen, der er udformet til at gøre krigshøgen Joe Biden til præsident, går ind i den tredje uge, kommer City of Londons rolle atter ind i billedet. I sit resumé, der blev præsenteret i hendes ugentlige dialog om kampen for at vende bedrageriet, afslører Helga Zepp LaRouche Lord Malloch-Brown – bestyrelsesformanden for firmaet Smartmatic der fremstiller afstemningsmaskiner – som en vigtig britisk operatør, med bånd til regimeskifte-fanatiker George Soros, der har været en førende bagmand i den beskidte kampagne mod Trump. Smartmatic er blevet identificeret af Trumps advokat Sidney Powell som genstand for hendes efterforskning af, hvordan bedrageriet blev kørt mod præsident Trump; firmaet er blevet afvist af flere nationer, på grundlag af hvor let det kan programmeres til et bestemt udfald af et valg.

Hun roste NSA-whistleblowerne Bill Binney og Kirk Wiebe som "absolutte helte" i deres mangeårige forsvar af personlig frihed mod overvågningsstaten og ukrænkeligheden af retfærdige lovlige valg, og støttede opfordringen til Trump om at tilbyde benådninger og frit lejde i USA til Edward Snowden og Julian Assange for at hjælpe med at udrense overvågningsstaten og dens aktiver indenfor 'Big Tech'.

Hun dissekerede også City of Londons rolle bag bestræbelserne på at etablere et globalt fascistisk bankdiktatur, der giver bankfolk kontrollen over regeringers finanspolitik, og hvordan disse bankfolk har til hensigt at bruge denne magt til at vedtage en dødbringende international miljøpolitik, 'Green New Deal'. Hun opfordrede seerne til at registrere sig til Schiller Instituttets onlinekonference den 12.-13. december, som vil præsentere en oversigt over, hvad der er nødvendigt for at trække verden tilbage fra en geopolitisk, neoliberal march imod krig og depression, og etablere et nyt paradigme for fredeligt samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater.

Dansk videokonference søndag den 8. november: Verden efter valget i USA

Talere:

Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:
Kan Trump og den amerikanske befolkning forsvare Trumps valgsejr imod valgsvindlen? (på dansk)

Gæstetaler: Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, bestyrelsesmedlem, Bælte- og Vejinitiativ

Institut i Sverige (brixsweden.org):

Nu skal USA og Europa tilslutte sig Kinas nye Silkevej, og mobilisere fødevarerressourcer til bekæmpelse af sult i Afrika.
(på engelsk)

Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:

Beethoven 250 år. (på dansk)

Lyd:

Hussein Askarys præsentation som skærskilt video:

Hussein Askary's presentation as a separate video in English:

Kan Trump og den amerikanske befolkning forsvare Trumps valgsejr imod valgsvindlen?

Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Resumé

USA: Valgsvindel med stemmerne i svingstaterne for at få Joe Biden valgt som USA's præsident er en del af den farvede revolution i USA for at få et regimeskifte og få afsat Donald Trump.

Dette regimeskifte har været fokus for efterretningstjenesterne og deres partnere i medierne siden Trump vandt præsidentvalget i 2016. Først med beskyldningerne om tråde til Rusland (Steel-rapporten fra britiske efterretningstjeneste, der kom med falske beskyldninger), så løggen om Russigate, der er blevet modbevist, rigsretssagen og 4 års angreb fra medierne.

Mediernes erklæring af, at Biden har vundet valget og NATO-landes lykønskning af Biden, er et forsøg på at etablere et fait accompli og forhindre at valgsvindlen

bliver afsløret.

Trump forsøger at få valgene i delstaterne undersøgt så valgsvindlen kan blive afdækket og retfærdigheden ske fyldest. Mobilisering af vælgerne for at forsvare demokratiet og beskytte Trumps valgsejr.

Massiv censur i medierne og på sociale medier for at forhindre præsident Trump i at tale til befolkningen.

Trump fik over 7 millioner flere stemmer end i 2016 selvom ikke alle stemmerne på ham er blevet tilskrevet ham.

Konkrete historier om valgsvindelen begynder at komme frem.

Tidligere NSA teknikker beskriver hvorledes programmet "Scorecard" kan bruges til at ændre stemme rapporterne fra valgstederne.

Vil USA's befolkning lykkes med at forsvare den demokratiske proces og Trumps valgsejr?

Hvis kuppet lykkes vil demokraterne forsøge at vinde de to sidste senatspladser i Georgia så Bidens kontrollører også kan kontrollere Senatet, udvide Højesteret og få magten der.

Hvis Biden bliver præsident er der konfrontation med Rusland og Kina på dagsorden. Vil vi få krig? Atomkrig?

Oveni COVID-19 krisen i USA og dens økonomiske effekter venter en nedsmeltning af finanssystemet. Med en grøn New Deal vil utilfredsheden i befolkningen blive enorm. Hvad følger efter den censur imod dissidenter, der allerede er i gang?

Topmøde i Davos 9.-11. november med blandt andet Mark Carney, den nye chef for Bank of England Andrew Bailey,

Blackrocks Fink, IMF, ECB, Bill Gates etc. om at gennemtvinge kredittørke imod alle investeringer, der ikke er "grønne". Digitale valutaer så centralbankerne får den fulde økonomiske magt.

Der er en verden uden for Vestens og NATO's kontrol. Kina og Rusland er ikke kuede.

COVID-19 var et lille bump på vejen for Kina. Man har igen vækst og Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet og international økonomisk opbygning fortsætter.

Vesten kan ikke stoppe Kina. Vil man forsøge krig? En atomkrig kan ikke vindes, men vil gale hoveder i Vesten forsøge alligevel?

Vil vi i stedet få en "Sputnik-effekt", hvor Vesten må skifte kurs tilbage til økonomisk, videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt for at kunne konkurrere med Kina og alle de, der vil samarbejde med Kina? Eller vil Vesten blive irrelevant?

De, der satser på økonomisk vækst drevet af menneskelig kreativitet og videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt vinder i det lange løb.

Vi lever i farlige tider men står også potentielt over for det største spring fremad i menneskehedens historie.

Lyt til hele talen her.

Nu skal USA og Europa tilslutte sig Kinas nye Silkevej, og mobilisere fødevarerressourcer til bekæmpelse af sult i Afrika.

Gæstetaler: Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien, bestyrelsesmedlem, Bælte- og Vejinitiativ Institut i Sverige (brixsweden.org):

Hussein Askary præsenterede den akutte voksende sultekatastrofe i Afrika og hvordan den kan løses. Dels gennem en nødaktion for at fragte fødevarer fra USA, Europa, Rusland og Kina, men også gennem at opbygge Afrikas egne fødevareproduktion og skabe økonomisk udvikling, især infrastrukturprojekter og industrialisering i samarbejde med Kinas Bælte- og Vej-Initiativ.

Hussein Askary præsenterede Afrikas egne udviklingsplaner, Kinas rolle i at virkeliggøre dem, og hvorfor USA og Europe skal deltage.

Hussein Askary brugte en Powerpoint præsentation til illustration under talen, som også findes, som en særskilt video på engelsk her.

Beethoven 250 år og menneskehedens æstetiske opdragelse

Michelle Rasmussen, næstformand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark

Vi har en civilisationskrise: en konfrontationspolitik, som kan føre til krig med Rusland og Kina, en COVID-19-pandemi, økonomiske og finansielle kriser og en voksende sulstkatastrofe i Afrika.

Vil vi etablere en ny retfærdig økonomisk verdensorden eller vil det ende i kaos og krig?

Det er en kamp mellem helt forskellige menneskesyn.

LaRouche understregede altid: hvad er forskellen mellem mennesker og dyr?

Er vi dyriske?

Eller har vi en iboende kreativ erkendelsesevne, som gør os i stand til at opdage nye principper – noget nyt, som ingen andre har tænkt på.

I videnskab opdager vi nye naturvidenskabelige

principper.

I kunst opdager vi nyt om vores egne kreative evner, som kan deles med andre, som i et orkester eller kor eller med tilhørerne.

Skønhed, som Schiller sagde, forædle vores følelser og vores intellekt –

ikke kun rå følelser som dominerer os uden intellekt, ikke kun intellekt uden medfølelse og næstekærlighed.

Men gennem at lege, speciel gennem kunst, at spille, kan de to gå op i en højere enhed, som vi kalder en æstetisk tilstand, når vi er omfavnet af skønhed.

Det var Schillers løsning efter den franske revolution, som ikke endte som den amerikanske, men i et blodbad.

Platon skrev, at den vigtigste uddannelse for sjælen var musik – at fylde sjælen med skønhed og gøre den skøn.

Mennesket ville så lovprise skønhed, modtage den med glæde i sin sjæl, og blive til en skøn sjæl.

Den 16. december fejrer vi Beethoven 250-års fødselsdag. Vi fejrer ham, som en af de mest kreative sjæle i historien, men vi fejrer også menneskehedens erkendelsesmæssige evner.

Studér Beethoven for bedre at forstå, hvad vi mennesker er.

Beethoven, selv da han ikke var i stand til at høre sin egne musik, hørte den alligevel i sit sind, og udfordrede sig selv til at lave det ene gennembrud efter det anden.

Der var ingen stilstand eller entropi, men hvad LaRouche kalder ikke-entropi.

At viljemæssigt blive mere og mere bevist om, at kende

sine egne erkendelsesmæssige evner, og presse dem til det yderste for at kunne stige op til det næste niveau, og som han skrev, at nærme sig Guds egen skaberkraft.

Og han havde et formål: at opløfte den trængende menneskehed.

Han var bevidst om musikkens rolle med at forædle menneskene.

Gennem at spille, synge eller lytte, kan Beethovens kreativitet deles med andre –
noderne på papiret, er ikke kun toner, men nøglen til Beethovens kreative sind.

Og dermed kan andre mennesker bekræfte et positivt menneskesyn, som også havde en politisk dimension for Beethoven – stræben efter frihed.

Som Schiller sagde, vejen til frihed går gennem skønhed.

For at fejre Beethoven så lyt til eller syng og spil hans værker. Genoplev hans åndelige gennembrud, bekræft den menneskelig kreativitet, skab et samfund, hvor vi kan genopdage den tabte kunst at skabe skøn musik, måske endnu mere kreativ end Beethoven, og udvikle vores erkendelsesmæssige evner, for hele menneskehedens skyld.

Så blev der spillet den første del af 2. sats af Beethovens 7. symfoni, dirigeret af Wilhelm Furtwängler, som eksempel.

Ud fra en enkel begyndelse tilføjes flere og flere stemmer for at skabe noget stort og opløftende.

**Schiller Instituttets
internationale
videokonference den 5.-6.
september 2020:
Krigsmagernes dommedagskurs,
eller et nyt paradigme blandt
suveræne nationer
forenet gennem menneskehedens
fælles mål?
PANEL I video og engelsk
afskrift (d. 5. sept.):
At overvinde geopolitik:
Hvorfor et P-5-topmøde er
presserende nødvendigt nu.
Også paneler II-IV.**



Panel I: Se det engelske afskrift nedenunder. Her er

talerlisten:

1. Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Tyskland), grundlægger og præsident, Schiller Instituttet
2. Andrey Kortunov (Rusland), generaldirektør for Det russiske råd for internationale Anliggender
3. Dr. Edward Lozansky (US), American University i Moskva; Moskow State University
4. Martin Sieff (USA), senior korrespondent for udenrigsanliggender, UPI; Senior Fellow, American University i Moskva
5. James Jatras (USA), tidligere rådgiver, det amerikanske senats republikanske lederskab
6. Spørgsmål og svar, del 1
7. Marco Zanni (Italien), formand, Europa-Parlamentets gruppe for identitet og demokrati
8. Oberst Richard H. Black (USA ret.), Tidligere leder af hærens strafferetlige afdeling i Pentagon; tidligere statssenator, Virginia
9. William Binney (USA), tidligere teknisk direktør, National Security Agency og Kirk Wiebe, tidligere Senior Analyst, National Security Agency
10. Spørgsmål og svar, del 2

Hele konferencen:

Dato: Lørdag og søndag den 5.-6. september 2020

Tid: kl. 16 – 24 dansk tid, eller fra arkivet bagefter.

Sted: Hvis du tilmelde dig ^{her}, får du et link sendt direkte til din e-mail.

Ellers vil vi lægge YouTubes live stream på vores danske hjemmesides forside.

Paneler: Talerlisten findes nedenunder

PANEL II (Lørdag 21:00 – 24:00 dansk tid)

Videnskabens rolle i skabelsen af menneskehedens fremtid:

PANEL III (Søndag 16:00 – 20:00 dansk tid):

Bælte- og Vejinitiativet bliver til Verdenslandbroen & Franklin D. Roosevelts uafsluttede projekt:

PANEL IV (Søndag 21:00 – 24:00 dansk tid):

Opbygning af tillid i internationale relationer: Klassisk kulturs rolle og bekæmpelse af global hungersnød:

Tilmelding: Klik her for at tilmelde dig og modtage talerlisten og opdateringer

Ellers kan den ses
her: www.schillerinstitut.dk eller www.schillerinstitute.com

Kontakt: for mere information: Michelle Rasmussen +45 53 57 00 51, si@schillerinstitut.dk

Foreløbigt konferenceprogram:

Arrangementet udsendes live på Zoom og YouTube. Der vil være

simultantolkning på spansk, fransk og tysk på Zoom-plattformen.

(Det følgende er en delvis liste over talerne. Hvert panel indeholder rigelig tid til spørgsmål og svar.)

PANEL II (21:00 – 24:00): Videnskabens rolle i skabelsen af menneskehedens fremtid

1. Jason Ross (USA), videnskabsrådgiver ved Schiller Instituttet

2. Dr. Bernard Bigot (Frankrig), generaldirektør for den internationale termionukleare eksperimentelle reaktor (ITER), tidligere direktør for den franske kommission for alternativ energi og atomenergi (CEA)

3. Sergey Pulinets (Rusland), Principal Research Scientist, Space Research Institute, Det Russiske Videnskabsakademi

4. Dr. Stephen O. Dean (USA), præsident, Fusion Power Associates (10)

5. Michael Paluszek (USA), Princeton Satellite Systems

6. Philip Tsokolibane (South Africa), head of LaRouche South Africa

7. Dr. Kelvin Kemm (South Africa), CEO, Stratek Business Strategy Consultants, former board chairman, South African Nuclear Energy Corporation

6. Spørgsmål og svar

PANEL III (16:00 – 20:00): Bælte- og Vejinitiativet bliver til Verdenslandbroen; Franklin D.

Roosevelts uafsluttede projekt

1. Dennis Small (USA), latin-amerikansk redaktør, EIR

2. Dr. Natalia Vitrenko (Ukraine), præsident for Progressive Socialist Party, tidligere parlamentsmedlem og

præsidentkandidat

3. Michele Geraci (Italien), tidligere minister for økonomisk udvikling

4. Hassan Daud Butt (Pakistan), tidligere projektdirektør, CPEC; Administrerende direktør for Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Provincial Board of Investment & Trade

5. Marcelo Muñoz (Spanien), grundlægger og præsident emeritus for Cátedra China, dekan for spanske forretningsmænd i Kina

6. Dr. Björn Peters (Tyskland), fysiker, iværksætter og politisk rådgiver inden for energi, bæredygtighed og råvarer

7. Spørgsmål og svar, del 1

8. Dr. Joycelyn Elders (USA), tidligere chef for USA's sundhedsvæsen m.m.

9. Marlette Kyssama-Nsona (Republikken Congo), farmaceutisk kemiker, politisk leder af Panafrican League UM0JA og specialist i folkesundhedsspørgsmål

10. Spørgsmål og svar, del 2

PANEL IV 21:00 – 24:00): Opbygning af tillid i internationale relationer: Klassisk kulturs rolle og bekæmpelse af global hungersnød

1. Jacques Cheminade (Frankrig), leder af Solidarite & Progres, tidligere præsidentkandidat

2. Marcia Merry Baker (USA), EIR-redaktionen

3. Bob Baker og amerikanske landbrugsledere:

Ron Wieczorek, South Dakota cattle rancher, LaRouchePAC

Nicole Pfrang, Kansas Cattlemen's Association Secretary-Treasurer, cattle rancher

Mike Callicrate, Colorado, cattle rancher, Owner, Ranch Foods Direct:

4. Paul Gallagher (U.S.), EIR Editorial Board
5. Fred Haight (Canada), Schiller Instituttet
6. Michael Billington (US), chef for asiatiske anliggender, Executive Intelligence Review
7. Spørgsmål og svar
8. Beethoven-messe i C-dur, opførelse af Schiller Instituttets kor i New york City.

Mange mennesker rundt om i verden, som er uvidende om, at en løsning til de mangfoldige kriser i den nuværende verden potentielt eksisterer, reagerer med stadigt større fortvivlelse og radikalisering på den ene eller anden måde, eller trækker sig tilbage til deres privatsfære. Mistilliden til regeringer og førende institutioner i størstedelen af verden har aldrig før været så stor. På et og samme tidspunkt er vi konfronteret med en pandemi, der er ude af kontrol, et økonomisk sammenbrud udløst, men ikke forårsaget, af pandemien, et kommende kollaps af det transatlantiske finanssystem og den stigende fare, ikke blot for en ny kold krig, men for at det utænkelige rent faktisk kunne ske, og en tredje, denne gang atomar, verdenskrig kunne bryde ud. Vi er i sandhed konfronteret med et systemisk sammenbrud – enden på en epoke.

Det bliver nu stadigt tydeligere for mange kredse rundt om i verden, at Lyndon LaRouches advarsel i 1971 var absolut profetisk: at Richard Nixons ophævelse af Bretton Woods-systemet, ved at erstatte de faste valutakurser med et internationalt system for flydende valutakurser, og åbningen af vejen til monetarisme, ville føre til faren for en ny fascisme, depression, pandemier og krig. Det er også klart, at hvis vores verden skal undslippe disse meget reelle farer, så

må vi implementere en presserende reorganisation af verdens finansielle og økonomiske system i den fysisk-økonomiske tradition fra Leibniz og Hamilton, som LaRouche har været fortalere for i årtier.

Lyndon LaRouche har i lang tid opfordret til en firemagts-aftale mellem USA, Kina, Rusland og Indien, som det bedste udgangspunkt for at påbegynde et sådant nyt paradigme. I dag er den eneste synlige struktur, som, realistisk set, hurtigt kan føre i denne retning, en konference blandt de fem permanente medlemmer af FN's sikkerhedsråd, som foreslået af Præsident Putin i januar. De fem atommagter har et særligt ansvar for at blive enige om principper, som kan garantere menneskehedens overlevelse på lang sigt. Dette er særligt presserende i lyset af det faktum, at vores verden, med ophævelsen af så mange internationale traktater om våbenkontrol og andet, er faretruende tæt på at styrte ind i lovløshedens æra.

Men disse fem nationer må understøttes af et kor af andre nationer, individer og institutioner fra hele verden, som må kræve, at de trækker verden tilbage fra afgrundens rand. Dette topmøde må tilskyndes til at adoptere følgende:

- En mekanisme til at løse alle internationale problemer gennem dialog og diplomati.
- Et Nyt Bretton Woods-system – i overensstemmelse med Franklin D. Roosevelts intention og uddybet af Lyndon LaRouche – med det eksplicitte formål, at overvinde fattigdom og underudviklingen af de såkaldte udviklingslande, og som må begynde med skabelsen af et moderne sundhedssystem i alle lande.
- En aftale om at gøre programmet »Den Nye Silkevej bliver til Verdenslandbroen« til grundlaget for sikringen af de mest moderne standarder i infrastruktur og industriel udvikling for alle lande på kloden.

– En ny sikkerhedsarkitektur baseret på verdenssamfundets fælles økonomiske interesser, hvilket indebærer sikkerhedsinteresserne for hver enkelt nation. De farvede revolutioner og destabiliseringer, som i øjeblikket orkestreres af det Britiske Imperium og dets bankerotte finansinteresser, mod regeringer, som de ikke kan lide, må have en ende – dette inkluderer blandt andet destabiliseringen af Donald Trumps, Xi Jinpings og Vladimir Putins regeringer.

– Et internationalt samarbejde i et forceret program for at bemestre fusionsenergi, et internationalt samarbejde indenfor rumfart for at bygge en by på såvel Månen som Mars, og et videnskabeligt samarbejde om forståelsen af liv.

– En aftale for at påbegynde en sand kulturel dialog, hvor hver kultur og civilisation forpligter sig til at lære om de bedste traditioner og universelle bidrag af andre, som grundlaget for fred og forståelse, og en ny verdensomspændende renæssance.

Der er præcedens for sådan en tilgang. Efter 150 år af religiøs krigsførelse i Europa, hvilket kulminerede i Trediveårskrigen, blev alle grupper, der tidligere havde bekriget hinanden, enige om vedtagelsen af Den Westfalske Fred. De indså, at hvis kampene fortsatte, så ville der ingen være nogen tilbage, som kunne nyde sejren. Den aftale etablerede det moderne grundlag for alle internationale love blandt nationer. Det er nu på tide, at basere international lovgivning på den lovmæssighed der findes i det fysiske univers. Det er det eneste sprog, som har evnen til at eliminere enhver misforståelse og tilsyneladende interessekonflikter på et lavere niveau.

Schiller Instituttets kommende konference vil stræbe efter at bidrage med idéer hen imod dette mål.

Tilmelding: Klik her for at tilmelde dig og modtage talerlisten og opdateringer

**Ellers kan den ses
her: www.schillerinstitut.dk eller www.schillerinstitute.com**

Systemets korruption er det problem, som vi alle konfronteres med Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche d. 29 juli 2020

I sine afsluttende bemærkninger i dagens dialog fremhævede Helga Zepp-LaRouche korruptionen i hele systemet, som ansvarlig for den civilisations krise vi står overfor. Hun henviste til sin bemærkning for flere år siden, på tidspunktet af Madoff boblen, om at hele systemet er et ponzi-spil med ingen interesse for det almene vel, men kun forøgelsen af den private profit.

Hvad enten man betragter den hurtige forringelse af amerikansk-kinesiske forhold, den forværende trussel fra Corona-pandemien, faren for massedød blandt børn pga. kollapset af fødevareproduktion og distribution eller stigningen i sociale kriser som stammer fra den voksende fattigdom, fører det alt sammen tilbage til

oligarkiets Malthusianske hensigt.

Løsningen er den fulde implementering af LaRouche-Planen, som ville genoplive det Amerikanske økonomiske system. Det er det, som må forme dagsordenen for det topmøde, som Præsident Putin organiserer. Hun opfordrede seerne til at blive en del af kampagnen, for at sikre at topmødet finder sted og at LaRouches politik er på dagsordenen ved topmødet.

Panel 3 “Ungdommens opgave” fra Schiller Institut konferencen “Vil menneskeheden blomstre eller gå til grunde?”

MEGAN BEETS: Good afternoon, or good evening as the case may be. I'd like to welcome everyone to the third and final panel of

the Schiller Institute conference, "Will Humanity Prosper, or Perish? The Future Demands a 'Four-Power' Summit Now." My name is

Megan Beets, I'm with the Schiller Institute in the United States, and I'll moderating the panel this evening.

Just a note by way of housekeeping, in the previous panel

this afternoon, we were unable to show a presentation by Mark Sweazy for time reasons, but we will be posting that video on the

conference page so that it can be included in the proceedings and

people can view that. [That that presentation is included in the
Panel 2 transcript, where it was originally scheduled -- ed.]

The title of this evening's panel is "The Job of Youth," and

we are going to begin with a musical offering to set the tone for

our discussion. What you'll hear is My-Hoa Steger, who is a member and organizer with the Schiller Institute in San Francisco, California, performing Johann Sebastian Bach Prelude

and Fugue in C-minor, from the {Well-Tempered Clavier}....

If we look back through history at moments of great revolutionary change, we see that most of them have been brought

about either in part, or on the whole, by youth movements: The Italian Renaissance, the American Revolution, the Apollo Moon-landing. This is not by chance; there's a principle involved, a principle that Lyndon LaRouche recognized going back

to the very beginning of his own political activity in the 1960s

and in the decades since. Young people do not just represent the

future, they create it. They are not necessarily trapped by the

old, failed axioms of the previous generations. To quote Percy Bysshe Shelley, "young people resonate with the gigantic shadows

which futurity casts upon the present."

Today is no different, and today's huge crisis requires the

leadership of youth, But youth who are qualifying themselves to

lead this new paradigm of civilization. So, let me introduce our

speakers on the panel tonight, and give you a sense of how this

is going to work. We'll hear first from the leader of the leader

of the LaRouche Youth Movement, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, followed

by

Daniel Burke, who's a leading organizer with the Schiller Institute, and is also currently a candidate for U.S. Senate in

the state of New Jersey. We'll then hear from a number of different people, including some of the people who are leading the effort to reach out to and educate young people in various parts of the world: Carolina Domínguez Cisneros in Mexico; Chérine Sultan in France, and you'll also hear from some of the

young people who have been participating in an ongoing series of

dialogues with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and in making organizing interventions in their own nations on behalf of the policies for

a new paradigm. You'll hear from José Vega in the United States;

Sebastián Debernardi in Peru; Andrés Carpintero in Colombia; Daniel Dufreine Arcevalo in Mexico. You'll hear from Franklin Mireri from YouLead, in Tanzania; Areej Atef in Yemen; Sarah Fahim from Morocco, studying in Paris; and Lissie Brobjerg in the

United States.

We'll then go to a dialogue, where you'll hear more young

voices who are part of this growing chorus.

So, before I turn it over to Helga, I'd like to go to a

short clip from the founder of the LaRouche Youth Movement, Lyndon LaRouche. This is from an address that LaRouche made to a

gathering of young people, the LaRouche Youth Movement, in February of 2003. What you'll hear him discuss is both the power,

but also the responsibility, of youth.

https://larouchepub.com/lar/2003/3007cadre_sch.html

LYNDON LAROUCHE: Because I saw the condition of society. And historically, only a certain kind of youth movement can change things.

Your generation, as well as those among your parents' generation, who are still alive and viable, are confronted by the fact that your parents' generation gave you a {no-future} world.

There's no way you can make a deal with this culture, which prevails today. No way. Because you can't survive! This culture cannot deliver you the means to survive....

So, you know that. What are you going to do about it?

You

know that you don't have a future unless you can change society.

But you're a generation which is not in a controlling position in

policy-making of society. So what you do, is you go out like missionaries, and begin to organize the dead generation, your parents' generation, in society. And you see the impact you have

when you go into these various places, like the campuses--go into

places such as the state legislatures, or the Congress--you see

the effect you have. The presence of four, five, or six of you,

walking in, knowing what you're talking about, which is more than

most of these legislators can do, and others: You have an effect

on them.

What happens then, is not magical, it's principled.

Whether

people know it or not, the difference between man and a monkey,

is the fact that the human species can do what no monkey can do,

no ape can do, no Al Gore can do: Actually assimilate valid ideas

of principle, and transmit them to a next generation. That's the

difference between man and the ape. Man is capable of

discovering
universal physical principles by a method of discovery which
is
illustrated by Plato's dialogues. Or illustrated by the case
of
Kepler, or illustrated by the case of Gauss, or the case of
Leibniz. Man can do that--and transmit these discoveries,
about
what's out there in terms of principles in the universe, and
transmit this to new generations.

These discoveries, and their transmission, increase
man's
power in the universe, per capita and per square kilometer.
Therefore, the most important thing about man, is society. We
all
die. Everyone is going to die. The mortal life of everyone
will
come to an end. So, you've got a mortal life; what are you
going
to do with it?

How long it is, is not the most important thing. It's
what
you go out of this life, leaving behind.

And what do you leave behind? You leave behind younger
people. You leave behind successive generations of younger
people. You leave behind what you transmit to them, what you
contribute to their development, to the circumstances of their
work in life, to the conditions of society, to coming
generations....

And when you're wise, and you're living in a
generation, you
think about dying. Not in the sense of a morbid thing, but you
say, "I'm going to die eventually. Now, while I'm still here,
I'm
going to get a certain job done. And my job is, to guarantee,
to
the degree I can contribute to this, that the next generation
will have everything we have, in terms of knowledge, and the
next
generation will have a better life than we had. And that
future

generations will benefit from what we, in our generation, have done." [end audio]

BEETS: Now we're going to go to Helga Zepp-LaRouche who is joining us from Germany, who is the founder and chairwoman of the Schiller Institute. Helga, please go ahead.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I just want to bring to your attention a very important writing by Friedrich Schiller, after whom the Schiller Institute is named, and that is "Why Do We Study Universal History?" This was an address which Schiller gave to students in Jena in 1789, where he talked to a room full of students like you are now assembled here on this webinar, and he said that the fact that we have assembled here -- and you can actually refer this to our situation as well -- you have to take all of universal history into account: All of you come with a very specific history, family, background, cultural experiences, something which made you join this webinar. And he basically then says, it is that which brings people together which makes them uniquely qualified to respond to the historical moment in which they are.

Now, we would not be here without the man you just listened to, namely, my late husband, Lyndon LaRouche, who was really the most spectacular, knowledgeable -- he knew just about everything. He ran eight times for President, he was known throughout the world. We had many leaders in India, in Mexico, in African countries, who all expressed one thing, namely, that he was about the only American they could trust. And he had developed a unique

method of scientific knowledge, of forecasting; he predicted every single aspect of this situation in which we find ourselves.

He talked about the pandemic; he talked about the systemic collapse of the financial system, when it was absolutely not apparent, because everything supposedly went well. But if people would have listened to him, we would not be in the situation we are now.

He had an incredible vision where mankind should be, which is expressed in a beautiful movie he made, "The Woman on Mars";

[<https://larouchepac.com/20170321/woman-mars>] it's expressed in

his writing {Earth's Next Fifty Years}; which were all extremely

visionary ideas where mankind should be. But I want to emphasize

one quality, which I think distinguishes him from all other people, because he had the most unbelievable passion for mankind.

And since it's now not so fashionable that young people should have passion for mankind, I would like to encourage you to take

that specific aspect, the agape of Lyndon LaRouche, because if we

are going to save civilization, and you are going to save civilization, because it's your future, I think you need exactly

that incredible love for humanity, and then, there is no problem

which is unsurmountable. That's really what I wanted to tell you.

BEETS: Thank you very much Helga. Next we're going to hear

from Daniel Burke. Daniel is an organizer with the Schiller Institute in the United States, and he will speak to us on the topic of "If You Sat Where They Sit, What Would You Do?"

- If You Sat Where They Sit, What Would You Do? -

DANIEL BURKE: [as delivered] The Schiller Institute has convened this conference with the urgent goal of bringing about a summit of the leaders of the so-called Four Powers: Russia, China, India, and the United States. I address my presentation to the youth of the world, to encourage them to investigate for themselves, what should be the character of such a summit. For, without a personal notion of what should be accomplished, how can you genuinely demand this meeting to occur?

So my question is, "If you sat where they sit, what would you do?" You can also stand, sitting is not mandatory.

It may be useful to begin by asking, just who is it that we are sitting in for? Not in the sense of, who are Trump, Putin, Xi, and Modi personally -- but, who is a national leader and what are their obligations?

What authority is conferred upon you, when you take their place, and where does that authority spring from?

Some, like John Bolton, perhaps, would say that the authority of the U.S. Presidency lies in its vast power -- its military power. Its power to kill. These are the heirs of Thrasymachus, outright Satanists, who, in fact, obliterate the notion of "authority" by crowning "force" supreme -- force without regard for its author. This concept of authority is exactly the one {preventing} a summit from taking place.

It's like Mike Pompeo's doctrine of deterrence -- kill them first, that way they can't do anything wrong!

To many Americans, the source of a President's authority lies in the notion of "democracy." Since we elected our President, he gets his authority from the people. He should

represent their will. These are the people who put, "Not {my} President!" on their bumper stickers. But, it raises a question:

What if your citizens have become a bunch of raving degenerates, on account of the misleadership of the past, or their own moral failings? What if their will is to take drugs and play video games? That would make for a terrible summit!

If we change our approach, and say that this authority comes from the "consent of the governed" rather than "the will of the people," an obvious question follows: By what authority do individuals confer their consent?

In our nation's Declaration of Independence, we answered this question by appeal to the unalienable rights conferred on all human beings by their Creator -- to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Ultimately, therefore, the President's authority, and, indeed, the authority of the leader of any sovereign nation do not derive from the people, or even from the Constitution or the Declaration of Independence (no words jumped off the page to give him the keys to the White House), but rather from the natural rights of the human individual in the living image of God. Should life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness be promoted, the obligations of that authority are fulfilled. The same concept is known in China as the "mandate of heaven."

This creates another problem -- you'd better figure out what this thing called happiness is! So, if you're depressed, you're going to have to give that up.

I submit to you -- that the greatest happiness is that corresponds most closely with our unique human characteristics.

{We are not animals!} We are {creative} creatures. We think,
we
discover, we devote ourselves to the future. {Not} to the
present
-- to the future!

Here, I can disabuse you of the idea that you are
important
because you are youth! It's not so. It's because you are
humans!

I will quote from Mr. LaRouche: "Natural Law is the hypothesis
which corresponds to the necessary and sufficient reason for
mankind's successfully continued existence." That is -- human
progress in the universe towards a greater and greater mastery
over its principles, is an essential function of that
universe.

We're acting on behalf of the universe, when we do that.

As the German-American space pioneer Krafft Ehricke
put it,

"By expanding through the Universe, man fulfills his destiny
as
an element of life, endowed with the power of reason and the
wisdom of the moral law within himself."

So, I think it is {not} at all an exaggeration, to say
that
the authority of these Four Leaders, to create this New
Paradigm,
depends upon the future colonization of the Solar System, and,
implicitly, the Galaxy. In that that is the most human thing
that
we can do.

Their actions today, these leaders, are necessary to
the
task before us, which will have been vitally important to
creating that future -- today, we have to overturn the unjust
rule over world relations by Thrasymachus! He has palaces in
the
City of London, in Lower Manhattan, and we should repossess
them,
and his weapons of mass destruction -- financial derivatives -
-
should be buried in a cave where they can't harm anyone.

And if we act in that way, we can unleash a Promethean age

-- we can create miracles such as the founding of a freedom from material want for every human child. A future where even the

Moon and the Earth, who have been lovers forever, according to Percy Shelley, they will finally marry, the ceremony held at the

founding of the first international Moon village. And in case you

think I am too optimistic, consider the words of Lysander Spooner, from his 1860 treatise, "The Unconstitutionality of Slavery":

"Natural law may be overborne by arbitrary institutions; but

she will never aid or perpetuate them. For her to do so, would be

to resist, and even deny her own authority. It would present the

case of a principle warring against and overcoming itself.

Instead of this, she asserts her own authority on the first opportunity. The moment the arbitrary law expires by its own limitation, natural law resumes her reign."

Here I find, then, the job of the youth. Regarding yourself

not as youth per se, but as practitioners of the natural rights

of man -- discover for yourself the limitations of the arbitrary

law of oligarchy, which has prevented humanity as a whole from acting in accord with natural law.

What are the limits to a tyrant's power? Where is the weak

flank of the enemy?

I think it lies in the flimsiness of the postmodern paradigm, so-called. "The prevailing narrative" tells us that we

want to be free from judgment, free from responsibility, free from rules or limits on our behavior. Free wifi. Or, increasingly

popular, we're encouraged to run society the way that the Big

Tech firms run social media. Block anyone whose views differ from

you -- they are not human, you are justified in ruining their lives by any means necessary.

And stacked on top of those narratives is a meta-narrative:

namely, that the universe as such is fundamentally unknowable, and that "narratives" are how we impose meaning on our lives -

- while we all acknowledge, with a knowing glance, that such a task

is, in fact, meaningless.

You can know whether you like death metal, or lo-fi hip hop, or K-pop, but you cannot know the meaning of your life in history

-- you can know if you identify as left-libertarian, or right-authoritarian, but you cannot know how to end poverty. Poverty, human suffering, these are merely part of the pastiche

-- the millimeter-deep collage of experiences that comprise our lives.

That fraudulent and quite Satanic view of the universe {is}

a weak flank. Across the world, the real physical economic conditions have asserted themselves. The passions of the people

are erupting, and being manipulated to drive us further toward the mass killing of the impoverished populations of the world. But, it's my faith that a small number of people committed to developing a higher, more beautiful concept of the nature of man,

can sound a certain note, and change the course of history. And

it's my view that this is not a hopeful wish, but it is hope itself, upon which we have always depended.

So, ultimately, will you find within yourself the moral

leadership, to cause yourself and others, to discover the principles of natural law?

BEETS: Thank you very much, Daniel. Next, we're going to hear from Carolina Domínguez Cisneros, who is leading the Youth Movement of the Schiller Institute, in Mexico. She'll be joined by three others, Sebastián Debernardi in Peru; Daniel Dufreine Arávalo in Mexico; Andrés Carpintero in Colombia. The title of their presentation is "Getting Back the Great Ideas That Were Stolen from Us."

- Getting Back the Great Ideas That Were Stolen from Us -

CAROLINA DOMÍNGUEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Carolina Domínguez from Mexico. I'd like to welcome you to this international conference, which is a result of the efforts of the Schiller Institute, which I've been a member of, for a number of years. I would like to share with you our enthusiasm and hope in creating an international youth movement.

Throughout his life, Lyndon LaRouche, and his movement which we are part of, defended the idea of creating a youth movement that studies the most profound ideas that humanity has produced.

These profound ideas represent the creation of new institutions.

LaRouche always said that, if you want to educate a president and transform a society, you should create a youth movement. And that is what we have done.

The youth movement which we are now creating is based on the idea of giving youth what has been stolen from them in their universities, their schools, and in general. They have stolen

from them the idea that they can know the universe, they can understand the universe, and master the principles which run the universe that man lives in. In addition to understanding those universal principles, they can take them, master them, and apply them for the welfare of all society.

As you have seen throughout this conference, it is essential that youth and the new generations master these concepts.

So our work in Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Venezuela and in general in Spanish-speaking countries, the task

we have taken up is to gather together these youth who are interested in transforming history, in being participants in an

international process with other youth who are not willing to be

told by the media that yes, this is a sad situation, that lots of

people are dying daily--but rather that they have to change it.

They cannot just wait to some day be part of those statistics, but they have to act.

And that is what the LaRouche movement exists to do, to be

that guide. We have weekly meetings studying Kepler, the astronomer LaRouche tasked us to understand. Kepler showed how human beings are able to understand those principles, and he left

us documents that allow us to understand his method and his thinking. We also study Friedrich Schiller--right now we are reading the Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man, which has totally stunned the youth about how they have been denied all

these ideas in the universities. The younger people in these meetings are the ones who are most struck, thinking that their education has only been to learn things, pass an exam, and then

forget them. Now they recognize, by participating in our

movement, that the knowledge and method they are learning is useful to transform society.

So the message I want to give you is to join and participate

in this movement. I don't expect you to agree with all of the ideas that have been discussed on these panels, but I do believe that we have all felt at some point that things are not right, and that it is necessary to do something, to assume responsibility as young adults.

The following messages that we are going to hear are from youth whom we have asked to comment on what they think of the work we've done with them--youth from Peru, Colombia and Mexico, who have taken up the opportunity to know the ideas that were stolen from them in their formal education.

So I invite you to participate in this. We have meetings every week, and this movement is growing. All of the work which Lyndon LaRouche developed has allowed us to master ideas that will help us change history, and not be reconciled to a totally uncertain future. That is my message to you; we're here so that all youth can participate in this process. Thank you, very much.

SEBASTIÁN DEBERNARDI: Good afternoon. My name is Sebastián Debernardi of Lima, Peru. I want to tell you about a Dialogue Meeting that we held on June 17, with the participation of Schiller Institute youth from Latin America, on the subject of the proposal to create 1.5 billion new, productive jobs in the world. That program is in response to the economic and health crises globally, and to the urgent need of the population as a whole to have greater development for their lives, and those of their families.

Various great projects proposed for our countries by the

Schiller Institute can have a major impact both on the creation of jobs that improve the quality of life for people, such as access to a better education and culture to be able to carry them

out, as well as benefits they would bring in the short term.

The Dialogue Meeting was characterized by a shared optimism,

as a result of the joint search for answers to the problems of the age, which are overwhelming our countries. And so we met virtually this time, hoping to be able to actually meet soon as a

result of the completed great projects.

ANDRÉS CARPINTERO: Hello, friends. My name is Andrés from

Bogotá, Colombia. I'd like to invite you to get to know the proposals of the movement that Helga and Lyndon LaRouche have created, to reverse the economic and social entropy that has brought us the chaos we are in today. We need to learn and acquire the tools to create a clean and sustainable future, inspired by reason, morality and art. We youth will build the world of the next 50 years. Join and participate in this marvelous movement.

DANIEL DUFREINE ARVALO: Hi, how are you? I'm Daniel, and

I'm very happy to greet you from Mexico. I have a very important

message for you, especially the youth. We are living in a world

that is changing ever more quickly, but the only thing that hasn't changed is oppression by the powerful, who are toying with

the world's people. We are living in mankind's most important age, a mankind whose purpose is to grow and improve those aspects

of life which make us human: love, passion, joy and methodology.

The powerful have taken all of this from us, and they will continue to do so, unless we change this reality.

Fortunately, there is a plan, a plan inspired in the profound thinking of Lyndon LaRouche, which essentially is an educational for fighting against the problems caused by the sick ambitions of the Wall Street and City of London circles. That plan requires the greatest possible number of youth, with their dreams and hopes, in order to make a better world in which to live, and not merely survive.

The Glass-Steagall Act will be implemented; the banks will be quarantined because they are bankrupt; and the toxic derivatives bubble will be frozen. We will demand that the leaders of Russia, China, the United States and India meet to decide on the next stage of industrial growth, which will allow us to grow more, while using less. Connecting the world with hundreds of thousands of kilometers of high-speed rail lines; creating more than 1.5 billion jobs in the whole world.

The time for changing the world has arrived, and we need you now. Let us fight now, to make this reality possible. Let us all fight to free the world, to bring down national barriers, to eliminate ambition and hate. Let us fight for the world of reason, for a world where science, where progress lead us all to happiness. Brothers, in the name of freedom, we must all unite.

BEETS: So, you've now heard from the United States and from Ibero-America. We're going to go across the Atlantic now, where it's much later at night, and we're going to hear next from Franklin Mireri, who is the partnership's coordinator for YouLead, which is an organization I think he'll tell you something about, which is based in Arusha, Tanzania.

Hi, Franklin. Nice to see you. Go ahead.

- The Greatest Want of the World Is for True Leaders -

FRANKLIN MIRERI: [as delivered] Hi Megan, nice to hear from you. Thank you, it's a pleasure.

Ladies and Gentlemen, fellow citizens of the world. Allow me to greet you in the famous Swahili greeting, "{Jambo}!" which simply means "Hello."

My name is Franklin Mireri, from Kenya, representing the YouLead program. YouLead is East Africa's flagship Youth Leadership and Development Program working to unlock youth leadership potential for a prosperous region. YouLead is a collective-action youth program hosted by MS Training Centre for Development Cooperation (MSTCDC) and the East African Community Headquarters in Arusha, Tanzania. It is co-owned and supported by the YouLead Consortium of over 25 State and Non-State Partners across all the 6 East African Countries (EAC) and Member States of the EAC.

We are cognizant of the wonderful work that being done by the Schiller institute in advocating for and mobilizing governments to respond definitively to the current crises, especially through the efforts of impassioned youth across the world, who are committed to taking responsibility of persuading their governments into action.

Last month, YouLead, a consortium organization in the six East Africa countries, launched a sovereign report on the disruptions of the coronavirus in the youth life in East Africa. The study, which was conducted between March and April, laid bare the bare the startling socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 to the livelihoods here in East Africa: 59% of the respondents had extremely severe negative impacts to their income and this was

just at the beginning of the crisis in March; 57% had experienced severe impact to their education, while 34% were not working from home because of the nature of their work. We believe that the economic impact will be most severe in developing countries, since many countries do not have social security safety nets.

At YouLead we are developing an online jobs platform for East African Youth, to mitigate the economics effects that have been brought about by the coronavirus. The platform will bring together skilled youth and potential employers on the same platform, with an emphasis on verified skills and a scoring system from successfully completed tasks, which build trust. The platform will provide three distinct features: a platform to reskill and retool youth; a one-stop shop for employers and employees; and a youth employer mobility passport, the year's passport. And finally, skilled and unskilled jobs without borders. This is to overcome the challenge of labor mobility in East Africa.

The creation of 1.5 billion new jobs across the world and dedicated financing for efficient health infrastructures in every country will definitely require more than just talk. Sadly, many of the noble ideas that have been advanced in the past, like the Millennium Development Goals, then the Sustainable Development Goals, the Global Goals, and action towards curbing climate change, have been clawed back because of a lack of leadership.

The greatest want of the world right now is for True leaders. Leaders who will not be bought or sold, leaders who are true and honest to the plight and needs of their citizens and humanity. Leaders who do not fear calling impunity and servitude by its name, leaders who will stand for what is right, though

the
heavens fall.

Allow me to end by quoting a famous Swahili phrase --
"{Hakuna Matata}," which means "All is well." I am sure most
of

you have heard that saying in many cartoons or animation
films.

The phrase appeals to the optimistic good-natured spirit of
human

beings all over the world. The truth is that the world is
presently faced with a uniquely challenging combination of
threats on every side.

This is the time for decisive action by everyone:
young and

old, rich and not-so-rich, from every religion, race and
kindred.

If we do not move and act decisively, together -- the
consequences will be dire.

Thank you

BEETS: Thank you very much, Franklin. Next we're going
to

hear from Sarah Fahim, who is a student from Morocco who is
studying in Paris, and she's been working alongside our
Schiller

Institute friends in Paris, France. Hello, Sarah.

SARAH FAHIM: Hello, everyone's hearing me? OK.

I study in the Schiller Institute's press my thoughts
on the

situation in young people's fate in my country and across
Africa,

because many of the causes are still present there today. So
real

phenomena are at the source of the failure of these young
people

to enter the professional world.

Morocco is divided country. Politics have
unfortunately made

of the national educational system something singularly
reserved

for less privileged social classes. There are way too many students and they're growing towards a school system that does not lead them out of poverty, and towards success. There are way too few teachers and they're discouraged by mediocre conditions, and educational structure. Then comes trouble with language: In public school classrooms French is not well taught, even when this language is, especially since the French protectorates that ended 1956, essential in today's job market. This language, as well as the Arabic language, is spoken daily across the country.

These young people then find themselves less trained, pushed aside, and see their future constricted by these conditions.

At the same time, another part of the population is benefitting from quality teaching. The educational system itself has never before been this developed. This minority has access to an education that, while expensive, still guarantees admission into prestigious universities as well as very good jobs, the best in the country. This evolution has led to a very real crisis, driven by the loss of confidence in one school, its role, efficacy, and equality. Public schooling, though supposed to bring children from various backgrounds together, as opposed to separating them, has failed. This observation is a real threat to African development. Governors do not ask for the required urgency to repair and invest in young people's educations, to offer them training that will ensure job acquisitions down the line.

This is how creating job opportunities as mentioned in the LaRouche plan will be achieved. Indeed, we need to remember that in the '60s, economists created a positive correlation between human investments and economic growth. The development process

of industrialized countries as well as developing countries has been structurally shown to accompany a general growth the skills and educational levels of their population. The essence of creation of job opportunities lies in education which is one of the strongest weapons against mass poverty.

While we stand to support the African development process, I always wondered if there was this conscious will to deprive Africa from developments and education for its youth? Can knowledge be dangerous? The answer to this question came to me when I paid closer attention to colonialism in this continent. It is important to understand that, in today's world, as claimed by LaRouche studies and conferences led by the Schiller Institute, every country's prosperity contributes to the well-being of the general population.

To me, at 19 years old, the only way to save the youth from this vicious cycle is to train them. Exposure to social media is stronger than ever nowadays. We must use all the digital resources we have access to and take advantage of this potential.

With around 364 million Africans ages 15-35, this continent has the youngest population on Earth. The United Nations predicted that Africa will be home to over 40% of the global youth population by 2030. The challenge of how to successfully integrate these new people into the formal economy needs to become a top priority for governments, policymakers, and development practitioners.

I was lucky enough to be born to a couple of hard-working parents, that had the privilege to offer me an education, that

could help me succeed. I want this opportunity to become a right.

The children of my country, of my continent, of the entire planet

deserve these rights. But even the paradoxical reality between a

youth that is sabotaged by our educational system and this enormous potential young people have, complete with the will to

act and in an awareness of the battles to come, it is our duty to

provide them with the necessary tools and the new job opportunities will naturally follow. Thank you.

BEETS: Thank you so much, Sarah. Next we're going to go to

ChÃ©rine Sultan, in Paris, France. She will be speaking in French.

I'd like to make sure the interpretation is working before we get

underway. We have to fix an echo. Thanks to everyone for being patient.

OK, now we're working. Go ahead.

CHÃ©RINE SULTAN: [as translated] I would like to thank Sarah

for developing this question of digital, as a chance to develop

youth. But I would like to raise the negative point of the digital culture today and see what we can do. We could call that,

"the youth and the digital and the future, how to employ digital?" Because often, you get children whose parents are telling them, you have to work in order to earn money, and you have to get good results in school. And when you have good results in school, the parents say, "well, I'm going to give him

one hour of television, one hour of internet, because he's deserved it." So, it's a kind pathway to push children to education.

The problem is that the good results in school are not

so

good, because the level of education has been going down. So international studies which are showing competencies of children

in OECD, show that that the levels are lowering and equalities in

measurement of the levels.

So this success is not at school. But we see the young people have a lot of success in the social networks, that is, that is the new way to have success. So you will see, on Instagram, on YouTube. And the objective of these media is to be

seen to have a lot of viewers. So the young people want to be "influencers." It's become a competition, and the negative point

in that is, some of them are becoming Manhattan sellers, even against their will, but they're just selling things, selling themselves, selling products: for instance, makeup, clothes, drinking. Imagine that, for the very famous influencers, we can

have \$20,000 for some minutes of video, and some of them are less

than 18 years old, so the parents are dealing with that; and some

of them are very happy to have this money, because of the unemployment. So that is a big challenge.

Because I'm just asking the question, who is gaining, who is

earning the money, really? Actually, it's not the people who are

selling the product, it is the companies. Because the companies

are just using those young people to selling things. So we can see that the videos are touching more and more people than advertising in the metro stations, because it's spreading very widely on the internet. And so, if you know Edward Bernays on propaganda, he developed the concept of advertising, this idea of

making people commercialized, to sell people was already developed.

One of the favorite hobbies of youth is TikTok, today.

TikTok is one of the main occupations of children. I don't know how many millions of young people have subscribed to this network. You have a lot of young people dancing, and you have to manage to do a perfect dance movement on the video, to enter the application and you can share the video -- and you can do it again and again, before you share it. And so you're repeating all the movements. Now you have children in classrooms or at home, are doing the movements unconsciously, so it's kind of a robotization of the body's movement. So their behavior is modelled by this kind of dance. People are more and more sharing their pictures without really going to other places; they're staying at home, sharing pictures, and not traveling or going anywhere to share.

Finally, people are becoming enslaved by social networks. You could say that those young people who want to be influencers, you could say that -- (I'm trying to get the idea); so you have those young people who have access to a higher degree, and they want to be not influencers as such in the social networks, but they want to build startups. And the problem is that even in this world of the startup, the small companies growing up, there is a trap, because you need a lot of finance at the beginning, and the finances coming from the big companies, if you don't have money to invest at the beginning, you have to submit to the big companies like Google, Microsoft, and you will have to work for them. But because in France you have something, just call it, Station F, which is a startup incubator -- like you have a lot of

young people going things, and to go in that you have to pay rent, you have to access to employment, often, you have to be dependent on a big company like the GAFAM, which is Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft. And if you are clever enough to develop something, the big company will help you but you will be under the circumstance of being employed by the company.

So your competence is used by those big companies. So maybe you are clever, you've done good studies, but we have to change the social environment and the economic environment, to ensure that the intelligence of people is used for the common good, not for those who have power. The question is, who will be instructed politicians, because now you have a lot of politicians who are discouraging, they are showing a lot of mediocrity.

So if you want to really be a startup to change the system you have to join our movement. If you want to start to develop as a young student, you have to join our movement, study how Kepler discovered the Solar System, that's what we're working on, that's what determines our capacity to understand the Four Laws that LaRouche has developed, for instance. So on that, I want to thank you.

BEETS: Thank you very much, ChÃ©rine, for that challenge.

Now, we're going to go back across the Atlantic, back to the United States, to Lissie Brobjerg, who is an organizer with the

Schiller Institute, formerly in Denmark and now in United States.

Her speech is "Are You a Large-Scale Geological Force?"

LISSIE BROBJERG: [as delivered] Thank you, Megan.

I will begin with a quote from the great Russian-Ukrainian biogeochemist, Vladimir Vernadsky: "The noösphere is a new geological phenomenon on our planet. In it, for the first time, man becomes a large-scale geological force. He can, and must, rebuild the province of his life by his work and thought, rebuild it radically in comparison with the past. Wider and wider creative possibilities open before him."

Now, what will your role be in the shaping of future geological phenomena? How will future geologists see the irrefutable trace of your life in their geological studies? Will the soil reveal but your biological remnants? Or a large-scale noetic geological force?

Vernadsky revolutionized the study of the nature of life.

Looking into the chemical composition of soil, he observed that

all organisms create a whirlpool of atoms passing through the body by way of respiration, metabolic activity and reproduction.

This process tends toward manifesting itself to the highest degree. Furthermore, the evolution of species has a directionality which is not random, but which increases this biogenic migration of atoms. Looking at the build-up of fossils

and life in the ocean, he recognized a steady increase over geological time of biomass, fleshiness, metabolic activity, energetic lifestyle (such as predation and swimming), and increase in food supply. Let's look at a few examples of this.

Four hundred million years ago the sponge class {Sclerospongiae} was dominating. Afterwards they declined and the classes {Demospongiae} and {Hexactinellida} took over dominance.

The living tissue of the old class was confined to a thin veneer

outside a 2-dimensional skeleton; whereas the new classes had developed erect, interlocked 3-dimensional skeletal

structures,
which enabled them to inhabit areas with strong currents,
utilizing the waterflow for nutrition, thereby increasing
their
biogenic migration of atoms.

At the same time, the dominating corals were of the
orders
{Tabulata} and {Rugosa}. After they went extinct,
{Scleractinia}
took over. Whereas the old orders were barely able to attach
themselves to the substrate, making them vulnerable to
disruptions, {Scleractinia}, through its ability to cement
itself
to the substrate and build large colonies, could sustain
communities that were able to survive even severe storms. Such
communities underwent symbiosis with microorganisms which
enabled
them to inhabit low-nutrition environments.

Then, 240 million years ago, the only orders of
{Articulata}, a class of brachiopods, that did not go extinct,
were those that developed strong pedicles, enabling them to
optimize their position in currents, and those that developed
their feeding system to filter through more water for
nutrition
and prevent the influx of indigestible particles.

At the same time, the dramatic increase of the
diversity of
{Bivalvia}, a class of mollusks, was due to the development of
full mantle fusion and siphons, which enabled it to burrow
more
efficiently and thereby invade new eco-spaces.

These are examples of the directionality of life
toward
maximum manifestation and evolution directed through the
increase
of the biogenic migration of atoms in the biosphere.

Now, the noosphere, the domain of the mind, is able to
direct this increase through cognition rather than biology. In
Vernadsky's words, since the appearance of civilized humanity
tens of thousands of years ago, "the face of the Earth
transforms

itself and virgin nature disappears." Our thoughts are able to change the chemical composition of the universe like no other species, and over short timespans, through exceptional individual contributions.

Shall your life, then, be reflected mainly through the biosphere or the noosphere? Do you choose to become a large-scale geological force?

What would Shakespeare say?

"Be not self-willed, for thou art much too fair

"To be death's conquest and make worms thine heir."

BEETS: Thank you, Lissie. Next, we have a short video message from Areej Atef. Areej is the Vice President of the Education Committee of the BRICS Youth Parliament, in Sana'a, Yemen.

- -Youth of the World Face Two World Systems: -
- The Old and the New -

AREEJ ATEF:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to be able to talk with you about the youth at the present time and the future. I'm Areej Atef, the Vice President of the Education Committee in the BRICS Youth Parliament. The experience we got in the BRICS Youth Parliament has given us the ability to see two world systems: the old, and the new. All the things with available knowledge of the LaRouche "5 Keys" to advance the BRICS countries and its definition has reached Yemen, in English language and Arabic.

As I'm responsible for health education in the BRICS Youth Parliament, I trust that all youth of both genders have the will

to face the war on policy-viruses, like they're able to face deadly viruses. And this through the right health education, which is built on physical economy, which we have learned from the late Lyndon LaRouche.

As for the beauty of Yemen: The civilization of Yemen has a fragrant smell. This civilization is the identity that triggered

the reports of the "Happy Economic Miracle" because of the pairing of the old frankincense trade and the New Silk Road. It

is a model report and all countries should pursue its rules.

Finally, I would like to share with you that on the coming

Tuesday [June 30] we will be celebrating World Parliament Day.

The world has been celebrating this day since 2018, so there they

can encourage the development in the parliamentary work. So, if

the world is going to celebrate this day, let the Alliance college in Yemen be lifted, so we can achieve the Sustainable Development Goals nationally and internationally.

Thank you. [end video]

BEETS: Thank you to Areej, who is doing some very important work in Yemen.

Our final speaker for the presentation portion of the panel

will be JosÃ© Vega, who will speak to use from the Bronx, in New

York City in the United States, and his presentation is "A New Space CCC."

JOSÃ© VEGA: [as delivered] Hello everybody, I'd like to start

by reading a quote by Schiller, later put into song by Beethoven:

Be embraced, O ye millions!

Here's a kiss for all the World.

Brothers, above the canopy of stars,
A loving Father must surely dwell.
Do you feel Him near, O ye Millions?
Do you sense your Creator, World?
Seek Him above the canopy of stars!
Above the stars must he reside.

I don't think even Beethoven realized it, but he was actually calling for a space program long before Kennedy.

Through classical composition, Beethoven's entire symphony serves to develop the ideas and essence of Schiller's poem, which is that of Mankind's beauty under the image of the Creator. Beethoven was incredibly challenged to set music to the poem, saying that it may not have been possible to create a symphony as beautiful as the poem. Beethoven's composition of the {Ninth Symphony} is similar to the Apollo space program, in that it required the composer to make new creative discoveries that would allow for such a composition to even exist.

In our pursuit to seek a loving father above the canopy of stars, we must make new discoveries that'll enable us to go farther and faster than ever before. But what does it take to actually accomplish this? Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in his letter from a Birmingham jail "Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability; it comes through the tireless efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation." What does that mean to be God's co-worker? It demands that you use everything you have, no matter how big or small it is. That requires big thinking, not small-mindedness.

Take the poorest district in the United States, which has the highest COVID transmission and infection rates, the highest levels of poverty and drug use, and also the highest amount of

"essential workers." How can anyone who lives in these conditions

be expected to believe me, when I tell them that humanity is greater than this, and that within them is the potential for greatness? Well, truthfully they no longer have a choice. They have to believe me because if they don't the country, and the world around them will implode. The fight for an honest future begins with those who need it the most. Because it is within them that the real future begins.

We must demand a New Deal-era policy, where a new kind of Conservation Corps is brought about, and it will be called a Space Civilian Construction Corps. Where anyone between the ages of 18-26 is allowed to use their God-given right to develop their creative capacities to bring forth a real future.

Suppose the people who go through the program are now running around building hospitals in their communities where millions will be born long after their deaths, and building schools where those millions will receive an education similar to theirs. These same people start developing higher forms of energy flux density where it'd be more expensive to send you a bill every month than to actually power your home. But then they go beyond their communities and even their own countries. As they get older and other programs start popping up all over the world they become teachers, passing down what they've learned, so that those they teach can then do for the world, what the original group did for their country. I would like to think that Martin Luther King, Jr. would agree with me when I say that this is one of the highest forms of non-violence.

I'd like to finish off with a quote from Beethoven's {Choral Fantasy}. "Only when Love and power are wed/ Mankind has God's blessing." So with that being said, are you ready to be

co-workers with God?

- Question and Answer Session -

MEGAN BEETS: All right! Thank you very much, JosÃ©. So, we're going to move into our question and answer session now. What we're going to do is, we have a number of young people who I mentioned earlier are part of the chorus of voices who are organizing, educating themselves on, and demanding a New Paradigm. So, we're going to bring some of them in to ask questions of the panel. What we really want to build here is not just some kind of formal Q&A, but a real discussion with the panelists.

We are going to start with a question -- or maybe it's a comment, he'll have to tell us -- from an honorary member of the youth movement, State Senator Theo Mitchell. Senator Mitchell is, as I said, a former state senator from the state of South Carolina in the United States. He is a Board Member of the international Schiller Institute, and a long-time friend of Lyndon and Helga LaRouche. He's also a long-time fighter, courageous fighter for justice. So, Senator Mitchell, welcome. Can you hear us? We can't hear you. We're going to come back to Senator Mitchell after trying to solve those audio problems.

In the meantime, I would like to go to a question from our panel of questioners assembled in a Zoom meeting. We're going to go first to Maddie Hirst. Maddie, are you there?

MADDIE HIRST: I wanted to thank JosÃ© first off for that impassioned speech, because that's what we need. We need somebody who's going to connect with people. I also wanted to note on a kind of theme that's been throughout the entire program, and

that

is that history is made by individuals. Every single one of us has the potential to change the world. Unless we act on that, the

future we all dream of is not going to come into being. That's mainly what I wanted to say.

BEETS: OK. JosÃ©, do you want to start us off?

JOSÃ© VEGA: Sure. To your response, yes, it is true. History is changed by individuals. But what good is writing the greatest symphony, or a great treaty, or the greatest essay if nobody is going to read it or listen to it? You really have to organize people around your ideas. Martin Luther King, Jr. was an amazing reverend, preacher, organizer, non-violent promoter. But it was the people around him, the people who organized with him who really made that possible. So, I don't think you can forget about the unsung heroes, as we put it. They're just as important, if not more important. I'll just say one thing. I know that there is a great philosopher from the 13th century whose name is escaping me at the moment who writes about civilizations that were so great, that were lost to war and famine. And no one has ever heard of them since. So, how do we stop that from happening to us? That requires everybody to come together to prevent from getting lost and destroyed.

BEETS: Right, well I think that raises to a certain degree what ChÃ©rine was bringing up about the culture. And I wonder if ChÃ©rine would like to come in on this, and say something.

CHÃ©RINE SULTAN: I don't know exactly what I can add.

Creativity is a big word that attracts people. And often we don't know exactly what we are talking about. When you are really creative, maybe you don't recognize it in the time, but if you are confident in the long time, finally you will see the difference between a false creativity and the true one. So, I would like to encourage people to make this tough work, to work on science, to work with others, because to do it by yourself is quite difficult.

BEETS: Thank you. For any young people who are watching this, we do have classes of the exact kind of group educational sessions that ChÃ©rine was referencing. So, I would invite you to get involved in that. Would anybody else on the panel like to respond to Maddie before we move on? OK.

It looks like we have Senator Mitchell back. Senator Mitchell, can you say something? Let's see if we can hear you now. Still can't hear you.

Let's take another question from our Zoom meeting here, while we fix Senator Mitchell. I'm going to go to

, and then after Senator Mitchell, I would like to go to Vicente or Mauricio. Is that Senator Mitchell? Welcome!

THEO MITCHELL: Thank you. Thank you very much. I certainly want to pay my respects and regard to my good friend Helga, for having this the temerity to put on this panel, this conference; and certainly to Lyn, my long-time friend too in giving recognition to his contribution and his foresight and his perspective as far as even today is concerned. It's really

perplexing to see that we are living in a time and an administration that has little interest at all in doing the right thing, especially on exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche.

I have been active for quite a while with the Schiller Institute. We dealt with the Operation Freuhmenschen and the human rights abuse concerning Lyndon. The Operation Freuhmenschen, of course, was targetted at the African-American elected officials. We managed to bring that to a standstill or halt. and consequently we don't know what if anything Lyn paid the price for, for he served time for nothing: it was abuse. Former Attorney General Ramsey Clark said that it was the chronic case of abuse of the so-called system of justice that he had ever seen. And this man was in the Attorney General's office, one of the Cabinet offices. Consequently, he came out in support of Lyn. We all did.

We are all happy to know that there are so many young people who are now participating in this saga. There's a lot of work to do, but we always have to remember this: To be able to get the justice that Lyn deserves and the exoneration, we're going to have to press people into the service, as far as this world is concerned. How can we act, when there's still abuse? No matter what you talk about as far as the Four-Power conferences are concerned, they're not going to spend one nickel or time on Lyndon LaRouche; especially this administration. This is a program that we certainly can't forget. It is something that we must continue working on. Of course, at this time, the abuse of the police departments, George Floyd, and the one in Atlanta, Mr.

Ahmaud Arbery: it's an abuse. It's open season. Still, open season on the black male. Consequently, I'll ask this distinguished panel, what suggestions if any to you have to be

able to help save us? Thank you. Exonerate our good friend Lyndon
H. LaRouche, Jr.

BEETS: Thank you so much, Senator Mitchell. Before I turn
that question over to the panel, let me just say that we will put
a link in the video description to the petition to exonerate
Lyndon LaRouche, so people can go there. There's also a really
wonderful video on Lyndon LaRouche's exoneration which people
should watch and help us disseminate.
https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/petition_exonerate_larouche

Let me turn that over to the panel. Let me start with Daniel, and see if you have a response to Senator Mitchell's question.

DANIEL BURKE: Thank you, Senator Mitchell; thank you, Megan. I'd like to respond by saying that the most important thing that we can do in my view is to create 50 million new productive jobs in the United States, and 1.5 billion jobs in the whole world. This is not a jobs program; this is a fulfillment of what Mr. LaRouche was fighting for in his life. It is a policy of transforming the human species to a new and more noble level of activity. It means that we're going to be invigorating all Americans with a mission for the future. Because it is only means of the future that we have any ability to unify Americans. It's always been that way; we're always for a "more perfect union" to fulfill the promissory note known as the Declaration of Independence. It's in that effort, as people commit themselves to creating such a future, I believe, that we'll be able to solve

the abuses of people that exist. Intolerable crimes that are committed against people in the name of -- for all types of justifications. We're going to have to take a look at a universal standard of man that demands of us that we fight with such a passion to overcome the brutality of this system in all of its representations by establishing a scientific optimism about the future.

To put it very directly, I am perhaps more optimistic than you are, that we could get this administration to exonerate Mr.

LaRouche. I think that this is a time for miracles, and whatever

circumstances stand in our way that appear to be objective, the

fact of the matter is that their system is in a total breakdown

crisis. So, the rules that have been set up to keep this system

going are crumbling, because the system is crumbling. Therefore,

I'm committed to the idea that it is possible in a short amount

of time to create a breakthrough on the recognition of Mr.

LaRouche in the United States. And that perhaps the most

important thing we can do, in addition to fighting for his

exoneration itself, is to recruit people to this vision that he

developed. Which includes taking the people of the

post-industrial cities of the United States, taking the people of

the poor areas of our nation, and giving them a means to

contribute to the future. This is how we're going to give people

a deeper identity and get them out of a feeling of nihilism and

despair, which is clearly inundating the country.

BEETS: Would anyone else on the panel like to say something in response to Senator Mitchell on the issue of justice? JosÃ©, yeah, go ahead.

JOSE VEGA: If Black Lives Matter, why isn't there a space program in the Bronx, or in Oakland, California? That's my response.

I live just a few blocks away from Gouverneur Morris' grave, and Gouverneur Morris was the person who penned the Constitution.

He also wrote the words to the Preamble of the Constitution. In

it, there is a section on promoting the General Welfare. So, if

we're promoting the General Welfare, doesn't that include developing the minds of all Americans, and giving them the opportunity to educate our youth?

I'd like to reference the story of Caliph Browder. He was

wrongfully put in Riker's Island prison, over a dispute of stealing a backpack. He was there for three years; his mother could not afford bail. Eventually, he was found innocent. He refused to plead guilty to a crime he did not commit, and three

years after leaving Riker's Island, he committed suicide. There

was no more hope; there was no future for him, in his mind. That

is a tragedy. That is what's happening to many young Americans

today who feel as if there is no future and no hope. We will give them one.

I'd like to also reference Plato's {Meno} dialogue. Because

in the {Meno}, Socrates and Meno, a slave master, are having a discussion about virtue and where does knowledge come from.

Socrates says, I'd like to see one of your slave boys. So,

Meno

brings out a slave boy, and Socrates asks about the slave, was he

born here, and can he speak the language? These two things imply

that this is not a native Grecian. This is somebody who does not

look like them, or may not even sound like them. What he does is, he brings him to the beach, and he tells the boy to double the area of the square. What does that mean, exactly, to the slave boy? The slave boy does it, and the slave boy is not learned. He has not studied at all, nobody's ever taught him anything. And yet, he was able to find the solution to a complex

geometrical problem, which is not so complex. The point is, he

could easily be the slave master, as Meno could be a slave.

The way we're going to solve this, is just develop the minds

of people, so that 50 million years from now, when everybody owns

their own galaxy, what will the questions be? Will the question

be, do black lives still matter? Or what do they become? How do

you transform the future in that way? I'll leave it there.

BEETS: Franklin, go ahead.

FRANKLIN MIRERI: Thank you. It's been wonderful hearing

from the fellow panelists and even from Senator Mitchell, and how

passionate he is about the issue of exonerating Lyndon LaRouche.

I think while many people outside of the United States may not have heard of Lyndon LaRouche, personally I first heard about him

this year, when I started taking the economics classes being offered by the Schiller Institute. When I many people may not have heard about him, what I know resonates across the world

is

what he stood for. For example, the way the financial systems are currently skewed against developing countries. So, that's just one aspect. As we then seek, as we then sign the petition,

let us not forget the importance of global solidarity towards that cause. You never know; the more people who get to hear the

wonderful works he did, the more gradual pressure might be put on

any administration. It might be this administration, or the coming one; but ultimately what he stood for was greater than just in the United States. That's my submission, thank you.

BEETS: Thank you, Franklin. Thank you so much for joining

us, Senator Mitchell.

I'd like to go back to our Zoom call, our collection of

young panelists there. Actually, Calvin I said you could go next, but first I want to check and see

VICENTE: I would like to ask the panelists if they can

clear me a doubt that I've been thinking about. Today, as we can

see, it is inevitable and it is impossible; we cannot implement

all these projects of the LaRouche movement and the Schiller Institute without the concepts for embracing globalization and various alternatives like the multipolar world, and this is talked about in the BRICS and the New Silk Road. So, I wanted to

say these are all new alternatives for globalization, but as we

can see in nature, so as in the spirit of the human, there doesn't exist multipolarities, so I wanted to ask if the new embracement of multipolar world for globalization, if it coexists

with the physical laws of the universe? Because in nature, there

is no multipolarity and neither in the human spirit. There is only the Earth is a polar world and as the Chinese law of change

-- they call it the sooyi or iching -- they say that you can bypass the polar concept, but you have to go beyond the polar concept. It's not anymore polar; it's passive. It's not any more active, it's beyond. So, these are not active spaces on Earth; these are passive spaces on Earth.

So, I wanted to ask if the multipolar world of the alternative of globalization being embraced in BRICS and the New

Silk World, if it coexists with the universal laws of physics and the human spirit?

BEETS: OK. I believe we also have Carolina on our Zoom

call. So, if she's on, we should test the translation first. I'd like to see if she would like to respond first, and then open

it up to the other panelists. So, Carolina, are you on? It doesn't sound like it. I'm going to open up Vicente's question,

which is really wonderful, to the other panelists, and if Carolina is on and we can get the translation going, then we'll

do that. Actually, Lissie, would you like to answer that one to start us off?

LISSIE BROBJERG: I think we have to start from the standpoint of trying to understand what the nature of the universe is. So, I don't think that we just look, when we look

at how life has been developing biologically, we see that new solutions are found all the time in order for life to manifest itself more effectively all the time. It's interesting how animal life and plants develop new biological technologies in order to do that. But the mind is superior to that, and Vernadsky discusses how suddenly you have an explosion in the world because of human cognition. We make all these

discoveries.

So, I don't think that the nature of our universe comes down to a question of multipolar or not. I think what's interesting is our creative ability to find solutions and to manifest ourselves in our thoughts and our ideas more effectively in this universe. What do you think about that? Was it Vicente?

VICENTE: Yes, well, I think that the universe is as Lyndon LaRouche said, is negentropic, and as we can see the mathematics and its closed system can't understand it because it's an entropic model. I was asking because if in politics and in the economy, we create on Earth and embrace a new concept of the alternative of globalization based on the multipolar world idea, it is as we can see if we just study old civilizations. They say it is proven scientifically that Earth is based on two poles - the North Pole and the South Pole. This is gravitational and electromagnetic, so I don't understand the concept of a multipolar world when you want to embrace it on Earth. I wanted to understand if this is an entropic system or a negentropic system that can coexist with the universal laws of physics? This is in the aspects of politics, economy, and globalization, so is this negentropic or entropic?

BEETS: Carolina, can you hear us?

CAROLINA DOMÍNGUEZ CISNEROS: Thank you. What I can say to you about this question is that you're going to have to discover

this for yourself. You could discover this. We're working on Kepler, and that's the best method. There's a document that LaRouche wrote for all youth, people who are younger than me, people young like you and even younger people. It's called "My Encounter with Leibniz and with Kepler," which is a document for young adults. So, I'm not going to save you the hard work that's required, but let's keep studying Kepler every Monday in the evening, and that's my answer to you. Thank you.

BEETS: OK, great. Daniel, you want to say something?

DANIEL BURKE: Yeah, if I can, briefly. I just want to respond because this question of a multipolar world and the idea of globalization. What do we mean when we say "globalization"? This is something that Helga LaRouche has referenced more than once. It is not her view, and I concur, that there is such a possibility of a multipolar world. In other words, one in which you have multiple poles of influence, who are collaborating; it's meant to be in opposition to what's called the unipolar world, which is where you have a collection of power in one center. Neither of these theories of the world really cohere with what is happening, which is that we live in an era of oligarchy. One of the tools of oligarchy which is, in my view, centered in these

... groupings across the world, these institutions that Mrs. LaRouche in the first panel referred to as the British Empire. That this operation to suppress humanity is the key enemy that we have. It's not a matter of one nation holding power over others, although the United States has often played the role of the brawn for the British brains, but rather, it's

a
matter of creating a community of nation-states. Or, as the President of China refers to it, a community of shared destiny.

A community of principle is what John Quincy Adams called it.

The point is, and this is what I was trying to get across in

my comments: if the whole purpose of a nation and the whole purpose of our republic here in the United States is to advance

the pursuit of happiness for our population. But it's based on

the idea of universal rights of the individual that extend naturally beyond Americans per se, as Franklin emphasized, then,

we have the prospect of national governments working together for

the common aims of humanity. If we want to demonstrate that the

world is not a closed system, not an entropic system, as you're

raising, Vicente, then it's my view that the strongest way to do

that is to have collaboration between Russia, China, and the United States, and other countries. All other countries that we

possibly can bring into this, on the exploration of the Solar System and the galaxy. Because as JosÃ© said, it's some future in

which we're all going to have our own galaxy. There are 2 trillion galaxies out there, and there's more than enough room for the human population to extend out there. It's a demonstration that there's not such a thing as fixed resources,

or a closed system, or that we have to manage through a unipolar

or multipolar system. What we need is a level of recognition of

sovereignty, respect for the sovereign governments of many nations, that they can form agreements in which they can work together for the benefit of all. This realm of space science

would be a great frontier by which we could change everything.

BEETS: OK, great. Now, we're going to go to Calvin. Calvin, are you there?

CALVIN: Mine is more of a question. I think it was Dennis, I'm not sure who said this, but there was a comment one of the guys made about people who are becoming slaves of white social networks and social platforms, and he further went on to criticize young people for making a huge amount of money by doing things such as selling make-up and making a lot of videos. That criticism about the way people choose to make money kind of reminded me of a conversation I had with someone last week about how when people do Uber and Lyft, those aren't real jobs. They aren't really productive, and they don't provide a sense of security for people. We talk about a lot of advances, but me personally, I see a lot of advances in this society technologically and non-technologically in both ways. I do think the result of some of these advances let's some of the white people choose to make money. But my question is, what's wrong with people making money off of selling videos and doing Uber and Lyft and things like that? I'm all for the 1.5 billion industrial jobs and things like that, but I think some people have to be realistic. Not everyone wants an industrial job; some people are satisfied with selling make-up for the rest of their lives. I'm just trying to understand what's wrong with making money off of making videos and stuff like that. I hope the question made sense, I know I was all over the place.

BEETS: It made sense to me. ChÃ©rine, I think maybe we start with you; that's your territory there.

CHÃ‰RINE SULTAN: Yes. I think that there is a common point between this and in the past when people had still productive jobs, the less-educated were workers, and the more educated ones were the bosses. It's to simplify, but that was the question. Because you asked yourself, do I need to find a job on my own and the society won't help me? So, I have to fight for my future on my own. The question today is quite the same. If I will use all my means on my own, if I can make videos in my bedroom, in my bathroom, I will make it. I will own my life, and if I have more skills, I can produce some software, some applications, I can invent something. At the same direction, there is no collective work. We have to work on this issue.

BEETS: Yeah, Sarah? We can't hear you. Why don't we work on your audio, and we'll go to somebody else and come back to you. JosÃ©, why don't you go ahead?

JOSÃ© VEGA: Sure. First of all, Calvin, always a pleasure talking to you, pal. I actually had this conversation with a few friends the other day. Is it immoral to want to make a living for yourself, and want the best conditions for yourself, if that involves you working a menial job or selling content -- whether that be stupid videos on the internet or whether that be dirty pictures and videos on the internet? My point is simple: I think you're worth more than that. I think you're worth more than a 9-5, and I think you're worth more than any salary or any amount of money that you could ever make in the world. I think

everybody is worth

dollar amount. But where is that worth? That worth is in the soul and in the mind; that's what makes you beautiful. I'm simply saying the country needs the means to develop that beauty that lies within everybody. That's where your real worth is. You could die with \$50 million in your bank account, 5 homes in Beverly Hills, 20 luxury cars. I think Jay Leno has a robot that he can use. None of that will mean anything. You die, and you've contributed nothing. Is that what you want your life to mean? Because life is not defined by the present, but the future. If you live in the present, you will die when you die. But if you live in the future, you become immortal. And that's really where true beauty and meaning in your life exists; in the future. That's my response to you, Calvin.

CALVIN: JosÃ©, I truly and honestly agree with everything you say, 100%. But maybe it's just me -- I don't know if there's bias on my end, but I think those jobs have value. It's good to live for the future, but I think we also have to live for now. I'm going to use a few examples: Uber and Lyft drivers, for example. Not everyone is in the position to afford a car. Some people have to get a job. It's more affordable than catching a cab. Selling make-up; that's a huge industry. The make-up industry is a huge one in America right now. We have beauty standards in America, unfortunately, you have to look a certain kind of way to get a job; have a certain kind of hairstyle to get a job. These are jobs that help satisfy those requirements to

get those jobs or get to work and things like this. Don't you think it's a bit odd to say that those jobs have no value when they in a way satisfy certain things that are needed today? I don't know; I hope that makes sense. I think those jobs that people consider unworthy are worthy.

BEETS: Franklin, did you want to say something in response to Calvin?

FRANKLIN MIRERI: I just wanted to say I totally understand where Calvin is coming from. I am a content producer, by the way. I produce gospel music when I'm not doing youth engagement work. What I can say is that I think I heard the contributor saying is it isn't bad to be making content and to be spending your time using your talent -- whatever it is -- to get a living, and as JosÃ© was saying, explore your creative aspect. But what I see most young people doing is that they see it as a means to an end. It stops there. The intellect is not growing. Because yes, you can be making music, but also develop your mind. When you look at how even structures are, I think one of the contributors was saying in the medieval times, and while the economy was developing, the ones whose intellect was more developed were the bosses, and the rest of them were the peasants. Sadly, that's how the world is. When your intellect and your ingenuity is not explored to the fullest, you are, so to speak, confined to now trying to just the menial crumbs of the economy. Yet, we could do much better. In Africa, for example, let me give our context for example. A lot of youth are spending more time trying to be YouTubers, trying to be on TikTok. It's not bad, but we could be doing so much more, like exploring

funding opportunities, exploring opportunities to be computer scientists. So, that is the whole aspect. We are not saying that yes, content production is not bad, but let us do more. And with that, we will open up a whole new basket of opportunities for the economy. That is my input.

BEETS: Thank you. Lissie, go ahead.

LISSIE BROBJERG: I just have a question for Calvin. What kind of culture, what kind of thinking is needed among people today and in the future for us to face a situation in 2 billion years where the Sun will burn out? How will we solve that? Yes, we have creative abilities, we have the ability to solve problems. But what kind of culture do we need in order to do that? Many animal species went extinct, and if we are not acting on a higher level, if we're just acting on some kind of basis where we're not developing and making new discoveries, and developing in a way that will make us able to solve that crisis in 2 billion years, then we could go extinct. What's special about man is our minds; that's the most precious thing we have. Therefore, I think in terms of necessity, necessity changes. Once the person can make a new discovery that makes a lot of what you can call practical jobs or anything obsolete. What do you think? What kind of thinking do you think is needed for facing that in 2 billion years?

CALVIN: Critical thinking, logical thinking most definitely some form of intellectual thinking would be needed to at least that kind of future, or contribute to that kind of future. So, it would most definitely be a culture of critical thinking.

That's my answer.

LISSIE BROBJERG: Yeah, well we have to look. It's not an easy question, so we really have to look into how do we answer that question. Lyn had a huge attack on the educational system, because you have this drill and grill method where people have to learn as if they are like a box. You fill the thing and you basically just have to learn like a dog that learns tricks. But he actually was challenging people, especially young people, to go through the discoveries. Who made the biggest changes for mankind? Who had these huge, large-scale geological influences on behalf of mankind? Carolina was talking about Kepler, who discovered how the Solar System works. So, we should look at those people who actually did change physically and through the noosphere, and redefined mankind and the role of mankind, and the future of mankind. And look at how did they think; we should rediscover their discoveries, so that we actually become also qualified to answer that question. What do you think?

BEETS: Can we see if Sarah's audio is working now?

SARAH FAHIM: To answer that question, I think the problem is deeper than just selling products. I think that the problem is the fact of what kind of society are we thinking if we just reduce all our visions to social media? We are encouraging a lack of ambition, we are encouraging this idea of easy money, of not developing our minds because we can have a normal life by just selling products on Instagram or something. I think the problem is that we are not educating people if they think that there is a future in that type of work. It can be a first

step;

you can sell products to win money to create another project. But it can't be a vision. This is not the way we should imagine

a society; this is so small. Social media is part of our lives

now, we can learn to live with it. But we can't make it the major part of our vision. I do not agree with that, because I don't want my society to not be educated and to dream about selling products and nothing more. This is what I have to say.

BEETS: Thanks, Sarah. So, we have a question from Joshua Kisubika, if he's still in the Zoom.

JOSHUA KISUBIKA: I just wanted to pose a question to Daniel, maybe, just to get to know the position of the LaRouche

group to support the youth in Uganda. So, I was saying that over

700,000 people reach working age every day in Uganda. This is expected to rise to an average of 1 million in the decade from 2030 to 2040. It's already creating a mismatch between labor demand and supply. While Uganda's youth are known for being highly enterprising, fewer than 4% of Ugandans are employers, 32% [?] are working for themselves only. 43% are unpaid family workers.

So, you can see that even this, it all goes back to maybe

leadership. I was trying to look at which strategies can we decide and fight together with you to help the youth in Uganda to

start living life to the full.

DANIEL BURKE: Thank you very much, Joshua. I think that

what you're raising is the prospect of dialogue and discussion about, most importantly as we are discussing here -- the epistemology of economics. Because what you're describing --

it depends upon your point of view. The point of view expressed by this British imperial, oligarchical financial system is the point of view that if you have many mouths to feed and you don't have enough food, or if you have many youth to employ, but you don't have enough jobs; then that means that you're poor. But from the standpoint of the American System -- which is to say, I'm not referring to what the United States has been doing recently or even over most of its history, but rather the so-called American System of economics from Alexander Hamilton -- which has been developed by Lincoln's economist, developed under Franklin Roosevelt, developed under John Kennedy, and in particular, by Lyndon LaRouche as an economist and an individual. Under that system, you look at a large number of youth and you say, "My goodness! What incredible wealth we have," because of the creative powers of their minds. And because we understand, as Hamilton did, that it's through the function of the human mind making discoveries that we actually are able to increase our wealth, our ability to provide for the population and for the future population. If we approach the circumstance from that respect, then we will immediately begin to look at what are the great projects that need to be built that would establish a new platform of infrastructure, a new platform of capability for the nation and for the region and for the continent, and therefore, for the world, which provide a basis for new qualities of economic activity that otherwise were not possible? That you create a future with a future. You create some kind of next step to the whole system.

But it's most important that this be under the idea of a

leapfrog. We say leapfrog to signify go beyond any of the so-called intermediate steps that the IMF demands that people take, which is total nonsense. You may have seen on panel 1, that Daisuke Kotegawa, former Japanese representative to the IMF, dealt with this idea: that it's ridiculous that we should be expecting nations to go step by step by step up the ladder of industrialization and so forth. That's nonsense! We should go to the highest technology that's available, and overmaster all of the problems that have come before, and go for the most rapid possible advance of productive capability. So, what we would like to discuss with you would be, what are the principles by which this can be achieved in Uganda, in the region, in the continent, and in the world. And what are we demanding from governments?

That's why presently, given the conditions of total breakdown of the system, which is what we're faced with right now, we're seeing that we really have got to bring forward youth leadership to demand this summit. A summit of the nations that are capable of initiating a New Paradigm. Because if we want to get that kind of project rolling, that kind of new platform, then we're going to have to change the whole financial system. We cannot allow the continued suffocation of the so-called developing countries. What the Schiller Institute is proposing is 1.5 billion new jobs. The discussion is that this could mean \$125 trillion of international credit, provided by international credit institutions to nations.

So, we'd like to discuss this with you and the youth that you work with, and provide a basis for dialogue in which we can have shared understanding of what is necessary. Then, have a

basis by which to demand that of the government there, and of the people of the world, and the governments of the world. Thank you very much for participating.

BEETS: Thank you very much, both of you. We have unfortunately come up on time. That's very unfortunate, because we have many more people who I know have questions, both live and we also got a number of email questions which we don't have time to take on this panel right now. I would encourage everyone who did not get an opportunity to ask a question, to send your question in. We will direct it to the panelists, so that we can continue this fun, fruitful, and important dialogue.

What I'm going to do is ask each of the panelists who remain with us if they'd like to say anything in closing before we end our panel.

CHERINE SULTAN: I would like to emphasize on the question of leadership and so on, saying once you have discovered a kind of truth, a kind of direction society is, maybe you didn't aim to take leadership, but this fate coming on you owes you to take leadership.

LISSIE BROGJERG: To all of you, I would just like to say that we will all become very old and wrinkled and ugly and all that, in old age. So the question is, when you are there can you think about your life and say that "Certainly, my life was important, and I am not just going to worm food." That's all.

CAROLINA DOMINGUEZ CISNEROS: I appreciate and thank everyone for having participated in this. I'm very happy. This is the first time we've had a forum of this sort for youth. I think that what helps me to understand and organize youth is to not be judgmental, but to actually try to inspire them. To view them from the standpoint of agape, of love. If we see the pain of seeing youth who are on drugs or doing those kinds of things, if this causes pain, we have to realize that perhaps there is something better that's an option. So, I think that we should take the occasion to try to communicate the idea that we can change all of this. We have tremendous potential. The more people die from drugs in the streets, the worse it is; rather, they can have lives based on creativity and agape towards others. Thank you very much for this seminar.

SARAH FAHIM: I think this is extremely amazing to be all gathered today to fight for our ideas and for a better world. This is so powerful and inspiring at the same time. I'm really happy that we're slowly changing our world, and I'm glad to be a part of that change.

DANIEL BURKE: I want to echo what Sarah said; I totally agree. It's inspiring; it sets a standard that encourages us to go higher. So, I just want to quote the immortal words of Lyndon LaRouche: "Have fun!"

JOSE VEGA: Think like Beethoven!

MEGAN BEETS: So, I'd like to thank all the panelists,

everyone who got on to ask questions, and I'd like to thank our audience for watching today.

Let me put out a call: Get active! If you're young, if you're old, get active with the Schiller Institute. We need you to become a member of the Schiller Institute. We need to sign and circulate our petition for a global health system. We need you to circulate our program for 1.5 billion productive jobs. And we need you to organize.

Thank you very much. Thank you to everyone who watched the conference today, and we'll see you again soon.

"Aktionsdag": Ungdommen mobiliserer for 1,5 milliarder arbejdspladser verden over med 'LaRouche-planen'

Den 17. juni (EIRNS) – To positive initiativer skiller sig i dag ud fra den omsiggribende pandemi samt andre voksende kriser. Schiller Instituttets ungdomsafdeling ledte en multinational aktionsdag, som opfordrede lederne fra de fire magter – USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien – til at hæve sig over stridighederne og mødes for at igangsætte tiltag for det almene vel, i særdeleshed mht. infrastruktur indenfor sundhed og medicin for at bekæmpe COVID-19, og for at skabe produktivitet i det økonomiske system gennem "LaRouche-planen"

for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser, og alt som hører til. For det andet, i samme ånd, blev der i dag afholdt et møde mellem kinesiske og afrikanske ledere, under titlen "Kina-Afrika-Solidaritetstopmøde mod COVID-19", som blev ledet og adresseret af Præsident Xi Jinping og den Afrikanske Unions formand, Cyril Ramaphosa, blandt andre.

Det ekstraordinære topmøde skabte en ny "Platform for medicinske forsyninger til Afrika", for at alle afrikanske nationer de næste seks måneder kunne få adgang til diagnostiske og terapeutiske forsyninger for at bekæmpe pandemien. Ramaphosa, som i den senere tid har påpeget vigtigheden af rumforskning og kernekraft, lagde vægt på tiltag for at tilsidesætte ubetalelig gæld i Afrika i denne nødsituation, for at bekæmpe virusset.

Schiller Instituttets aktionsdag inkluderede henvendelser, gennem alle former for kommunikation, til hundredvis af individer og organisationer, som har muligheden for at påbegynde de nødvendige initiativer til et nyt økonomisk system, hvis akutte mål er fokuseret på infrastruktur til global sundhed, som overskriften på Schiller Instituttets begæring lyder: "Forsvar Jordens allervigtigste ressource – mennesket!"

Planen for denne aktivering findes i dokumentet: "LaRouche-planen til at genåbne USA's økonomi: Verden har brug for 1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser". Rapporten, produceret af LaRouchePAC, vil blive diskuteret lørdag d. 20. juni, kl. 20:00 (dansk tid) af landbrugsledere, fagforeningsledere og andre, ved LaRouchePAC's ugentlige, nationale "rådhus", under overskriften: "1,5 milliarder nye, produktive arbejdspladser verden over – hvordan USA's arbejdsstyrke bringes tilbage til videnskabsbaseret produktion". Dette er lyset, som skinner gennem det der ellers kan synes et håbløst mørke af uretfærdighed og lidelse, uden nogen vej imod en

produktiv fremtid. Dette er en opfordring til handling.

Det modsatte til denne kampberedte tilgang til et samarbejde om et nyt økonomisk system, blev udstillet i dag i nye amerikanske udenrigspolitiske initiativer mod Syrien, i et modbydeligt skue af britisk imperialistisk geopolitisk taktik for regimeskifte. Det bliver gjort værre af, at sanktioner bemyndiges og har den samlede støtte fra de neoliberale og neokonservative tosser, der tilføjede det som en paragraf i den seneste Lov for den Nationale Forsvarsmyndighed (National Defense Authorization Act). Udenrigsministeriet bekendtgjorde 39 nye sanktioner mod den syriske præsident, Bashar al-Assad, hans kone, mange familiemedlemmer og andre syriske ledere, hvilket forbyder nogen som helst form for økonomisk støtte til nationen. Dette sker efter at detaljer om den desperate situation med mangel på medicin og fødevarer i Syrien blev formidlet til FN's Sikkerhedsråd den 16. juni, og gennem advarsler om truende hungersnød i Syrien fra FN's administrerende direktør for Verdens Fødevareprogram, David Beasley, i et interview den 12. juni med dagbladet The National i de Forenede Arabiske Emirater. Mere end 9 millioner mennesker i Syrien har ingen fødevarer-sikkerhed (uden tilstrækkelig føde, enten grundet mangler eller forsyninger), og yderligere 2 millioner står på randen.

En del af dette billede inkluderer Libanon, tæt forbundet hermed, hvor banksystemet er brudt sammen. Libanon, en nation med 5 millioner mennesker, har taget imod 1,5 millioner syriske flygtninge. I de seneste dage bliver der taget skridt hen imod et "nyt paradigme" i samarbejde med Kina, med en intervention for udvikling af infrastruktur og mulig understøttelse af Syrien gennem russiske og iranske initiativer.

Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, talte i sit ugentlige webcast i dag, om hvordan det "ikke er tid til geopolitiske spil". Ønsker man at skabe "et regimeskifte i

Syrien gennem hungersnød?"

Efter en detaljeret beskrivelse af situationen, samt andre af dagens udviklinger, såsom at Tyskland og USA "driver fra hinanden", sluttede hun af med at understrege den generelle pointe om, hvad der er brug for blandt nationer. "Tyskland og USA bør arbejde sammen for at løse flygtningekrisen, opbygningen af Sydvestasien, overvindelsen af pandemien, samarbejde om industrialiseringen af Afrika – dette er den slags ting, som vi skulle stikke hovederne sammen om. Vi bliver nødt til at have et andet paradigme og en fuldstændig anden måde at tænke på. Fordi nationale interesser er fine – jeg går fuldt ind for nationale interesser, herunder Tysklands. Men som Friedrich Schiller har sagt mange gange, man kan ikke have nationale interesser, som er i konflikt med menneskeheden. Derfor bliver man nødt til at være en patriot og en verdensborger på samme tid."

"Så det er denne ånd som Schiller Instituttet forsøger at vække til live. Dette vil være emnet på vores kommende konference, d. 27. juni". Find indbydelsen til konferencen her:

[http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2020/06/invitation-til-konferenc
evil-menneskeheden-blomstre-op-eller-gaa-til-grundefremtiden-
kraever-et-fire-magts-topmoede-nu/](http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/2020/06/invitation-til-konferenc
evil-menneskeheden-blomstre-op-eller-gaa-til-grundefremtiden-
kraever-et-fire-magts-topmoede-nu/)

VIDEO ARKIV: INTERNATIONAL

VIDEOKONFERENCE den 25.-26. april:

Menneskehedens eksistens afhænger af etableringen af et nyt paradigme nu!

HARLEY SCHLANGER d. 22. april, 2020: Jeg opfordrer dig til at slutte dig til os ved denne konference, da vi klart står over for et øjeblik i menneskets historie, hvor din kreative aktivitet, og din stemme er vigtig, fordi du kan nu spille en rolle i historien.

Der er ingen tvivl om, at vi er ved et vendepunkt. Den kombinerede effekt af coronavirus-pandemien og det økonomiske krak gør, at vi befinder os i ukendt farvand, og vi ser, at der vedtages en politik, som er det nøjagtig modsatte af, hvad der burde gøres. Især i forhold til økonomien, med redningspakkerne, med den stigende mængde af likviditet der pumpes ud af Federal Reserve, den amerikanske centralbank. Men endnu farligere, som Helga påpegede i vores diskussion i sidste uge, er det rablende anti-kinesiske hysteri, der kommer fra de selvsamme mennesker, der bragte Russiagate, og de selvsamme mennesker som er ansvarlige for den økonomiske krise. Især har vi identificeret Henry Jackson-Selskabet og Atlanterhavsrådet, der havde en konference for to dage siden for at diskutere, hvorfor vi er 'i krig med Kina', og hvorfor vi taber, og nu opfordrer den vestlige alliance til at opgradere dets aktivitet for at besejre Kina.

I stedet for skal vi samarbejde! Stillet over for denne krise bør vi hæve vores blik såvel som vores hjerter til at omfavne menneskeheden, og samarbejde for at komme med løsninger. Og i weekenden 25.-26. april – lørdag og søndag – vil vi præsentere

en konference, som er åben for dig her på siden, eller på

Schiller Instituttets internationale hjemmeside

Men lad mig give dig en fornemmelse af programmet, så du kan se, hvad vi skal diskutere, og dets vigtighed. Det vil forresten være online, så det vil være tilgængeligt for alle jer, der har adgang til internettet.

I dag lørdag kl. 16 dansk tid

Panel 1: "Det presserende behov for at erstatte geopolitikken med et nyt paradigme i internationale relationer".

Panel Moderator: Dennis Speed

10:00 USA østkysttid– Opening Remarks & Introduction

Dennis Speed, Schiller Institute

10:15 – Keynote Address

Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Founder and Chairman, Schiller Institute

10:55 – Dmitriy Polyanskiy, 1st Deputy Permanent Representative

The Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations

11:10 –H.E. Ambassador Huang Ping

Consul General of the People's Republic of China in New York

"For a Better Future: Proposed Principles Needed to Ensure Peaceful and Productive Relations Between China and the United States"

11:25–12:00 – Q&A with Zepp-LaRouche and representatives of Russia and China

12:00 – Jacques Cheminade

Chairman, Solidarité et Progrès, former French Presidential

Candidate

“A Europe Not To Be Ashamed Of”

12:20 – Michele Geraci

Economist from Italy, former Undersecretary to the Development Ministry in Rome

12:35–1:15 – Q&A with Zepp-LaRouche, Cheminade, and Geraci

1:15 – Helga Zepp-LaRouche

“Introducing the LaRouche Legacy Foundation”

1:30–2:00 – Q&A continued

Dette vil tage udfordringen op, som Lyndon LaRouche foreslog for mere end et årti siden, at de fire stormagter – Rusland, Kina, Indien og De Forenede Stater – mødes for at diskutere et nyt paradigme, herunder en Ny Bretton Woods-aftale, og inkluderende et samarbejde om LaRouches Fire Love for at muliggøre en global økonomisk genoplivning. Samarbejde, ikke konfrontation, ikke geopolitik, som er en britisk opfindelse. Vi er nødt til at afslutte regimeskifteketup, gøre en ende på de uendelige krige og i stedet arbejde sammen. Dette var præsident Trumps erklærede intention, da han blev valgt; dette er grunden til, at han blev angrebet med Russiagate, og til at der i dag er en samordnet indsats fra begge partierne, fra efterretningssamfundet og fra medierne for at vende præsident Trump mod Kina og mod Xi Jinping. Så i det første panel diskuterer vi, hvordan vi kan overvinde geopolitikken.

I dag lørdag kl. 21.00 dansk tid,

Panel 2: “For en bedre forståelse af hvordan vores univers fungerer.”

LaRouchePAC Science Team: Megan Beets, Benjamin Deniston, Jason Ross: “In Defense of the Human Species”

Plus additional experts

Dette er afgørende, fordi vi har set en forandring på områder inden for videnskabelig forskning, i mange tilfælde, som i tilfældet med den såkaldte "grønne" politik, til en anti-videnskabelig tilgang, der igen er designet til at beskytte det finansielle system, men ikke til at skabe fremgang for den menneskelige art. Og så vil vi tage spørgsmål op fra skikkelser som Kepler og Leibniz, Einstein, Vernadsky – hvad er i grunden videnskab? Og hvad er menneskets forhold til universet, det ikke-levende til det levende og det levende til noösfæren, fornuftsfæren, det vil sige domænet for menneskelig kreativitet.

Søndag 26. april kl. 17 dansk tid

Panel 3: "Kreativitet som den markant karakteristiske egenskab ved menneskelig kultur: Behovet for en klassisk renæssance."

Beethoven, An die ferne Geliebte, John Sigerson accompanied by Margaret Greenspan

Lyndon LaRouche "I Have Insisted that Music is Intelligible!"

Helga Zepp-LaRouche, founder and chairwoman, Schiller Institute

William Warfield, "A Poetic Musical Offering"

John Sigerson, "The Physical Power of Classical Poetry and Music"

Diane Sare, "On the Employment of Chorus in Politics"

and other experts

Sandsynligvis et af de vigtigste paneler, vi nogensinde har haft, Hvis man ser på alt det rænkespind og den dårskab der breder sig, hvilket i store træk ikke er uventet, i betragtning af fordummelsen af befolkningen, og også det virkelige stress og angst, som folk står overfor, idet vi ser civilisationen, som vi kender den, falde sammen, må folk have

noget dybere at falde tilbage på for at komme med løsninger. Og en af de ting vi vil gøre, er at se på hvad det var, der gjorde det muligt for Renæssancen at opstå, den håndfuld af enkeltpersoner, videnskabsfolk, kunstnere, digtere, mennesker, der kiggede på menneskets forhold til universet og gjorde fremskridt gennem kreative opdagelser – i et øjeblik af dyb fortvivlelse, fordi Renæssancen kom efter, at den Sorte Pest havde fejtet hen over Europa i midten af det 14. århundrede, og udslettet fra en tredjedel til halvdelen af befolkningen på hele kontinentet.

Så i dag, hvor vi står over for lignende kriser, kan vi ikke “vende tilbage til normalen”, fordi ‘business as usual’ var det der fik os ind i denne krise. Så ved at ændre den måde mennesket ser på sig selv, og vi ser på hinanden, som vi ser på andre nationer, at vi legemliggør Schillers princip om, at man skal være en patriot i forhold til ens eget land, men samtidig en verdensborger: Hvis vi ser på dette udtryk gennem kreativitet og musik og kunst, kan vi finde en bedre version af os selv, så vi kan arbejde på at løse disse problemer.

Søndag kl. 21 dansk tid på søndag

Panel 4: “Videnskaben om fysisk økonomi.”

Dennis Small, United States, Schiller Institute Director for Ibero-America: “LaRouche’s Legacy: Foundation of the Modern Science of Physical Economy.”

Sébastien Périmony, France, Schiller Institute representative: “When Africa Looks to the Stars.”

Phillip Tsokolibane, South Africa, leader of LaRouche South Africa.

Bob Baker, United States: “Feed the Future: Eating Is a Moral Right—A Dialogue With American Farmers.”

and other experts

Dette er LaRouches specielle felt; Lyndon LaRouche var en pioner inden for hele denne idé om fysisk økonomi. Og dette kombinerer videnskab, det kombinerer historie, det kombinerer kultur, psykologi, kan man sige, hvordan det går til, at vi kan opbygge en økonomi, der reflekterer de menneskelige væsener, som vi er.

Dette er en yderst spændende konference. Vi har talere fra hele verden. Vi håber at have deltagere fra hele verden, og jeg forventer, at mange af jer vil tage tiden til at overvinde jeres dysterhed, jeres apati, jeres frustration, jeres vrede, og tænde jeres sind og lytte til diskussionen, deltage om I vil – og for at gøre det, skal man registrere sig, så gå til Schiller Instituttets website og tilmeld dig, så du kan deltage. Det vil finde sted denne weekend, 25.-26. april, og starter kl. 16 i Europa.

Tak fordi du lyttede med. Jeg vender tilbage i næste uge med Helga LaRouche, men jeg forventer at se dig deltage denne weekend i vores konference. Tak, fordi du deltager. Farvel!

**International ungdomsopkald
med Helga Zepp-LaRouches**

tirsdag 31. marts kl. 16-18

dansk tid via Zoom

Verden er i en alvorlig krise, som er uhørt, uden sidestykke. De gode nyheder er, at eftersom situationen er resultatet af de sidste årtiers forfærdelige politik, vil det være umuligt at "vende tilbage til normal praksis". Helga Zepp-LaRouche har opfordret unge mennesker til at tage lederskab på dette tidspunkt med store forandringer, for at bekæmpe de to dødelige virusser som nu truer menneskeheden – coronavirus-pandemien og nedsmeltningen af det globale finanssystem.

Vi må komme ud af denne krise med et helt nyt paradigme for fredelig sameksistens mellem nationer og et nyt økonomisk system baseret på samarbejde om fremskridt for hele menneskeheden. Som det bliver mere og mere graverende med coronavirus-pandemien, vil det blive en hasteprioritet at bygge et moderne globalt sundhedssystem for at sikre retten til liv for alle mennesker på jorden.

Videokonferencen er en mulighed for unge mennesker at tale med Helga Zepp-LaRouche og tilslutte sig kampen for dette nye paradigme.

Efter indledende bemærkninger af Helga, vil repræsentanter fra hver nation give en 2 til 4 minutter lang rapport om deres organisering, og en spørgerunde vil herefter følge.

HVORNÅR

31. marts kl. 16-18, dansk tid

HVOR

Voom video konference

Klik her for at tilmelde dig: <http://LPAC.co/hz-youth>

Del venligst med dine unge kontakter!

**Luk den neoliberale kasino-
økonomi ned nu, den er
håbløst bankerot.**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche, d. 19. marts,
2020**

Schiller Instituttets formand Helga Zepp-LaRouche offentliggjorde, d. 18. marts, en presserende appel, som hun understregede i sit webcast, d. 19. marts, for at lukke finanssystemet ned i flere dage, således at der vil være tid til at indføre nødvendige reformer, begyndende med en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, for, gennem en konkursbehandling, at reorganisere det nuværende finanssystem. Det neoliberale system er bankerot, sagde hun, pga. det skifte der begyndte for 50 år siden, væk fra efterkrigstidens Bretton Woods-systems faste vekselkurser, over til en dereguleret, spekulativ kasinoøkonomi.

Det finansielle sammenbrud, som finder sted samtidig med coronapandemiens udbredelse, kan ikke løses gennem flere redningspakker, hvilket blot forlænger ødelæggelsen af den virkelige økonomi. Yderligere vil dette underminere indsatsen undervejs for at rette op på kollapset af sundhedssystemets verden over, der blev saboteret med "sundhed for profit" for

øje (i profitmaksimeringens navn). Hvad der nu er brug for, er et fuldt samarbejde mellem de førende nationer – en global solidaritet – som må erstatte det geopolitiske syn. Selvom at der er taget nogle positive skridt i denne retning, forbliver de økonomiske tiltag indenfor neoliberalismens pålagte rammer, i mens nogle embedsmænd, såsom USA's udenrigsminister Pompeo, fortsætter med at søge den geopolitiske konfrontation, som ses i hans angreb på Kina.

For at lykkes i kampen mod den globale pandemi, sagde hun, bør vi lytte til lægestaben fra Wuhan, som førte en heroisk kamp mod sygdommen. Hvad der er brug for er kærlighed, ikke ubegrundede anklager. Krisen har givet os muligheden for at kassere alle geopolitiske og neoliberale aksiomer, og i stedet handle i solidaritet med vore medmennesker.

Afskrift på engelsk:

SHUT DOWN THE NEOLIBERAL CASINO ECONOMY NOW, IT IS HOPELESSLY BANKRUPT!

Schiller Institute New Paradigm Webcast, March 19, 2020

With Helga Zepp-LaRouche

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute, with our weekly webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, our founder and president. It's March 19, 2020.

Let me begin by simply saying that we had intended to do this webcast yesterday, but the sheer volume of activity on the internet has made it questionable. Hopefully, we will be able to get through the briefing and discussion today, but please bear with us if there's some shakiness or jumpiness in the picture. These are extraordinary times, and it does require a certain amount of patience and concentration.

We're facing a situation which is a worldwide emergency, and Helga, we'll start with your call yesterday. You issued an

emergency call for a bank holiday, which I think addresses the problem of the corona virus and the financial crash simultaneously. So, why don't we start with what you said yesterday?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the need to address the fact that we don't only have the coronavirus crisis, which is a pandemic, but we also have clear signs that the financial system is collapsing. So, that is why I issued a call to close the markets for a few days, which I will specify, in order to take the absolutely necessary reforms of the financial system, which has to start with the immediate implementation of a Glass-Steagall banking separation. Followed then by the other measures which we have been asking and demanding for, namely; a national bank in every country; a New Bretton Woods credit system in order to restart the economy and concentrate on the physical economy. This is absolutely necessary because, while it is clear that now, finally, after a quite significant delay, all the governments of the trans-Atlantic sector are clearly taking measures. For example, the European Union has suspended the rules of the stability pact, Trump has invoked the National Defense Act, there are obviously many measures being taken. For example, the various bazookas which have been taken out, giving credit to firms to delay tax payments, to even talk about helicopter money – in other words, directly handing out money to everybody who needs it. All of these things are necessary steps to just keep the economy going, and also calm down the population, which is really in a difficult state of mind. And physically, many people have existential worries about their livelihoods.

But this is all missing one essential point. That is, the reason why we are in this crisis has to be addressed. That is something which absolutely only we can bring on the agenda. So, the very first step would be to close the financial markets in order to implement Glass-Steagall. Now that is obviously something which requires a different kind of

approach. It requires the intervention of the most powerful governments in the world working together. And that is the need to have the summit of the United States, Russia, China, and India; then other countries can support that. But you need a decision on the level of the heads of government to end the casino economy, to go in the direction of a world credit system which enables a world health system. Because it should be very clear that this pandemic will not be fought in one country, but you need a health system in every single country of the world, and that is absolutely not possible under the present circumstances. So therefore, the shutting down of the financial markets is the absolute necessary first step, but it must be followed by the whole package.

SCHLANGER: In saying that, and looking at the importance of taking emergency measures, I think it's really important that people step back and recognize what you just said. This is something that's been in the making for many years, and your expertise in this comes from your long working relationship with your husband, who forecast this back in 1971. It was clear to him back then that this is what we were facing; and yet, governments missed these warnings. Why don't you just review for a moment his forecasting on this, and how we missed the boat?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: My late husband, in 1971, was probably the only economist who with absolute clarity recognized the significance of Nixon abandoning the fixed exchange rate system and abandoning the coupling of the dollar to the gold standard, and going in the direction of unregulated monetarism. He said in August 1971 that if the world would stay on this course, it would absolutely necessarily lead to a new depression and the danger of a new fascism, or you would replace the system with a completely different one; namely, a just, new world economic order. Then, at every step of the way, whenever the financial oligarchy moved in the direction of further deregulation, he absolutely pointed to the

consequences of that. He predicted the crash of 1987, he absolutely recognized the significance of the 1997 so-called Asia crisis as being really the eruption of a global crisis. And he made this famous video on the 25th of July in 2007, saying this is the end of the system, and all which we see right now will be coming to the surface of the total bankruptcy of the system.

Obviously, the measures which were taken by the central banks and the G-20 after the 2008 collapse, just amplified the problem by pumping more liquidity into the system. Now we are at the absolute end phase of that process. He also was very much on the record saying the consequences in the physical economy of this monetarism would lead to the eruption of pandemics. It would lead to the re-emergence of old diseases, and the emergence of new epidemics, pandemics; because you cannot lower the living standard of entire continents over a long period of time without causing such breakdowns of the health system, the immune system. That is exactly the point we are at right now, and that is why we are saying that you cannot remedy it by just controlling this pandemic. Because if you don't remove the causes, the danger is that new viruses, new diseases will emerge. So, we are at an absolute fundamental point that we have to change the whole system.

SCHLANGER: I think we're seeing some governments beginning to recognize that this is more than just a simple crisis. Macron, for example, announced the suspension of the so-called reforms he was pushing. Macron and others are saying we need to look into what caused the failures of the system. But up to this point, Helga, have you seen anyone addressing the need to reject the whole casino economy and go back to the measures that would feed the physical economy?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No. I think that the measures that have been taken by, for example, Germany – Merkel was yesterday in a TV speech where she really didn't say anything significant. All she said is, "It's up to you to flatten the curve of the

spread of the pandemic." Now, I don't think that is the way to go about it at all. Naturally what is behind that is how all the Western governments are now confronted with the fact that the takedown of the health system over the last decades, the privatization, the shutting down hospitals, shutting down other facilities for the sake of profit, is now haunting everybody, because we have a severe shortage of such facilities. But, I think the approach which was taken by China has been a completely different one. They did not talk about flattening the curve; they took in Wuhan and Hubei province very decisive measures. They closed down the entire area of 60 million people and acted in solidarity in the whole country; all of China was supporting that. They were successful in reducing the number of new cases erupting. So, they basically have it under control for the situation in China. That is a successful model. Also, Singapore and South Korea took a similar approach. There is no reason one cannot replicate what China did, if there is solidarity.

Obviously, in the EU, that has been lacking so far. There was no solidarity. This just shows you the deficiency in the neo-liberal and liberal model of everything – the markets, the health system, the cooperation among countries. I think that the situation now is very severe. You can see it in Italy, which was the country which, because of its positive relations with China, did apply the Chinese model to a very large degree. But in northern Italy, in Bergamo, in Lombardy, they are now faced with the situation that the capacity simply is not sufficient. So there is de facto triage, not because they intend it, because the doctors and the nurses around the clock and they are near the point of breakdown; but they simply don't have enough facilities, so they cannot treat every patient. This is a total catastrophe.

But China, which not only totally successfully contained the virus, is now worried that it may come back from abroad, because other governments did not apply the same rigorous

methods. But the Chinese are providing help. They have sent medical experts to Iran, to Iraq, to Spain, to Italy. They have offered help to any country which wants to take it. They are sending massive supplies to Italy, Spain, and France, who they regard as having shown to have been friends with China. I think the only thing to draw as a conclusion is to stop this anti-China bashing. First of all, it's completely insane; it is not justified. Cooperate. I think this is the moment where you have to work together as a human species. China has provided the way to go.

You need to learn the Chinese lesson from Wuhan, and that is the best thing the Europeans and others like the United States can do right now.

SCHLANGER: On the question of the takedown of the public health system and replacing it with a totally for-profit health care, which has obviously failed, even the New York Times admitted this today. I just want to read a couple of quotes from an article there where they said that it's now the EU austerity which has left the health care systems unprepared. We're talking about Europe, but the same thing can be said about the United States. They said, in the southern European countries, they're ill-prepared for a pandemic. They describe this as "tragically vulnerable", that the countries are tragically vulnerable.

Now, we had in the United States, a standard set with the Hill-Burton system, of 4.5 hospital beds per 1000 people. This was taken down starting in 1974. Helga, you were talking about a world health standard. What would that take to get a Hill-Burton standard for the whole world now?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, you would need a crash program approach, where obviously those countries which have the capability would have to help those who don't. But all together, it would mean to build 35 million new hospital beds worldwide. It would require having the necessary electricity,

which would mean the creation of 358 gigawatts of new electricity; most of which would also have to be built in a crash program. You would need the increase of clean water supplies by 40% of the existing capabilities. So that obviously is a completely different approach, and would require a completely different approach in terms of real industrialization of the Southern Hemisphere. That brings you to the absolute point where this went wrong. We are now at the point where we have to make a fundamental decision: Do we want to in the direction of a Malthusian world order, which indeed would mean what the British system has been pushing? Like Jeremy Warner in the Daily Telegraph, wrote a couple of weeks ago, that the coronavirus has a benefit; namely that it is culling older people. That notion of culling, that you treat the human species as a herd of animals which must be culled, this has been our attack against the British Malthusian genocide approach for a very long time. This is now what obviously is coming to the fore. We have to make a fundamental decision, that we absolutely reject this idea that there are useless people, which obviously is behind some of the thinking, because the danger is that we come out of this with a Green approach, with a Malthusian approach. We have to absolutely go in the opposite direction, and go for the full industrialization of the world economy. We have to have the industrialization of Africa, of Southwest Asia. That is the key moral decision which the whole human race has to make at this point.

SCHLANGER: As you said, this would require international solidarity. I think there is still the proposal that you made, and was somewhat adopted by others, that there be an emergency summit of the great powers. How could they act to bring about not just this new world health standard, but a new financial system?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I made this proposal for an emergency summit of the United States, Russia, and China following the

assassination of Iranian General Soleimani on the third of January this year, because there was the immediate danger of an escalation which could have gone into a superpower conflict. Subsequently, President Putin called for a summit of the Permanent Five of the UN Security Council to establish the principles for the continued collaboration and survival of the human species. Now in the meantime, all the governments of the Permanent Five have agreed – the US, China, Russia, France, and Great Britain – that they would agree to this. I still think that the absolutely necessary combination is the United States, Russia, China, and India, being representative for the whole world, and then other countries should cooperate. I think we have reached the point where we have to different principles in the international cooperation. Geopolitics must be absolutely put aside forever. We have to define the common aims of mankind; we have to agree on those principles which constitute the one humanity. That would first of all mean to establish a system of new international relations of countries respecting the sovereignty of everyone, of non-interference, of accepting the different social system of the other one. And then agree on joint economic development programs to overcome poverty, to overcome underdevelopment.

I think the only realistic proposal on the table is what China proposed with the New Silk Road, the Belt and Road Initiative, which already 157 countries are participating in. The Schiller Institute, already several years ago, started to publish reports – “The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge” – which is a comprehensive economic study of how to bring industrial development to every continent on this planet. Some of these projects are in different degrees of realization, but that would be the kind of platform which has to be agreed upon by the top governments in the world. That way you could start a real economic development plan following such a summit right away. It would mean you completely change the orientation. In a certain sense it's like the end of the Thirty Years' War, where people recognized that if they continued, there would be

nobody left to enjoy the victory, so-called. That is the point humanity has reached right now.

We have reached a point where we either become rational and cooperate, or we may not only face a Dark Age, but we may actually face a real holocaust of the whole human race.

SCHLANGER: I think a lot of people would like to get your assessment of the so-called financial measures that are being taken, beyond those that are emergency funds to provide care or funds for people who are losing jobs, a moratorium on foreclosures – at least for a month or two. But what we see from the Federal Reserve in the United States, as an example, is a bail-out of the speculators of extraordinary level of so-called credit; basically, funny money. What's your assessment of that? Obviously, this goes against what you're talking about in terms of the financial bankruptcy reorganization.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: That just reflects the intention of Wall Street to keep the casino economy going. They bring out what they call the big bazooka, I think the Federal Reserve put in \$1.2 trillion in various support actions, buying up bonds, buying up all kinds of debt to keep the derivative bubble going. The European Central Bank has announced 750 billion, and that is not the end of it. If they keep doing that, and there is right now the clear intention to do so, it will lead to a hyperinflationary blow-out of the whole system.

I'm not saying that these temporary measures to keep individual families and firms going by giving all kinds of support measures, that may be useful in the short-term. But you need to end the casino economy. You absolutely have to have Glass-Steagall, because this would shut down the casino economy for good. You put the commercial banks under state protection, you put a firewall between the commercial banks and the investment banks and all the other operators and players. If they have no more access to the savings of the commercial banks, or do not get bail-outs from the taxpayers

any more, they will have to bring the books in order on their own and if they can't do it, they have to be closed down. That is the kind of intervention which now absolutely needs to exist. If this thing is continuing, you will end up in a hyperinflationary blow-out like what happened in Germany in 1923. That is the complete expropriation of the life savings of the population, and that would lead to a social explosion such as I don't even want to imagine.

So, I call upon all rational people to support our action that this approach – that you need a summit of the most important governments of the world, and they have to end the casino economy, and they have to adopt a system of integrated cooperation for world development. If there is sufficient support for that, it can be done, because there is already motion in this direction. So, I'm calling upon you, that you sign this appeal which will be below this webcast [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/four_laws_new], and that you help us to circulate this idea. Because there is a lot of confusion right now, a lot of panic, a lot of chaos. But you have to elevate the whole discussion on a much higher level, and that has to be one of unity of the entire world. Then we can solve it.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned ending the casino economy, I found it somewhat interesting that yesterday the state of Nevada shut down the casinos in Las Vegas. That's a good step in the right direction.

Helga, come back to this question of international solidarity, and why that's necessary. Unfortunately, we have someone who hasn't gotten that message; namely, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, who continues to rant against China, talking about escalating sanctions against Iran, which is one of the countries that has been badly affected by the coronavirus. What can you say about that? Obviously, this is the opposite of solidarity.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think President Trump has been capable of getting rid of some of his bad advisors in the past, like Bolton. And I think he would be very well advised to get rid of Pompeo. What Pompeo is doing right now in his anti-China campaign is really dangerous. The relationship between the United States and China has been deteriorating. It's very difficult to assess all of this, because there is a lot of fake news being circulated right now, and one has to be very careful in assessing this.

Let me bring in another element of this. There is a geopolitical dimension in a lot of things that are happening right now. There was, for example, a scenario played out in October 2019, where the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the World Economic Forum, the CIA, and the UN, and a couple of other institutions had a scenario acting out a new pandemic hitting the world with the coronavirus, and they basically came to the conclusion that this would cause 65 million deaths. Now that was the very same day the military games were conducted in New York on the very same day in Wuhan the military games started, and subsequently the Chinese Foreign Ministry raised the question, if the virus had not originated in Wuhan, but possibly coming from US soldiers participating in these war games. There is a big story as to what was the role of Fort Detrick, which was closed down last July. In any case, I'm not in a position now to assess the validity of all of this. And as I said, there is a lot of psywar fake news, disinformation. But this whole question has now led to a brawl whereby Pompeo is continuously talking about the China virus. The Chinese government correctly refuted that as a racist policy. This is going back and forth, and unfortunately, President Trump has repeatedly also used that language of the China virus.

This is very dangerous, and naturally, there is also this question of Iran. The oil price right now is at \$20/barrel for Brent crude [North Sea], and that means the entire shale-gas

industry at this point is completely bankrupt. So, there is absolutely the danger that on top of this present crisis, you could have a war in the Middle East, with the intention to drive up the price of oil. I'm just saying that we are in a situation where if this present situation is not brought under control in the way I said before, that we could really end up in a complete strategic disaster. This is why I think President Trump is doing a lot of positive things. He has started a very useful cooperation, for example, with Governor Andrew Cuomo from New York. There are lots of things where people overcome bipartisanship. But there is also this other tendency. So, I think the absolute necessity right now is to go for an international cooperation and address the common aims of mankind as an absolute necessity of surviving for all of us.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned earlier the period of the Thirty Years' War and the end of the Thirty Years' War, which led to the Peace of Westphalia. This actually does give us an opportunity to reflect on the actual nature of man, as opposed to being totally focussed on material wealth, greed, making money. You actually have an opportunity to sit back and reflect on why we're here. And I think it would be very useful, Helga, at this moment of great anxiety and stress, for you to reiterate points to what is that nature of man? And how do we regain this concept of the cooperation among beautiful souls?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I think that the medical team of doctors who worked in Wuhan, they just issued a very beautiful video and message, where they told what incredible strain one goes through in this period. But then they say they came out of it with the idea that what was really needed was love. That each individual human being is mortal, but what is immortal is love. Love for your loved ones, your family, your nation; love for mankind. And that that is the kind of spirit which needs to be evoked. I think this is really the true tendency you can

clearly see. You have those people who are for humanity, like for example, the unbelievable work being done by the many doctors and nurses around the world, and other people who help to make this situation function. And people who grow, who show a humanity which goes beyond anything which was there before. But then you also have the people who are displaying their evil nature. I think in a certain sense, we are now at the point where we have to shed all the axioms which led to this situation; which is geopolitics, monetarism, Darwinism, the liberal system that everything is allowed. And we have to replace it with the idea that the human species is the only creative species known in the universe so far. That we have to employ these creative capacities to relate to each other from that standpoint to respect the creative mind of the other; to show the kind of solidarity which has been demonstrated, especially by such doctors in China in Wuhan. That should be an inspiration of how we get out of this crisis.

SCHLANGER: I would encourage all of our viewers to take the time now, especially if you are off work or you have limited hours, instead of sitting there worrying, or wasting your time watching CNN or MSNBC, go to the Schiller Institute website; go to the LaRouche PAC website; and familiarize yourself with the ideas of Lyndon LaRouche, particularly related to the Four Laws of Economics, and also the Four Power Agreement.

So, Helga, do you have anything else to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I can only add that a lot of people in Italy are now going to their balconies and singing. You have opera houses playing for free to be transmitted on the internet. Since we are in the year of Beethoven, I can only say that the best thing to get the inspiration is to listen to a lot of Beethoven. Otherwise, I really think that if you go into the archives of our website and study the works of Lyndon LaRouche, that is actually a very good advice. Because we have to come out of this present crisis with a completely different approach. I think between Beethoven and LaRouche, you will

find a lot of the inspiration needed. So, we will come back with other programs as the situation unfolds. So, stay tuned, and help us to change this paradigm.

SCHLANGER: OK, Helga. Thank you very much.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: 'Til soon.

SCHLANGER: 'Til soon.

<https://www.larouchepac.com/20200319/shut-down-neo-liberal-casino-economy-it-hopelessly-bankrupt>

**Vil de igangværende chok
fremprovokere en ny slags
tænkning,
der er nødvendig for at
overvinde en ny mørk
tidsalder?**

**Schiller Instituttets
ugentlige webcast med Helga
Zepp-LaRouche d. 11. marts
2020**

Helga gentager de seriøse advarsler fra ledende tyske eksperter indenfor smitsomme sygdomme og ser på Wuhan-modellen

for at bryde smittevejene i begyndelsen. Helga beder lande om at koordinere deres indsats for at besejre denne pandemi, inklusiv at dæmme op for de økonomiske indvirkninger på den globale økonomi, men det betyder ikke at redde Wall Street! (Se hendes opdaterede underskriftsbegæring)

Helga og Harley diskuterer svindelen med her-og- nu-økonomien, og påmindelse folk om Lyndon LaRouches advarsel, at hvis vi fortsatte ned ad vejen mod nulvækst, ville Vesten ikke længere være i stand til at opretholde sig selv og ville sprænges indad. Hun kræver en ende på geopolitik, og at alle kræfter må være fokuserede på at løse den fælles virus- og finanskrise. Pas på dig selv, og tak for at du følger vores arbejde.

Afskrift på engelsk:

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger from the Schiller Institute, welcome to our webcast with our founder and President Helga Zepp-LaRouche. It's March 11, 2020. And now we're very deep into a process which has been unfolding rapidly with the coronavirus, the emergence of a pandemic worldwide. And Helga, this is something that people in the West have been trying to wish away, but it's something that's going to be wished away: It requires a total change in thinking. Why don't you start with your thoughts on that, because you have been very out front in the need for an emergency call to reject this old paradigm, and move to the new.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I think the situation is very serious. It probably will not be possible without a lot of casualties, but nevertheless, if there are decisive measures now, and a complete change in the attitude, the damage can be minimized. Otherwise, it will be catastrophic.

Now, I think it is useful to listen to the experts from Germany who are making regular podcasts, Christian Drosten, the virologist from Berlin Charité hospital, and Professor

Lothar Wieler from the Robert Koch Institute, and they put out very drastic warnings. What Drosten said is that there will be no lessening of the increasing in the spring and summer period, which some people temporarily assumed, because we will face a virus wave, and naturally, in the summer period, the virus will continue to spread to the summer hemisphere, where it will be winter, and then in all likelihood return even more, and with possible mutations in the fall, and a vaccine, as of now, cannot be expected before a year or so.

So, Merkel announced what is now commonplace among many leaders of countries, that the infection rate probably will infect 70% of the population, and unfortunately, it is absolutely not true what our Health Minister Jens Spahn still thought in January, which is really incredible, where he said that the coronavirus does not represent a danger for Germany, and that the mortality rate of the coronavirus would be lower than of the common flu – that's what he said in January.

Now, obviously, that that was not the case was clear, already if people looked to China, which in the month of January was waging an incredible battle, and by closing down the entire city of Wuhan and Hubei province, effecting a lockdown for 60 million people, implementing it and also enforcing it and having a population which was very cooperative in doing so, according to the World Health Organization, China has set a new standard in dealing with such pandemics. And the West could have taken that as an example, but people in the West are just too arrogant, too Euro-centric, or too Western-centric, so they thought they could ignore, or even think "this is affecting China and not coming to Europe or the United States"; so they lost three valuable months, maybe not entirely, but obviously, a completely different attitude would have been necessary.

And now, it is spreading and changing by the hour, so people are completely aware of the fact that this is out of control. And I do not want to add to any panic, but it is very clear

that the numbers which are announced right now are not accurate. I talked to my colleagues in France, today, and there are only a little bit more than 1,000 tests which have been made in France so far! That is not a representative figure which comes out, then. And we have some cases where people clearly have symptoms, and they try to get tests, and they were told, there are no tests in France right now, France doesn't have the production capability and all the tests have been bought up and there simply are no tests. So, obviously, the fact that in Germany, there are only two deaths so far, as of this webcast [midday in Germany March 11 – ed], they attribute that to the very well testing – now, we have to see.

I think the lesson from Wuhan, and now that all of Italy is basically a red zone, after some very irrational behavior on the side of some citizens, after the north was locked down, you have quite an advanced situation; but I think the lesson to be learned from all of that is that is that we have to learn from China. We have to get rid of our Western arrogance, and simply look at the way how China effectively dealt with it, and then the only conclusion is, that you have to enforce these measures before you have a mass of cases. That means that if you have anywhere, a region, like some cities or areas in North Rhine-Westphalia, one should apply the Wuhan model immediately. It should be closed down, there should be a quarantine for a certain number of weeks, and these measures must be taken early on, because everything which counts in this is the speed, to take preemptive measures before the virus spreads completely out of control.

So I think we are in a very serious situation, but it's not some moment where you can completely panic, but there are clear ways, and I think the Chinese efficiency with which they dealt with this, should be a lesson for everybody.

SCHLANGER: When you speak of the arrogance, I think you're referring, in particular, to the continued adherence to geopolitics, to the neo-liberal model, the whole idea that the

West is superior, the West has solved all the problems. Isn't this what hampers the thinking of people at the European Union and many of the people in the U.S. Congress, and think tanks in the United States?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the reaction so far by the leading politicians, for example, the European finance ministers – the so-called Eurogroup – they have a meeting on March 16, and on their agenda is first, the European Stability Mechanism, and then something else, and then only third, the coronavirus attack, and it is very clear that the reason why the reaction was so late, and why they didn't use the word "pandemic," because they were more concerned about the stock market, the efficiency and the profits coming from the so-called "pandemic bond" – which is an absurdity all by itself, that you would try to finance the cost of pandemics with bonds from which people can make a profit, but only if you have the maturity of the bond. So, I think the thinking is still very much dominated by the geopolitical idea: For example, yesterday, I was listening – and one should actually stop doing that! – I was listening to the ZDF news and this moderator reported about the coronavirus crisis, but then, instead of praising what the Chinese accomplished in Wuhan, he took the occasion to blast China and attack it, or to continue to attack Russia, China, that has to stop! Because if you look at it, the only way how humanity will get out of the crisis, is international cooperation. Wang Yi, the Chinese Foreign Minister, has just telephoned the Italian Foreign Minister Luigi Di Maio, and the Chinese offered share their experience, to send their experts; they're donating masks, protective suits, and tests to Italy. This is a completely different approach. And I think the West has much to learn how to respond to challenges which all of humanity is facing. And this whole geopolitical thinking is really one of troglodytes and should be eliminated completely.

SCHLANGER: We see people like U.S. Secretary of State Mike Pompeo continuing to attack China; he calls coronavirus the

“Wuhan virus” – you have this kind of attitude, when in fact, what we’re seeing is a significant drop of cases in China. And you mentioned earlier the importance of President Xi Jinping going to Wuhan to talk to the people who are on the front lines. I think it’s important to report this, Helga, because it’s not going out in the Western press.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I have proposed something, which may look impossible to some people, but I dare the prediction that the situation will – because of this ineffectiveness of Western response – that the situation will soon come to the point where more and more people are recognizing that what I’m saying is the only way to address this problem. What I have reiterated is my call to have an emergency summit by Xi Jinping, Putin, Trump, Modi, as a minimum combination, to address all these problems. Because it’s very clear that we need an international cooperation concerning the coronavirus pandemic. This is already threatening the international financial system: We saw, in the last several weeks, several plunges, absolutely of the same dimension as after the 2008 systemic collapse, or after the September 11, 2001 attack; and only because the central banks have now decided to flood the markets, to lower the interest rates – like the Bank of England lowered the interest rate by a half-percent, 50 basis points, today – as if the simple pushing of liquidity would remedy any of the real, physical causes for why the system is collapsing. So, I want to have a mobilization of the population to demand that the leaders of the most important governments – of the United States, Russia, China, and India – need to discuss the Four Points which were proposed by my late husband Lyndon LaRouche, in June 2014, because you need to have an immediate end of the global casino economy, by implementing a Glass-Steagall system; we have discussed this many times on this program, but it is the only combination of measures which would address the problem. Then, you need a national bank in every country; in Germany, we could extend the functions of the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau; have a

national bank in every other country; have an international cooperation among these national banks, reinstate fixed exchange rates, and then have agreements about industrial development projects, like the industrial development of Southwest Asia, of Africa, and this will become then, a New Bretton Woods system. There must be cooperation with the Chinese New Silk Road to have these kinds of development plans. And we need a crash program to go into a new platform of higher productivity of the economy, joint cooperation in advanced technologies, like fusion, like biophysics, like space research cooperation. And then, such a summit could implement these measures, and then could have a series of such summits, and that way change the geopolitics, and move towards an international cooperation, a shared future of humanity.

And that shift has to occur. And I'm predicting, and I think I'm on the safe side in doing so, that the crisis will accelerate, there will be many more unfortunate consequences, and people will recognize that to establish a completely different level of thinking will be the only way out for all of mankind.

If you agree with that, you should help this mobilization. There is a resolution, which is attached to this webcast [https://schillerinstitute.nationbuilder.com/four_laws_new], please sign it, please spread it among your friends and colleagues, get more people to sign it: Because we need a public discussion about this, and public demand that the whole world should move into a completely new way of cooperating and solving these kinds of problems.

SCHLANGER: I've received a few emails from people who have asked, why do we focus on "neo-liberalism" as the problem? What does that have to do with the virus? And I think it's important to look at what Dr. Redfield of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) had to say about the need to rebuild the system: That the so-called "just-in-time" system, which has been accepted as an economic model doesn't

work. We need redundancy. And Helga, I think it would be very useful for you to just review again, why this neo-liberal system is the cause, or sets humanity up for these kinds of crises. Because this is what your husband was warning, going back to 1971, with the Biological Holocaust Task Force he set up, and so on.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: The prognosis of Lyndon LaRouche, which he made on Aug. 15, 1971, when Nixon dissolved the Bretton Woods system by going to floating exchange rates, by decoupling the dollar from the gold-reserve standard and that way, opening the deregulation of the markets which has escalated ever since. My husband at that point had made the prognosis that if the West would continue on this road, of liberalizing the markets, of going with neo-liberal, monetarist policies, that it would end up in a new depression and the danger of a new fascism; or, one would go to a completely new economic system.

Now, that prognosis has proven to be absolutely on the mark. And the Biological-Ecological Holocaust Task Force which you just mentioned, he set up in 1974, and it was to study the effects of the policies of the IMF and World Bank on the economic system, especially in the developing sector. And in meantime, we have produced *many* studies, which you can all see in our archives, that if you impose such austerity or zero growth policies, especially on the developing countries, that you would inevitably cause the emergence of old diseases and new diseases, because you cannot consistently lower the living standard of entire continents, as the IMF and World Bank have done in the last 50 years, without creating conditions of breakdown. And that is exactly what you see right now: Because you don't have only the coronavirus crisis, you have the locust situation getting completely out of control in many African states, in the Horn of Africa, and in the Arabian Peninsula and Pakistan-India, even threatening to go into China.

Then, as part of this geopolitical, liberal scheme of the

West, the refugee crisis: It's not a natural phenomenon, it is the result of the interventionist wars conducted by the Bush Administrations and Obama, with the idea that you have to spread "democracy" and "human rights" and that it's legitimate to make interventionist wars against Iraq – doesn't matter if it's based on lies that there are so-called weapons of mass destruction which Nancy Pelosi, in the meantime has admitted that they all knew it was lie and they did it anyway; Iraq, Afghanistan – these are all the reasons why you have a refugee crisis. The underdevelopment of Africa is a result of these policies.

So that is why I am saying, if we don't get rid of this paradigm, which has many elements – it has geopolitics, it has neo-liberal economic policies; but it also a Malthusian dimension to it. The Green axiom which says that nature, or some spiders or some ants somewhere are more important than human beings; and I even go so far as to say that I think the reason why there is such an absolutely bestial attitude – I mean, on the coronavirus, do you think that most African countries or Asian and Latin American countries that do not have the health systems we have, do you think they are testing their people? I don't think so. So the figures are in all likelihood completely off, and the ability of these countries to remedy it is much, much less. And I'm absolutely convinced that there are some people who say, "Oh, there are too many people anyway," like Bertrand Russell, who said, you need a pandemic every generation – these are quotes we have published many times! And the absolutely disgusting way how the EU is dealing with the refugee crisis, now again erupting at the Turkish-Greek border, that is a mindset which is disgusting! And it is the reflection of geopolitics, of the Malthusian idea that there are too many people anyway.

Now, Erdoğan, obviously, is playing his own, terrible games. But I think in this moment, where innocent people who have nothing, – the whole thing is that these refugees, even if

they're sitting in camps for years on end, and have begun speaking Turkish, and now Erdoğan is instrumentalizing them, that may all be true – that's what the Greeks are saying – but what is the solution to that? You have to stop insisting that you have regime change in Syria, that has to stop. There has to be recognition that the only legitimate government in Syria is the one which the Syrian people themselves elect. There was a constitutional process under way, which is now stopped again; that has to be resumed. There has to be an end to the war. Turkey should not be backed by NATO – this is an insane idea. The U.S. special envoy for Syria James Jeffrey just demanded that NATO should fully back up Turkey against Syria, that is complete insanity: What needs to be done is you have to have peace with Syria, and then you have to have an orderly negotiation between the Assad government and the opposition, to arrange for the return of the Syrians to their own country, which is what most people want to do, anyway.

So I think all of these assumptions, that you just keep going with the policies which have proven to be a failure, that that has to absolutely stop. I don't see a sign that the European establishment is capable of doing it. That just means we need a mobilization of the population, because this is becoming a serious existential crisis for all of us, and we have to take responsibility to put in a new paradigm – a paradigm of cooperation, and then we can solve most problems; at least over time, we can find solutions to such problems as coronavirus. But we need to change the view of the West towards China and Russia, and this whole idea that regime change is allowed under the pretext of spreading democracy and human rights, is one of these imperial, colonialist ideas which have to go.

SCHLANGER: Another perfect example of that is the expansion of sanctions against Iran and Venezuela for regime change, in the face of this growing pandemic.

I'd like to come back to one other point, which I think you

alluded to earlier, which is the financial crisis: We now see, if something is going to be quarantined, we ought to quarantine Wall Street and the Bank of England. The idea that lower interest rates will solve something, but what's going on with the repo lending, the incredible demand for liquidity without any concern for solvency, this is the other aspect of Mr. LaRouche's warnings over many years.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes. I don't know how long this will continue. And I think what the central banks are proposing is completely irresponsible, because the continuous flooding of the markets with money, and the idea to go even to negative interests rates, all of this is already eating up the savings and life's earnings of the population, and is threatening at some point to go into a hyperinflation. So these derivatives must be absolutely written off – this is why Glass-Steagall is so crucial – and I think the whole EU program as it was announced by EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen, in this presence of this deplorable Greta Thunberg, that has to go, too! Because you cannot have an industrial state and implement these policies. I think if you want to have hospitals, if you want to have enough intensive care units to deal with such a situation, you have to have a productive society. And that Green policy of von der Leyen it has to go. We need the full package that I talked about before: Glass-Steagall, and the return to Hamiltonian banking, which every time there was a successful economic system in history, whether it was the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt, whether it was the reconstruction of Germany in the postwar period, these were the principles which were applied, and that is what is urgently required.

SCHLANGER: And while this is all going on, we have this incredible soap opera in U.S. politics around the Democratic nomination. I think it would be very useful, as we come toward the end of this webcast, for you to emphasize again, what do you think people should do, to make sure we can change the paradigm? There's a hunger for change, people are still

extremely unhappy, and now, very nervous, both because of the financial crisis and the coronavirus, what should people do? How should they respond?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: Since you mentioned the U.S. situation, I think it's a big problem, because, unfortunately Trump said he had a hunch that the mortality rates of the coronavirus is much less than what the World Health Organization was saying. Now, I think that he's probably saying that because of the election campaign and he thinks that this will intervene. But I think the reality will assert itself very quickly: This will come as fast as it came in Europe, maybe faster even, and the U.S. right now is really unprepared! The health delivery system was taking even more than in Europe. The Democrats have this Biden now as a major candidate – I can only advise people, there is a very interesting collection of videos which was published by *Consortium News*, the author is Caitlin Johnstone [<https://consortiumnews.com/2020/03/06/stop-calling-it-a-stutter-dozens-of-examples-show-bidens-dementia-symptoms/>], and she collected about 20 or so videos of speeches of Biden where you clearly can see that he doesn't have it any more – he's lost it. So the idea to somebody who has clear signs of aging (to put it mildly), to think that you can run him through the Democratic Convention, the election campaign, and then win the election in November against Trump, is also a sign of extreme mental deterioration of the people who think they can do that and get away with it.

So if you look at all of these things, we need a completely new thinking: We are in a Dark Age, the Dark Age is absolutely comparable to the 14th century when the Black Death killed one-third of the European population, and people just went crazy! You see signs of this insanity, already now, and we need therefore, a completely different approach, like it came with the 15th century and the Golden Renaissance in Italy. We can talk about that some other time, but, I think people have to really recognize, we are in a Dark Age, and we have to

reject all the assumptions which have led to this present situation.

And I actually would like to make one other point: I think the coronavirus will force lockdowns, it will force measures, schools and universities are already closed for several weeks in several countries; you don't know yet what will be the effect of all of this on the financial system, on the real economy, and I think on these circumstances, where Merkel is talking about 70% of the population will become infected, and if you assume worldwide it may be 100 million people, and then, if you take present mortality rates, it will be 2-4 million people – under these circumstances, we should not have war games. And therefore, I think we need to stop the present NATO maneuver in Eastern Europe, the Defender-Europe 2020: Because obviously, the virus does not stop in front of the military. And to have these kinds of things going on, when you have an immediate health threat to the population, is really something which doesn't make any sense. So this NATO maneuver should stop. Presently I think the highest commander of the U.S. forces in Germany is a victim of the coronavirus and is in quarantine in Wiesbaden: So, that should just give people to think that the virus does not stop in the face of the military.

And I think we should go in the direction of mobilizing for the summit: I know people think that this is too big, but sometimes, when you are in a real crisis, only if you reach a completely new level of thinking, namely the idea that all the major countries of the world – the United States, Russia, China, and India, as a minimum; and then other countries can come together with these countries – only if you change the level of thinking, and the level of approach, can you find a solution. So if you agree with that, then help us in this mobilization, because, you know, we will do other things: We will call for the rebuilding of the health delivery system, there are other things we can do. But I think because of the

complexity of the world situation, the interaction of all of the elements of the breakdown, that we will not solve the problem unless we go to a completely new paradigm, a new system of international relations, and you should help us in this mobilization, and that's the very best thing you can do for your own life and your own future.

SCHLANGER: And I would recommend, toward that end, that people circulate this webcast, get this webcast around, so people can hear the extent of the crisis and the solutions; and secondly, go to our website, and download the call for emergency summit from Helga Zepp-LaRouche, take that to your city council, to your trade union group – well, maybe you shouldn't go too far, but you can certainly use the internet to get it around and get people signing it and support it.

So, Helga, anything else you want to add?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: No. I think this is a moment where people will be freaked out and it's understandable: But sometimes a shock is also healthy if it helps you to get out of a wrong idea, and to think things through and then move ahead and find a solution. So, I would urge people to overcome your present fears and be confident that if we work together as one humanity, we can solve this.

SCHLANGER: OK, well, with that, we'll see you again, next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.

Formand Tom Gillesbergs tale til Schiller Instituttets konference i Paris

Jacques Cheminade, LaRouche-bevægelsens leder i Frankrig og fhv. præsidentkandidat, og Tom Gillesberg på en tidligere konference.

Den 4. februar 2020 organiserede det franske Schiller Institut et meget vellykket seminar i Paris med titlen: "Dialog mellem Kulturerne eller Handelskrig: Frankrig ved en skillevej." Tæt ved hundrede personer – kontakter, diplomater, foreninger, iværksættere og Kinaeksperter – fyldte lokalet på rådhuset i Paris' 5. arrondissement. Såvel Schiller Instituttets internationale grundlægger og præsident Helga Zepp-LaRouche som formand for det danske Schiller Institut, Tom Gillesberg, sendte varme hilsner samt meddelelser til begivenheden.

Meddelelse fra Tom Gillesberg, formand for det Schiller Instituttet i Danmark:

Jeg er ked af, at jeg på grund af sygdom ikke kan være med jer i dag, men her er nogle tanker jeg gerne vil dele med jer.

I Danmark, og i resten af Skandinavien, har vi gennem de sidste par år set en voksende kampagne i medierne – og med støtte fra efterretningstjenester og regeringsinstitutioner – for at dæmonisere Kina, i lighed med, hvad der igennem nogen tid har været tilfældet for Rusland. Presset kommer fra USA og deres kontrollanter i Storbritannien, og udøves ofte gennem "soft power" ved at sprede historier om Kina såvel som Rusland der skal vise, at de er diktaturer, som man virkelig ikke kan stole på. På det seneste er dette set i den massive kampagne imod at lade det kinesiske firma Huawei, verdens førende leverandør af 5G-teknologi, levere udstyret til det nye 5G-netværk i Danmark og på Færøerne. Nogle prøver endda at bruge

udbruddet af en ny form for coronavirus i Wuhan som et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og dets indflydelse verden over bringer os alle i fare.

Derfor besluttede Schiller Instituttet i Danmark i 2017 at imødegå denne voksende fjendtliggørelse med et projekt for en "Dialog mellem Kulturerne". Sammen med venner, der var aktive i det dansk-russiske samfund, arrangerede vi en koncert, hvor vi havde klassisk musik og dans fra Rusland, Kina, Afrika, Indonesien og mange europæiske lande, for at vise, hvor berigede vi alle bliver ved at få adgang til alle disse andre nationers kultur. Kinas Kulturinstitut i København var også medsponsor, og arrangementet blev afholdt i det russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur.

Koncerten var en stor succes. Vi havde en fuldt pakket sal, og på trods af at vi fik ekstra stole bragt ind, var vi nødt til at afvise mange der kom. Publikum blev imponeret og bevæget af mangfoldigheden og skønheden af bidragene ved koncerten. Især afsyngningen af en kinesisk folkesang af en kinesisk studerende sammen med Feride Istogu Gillesberg, vicepræsident for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og hovedorganisator af begivenheden, betog publikum. Hvordan er det muligt, at en europæer kan synge på kinesisk og skabe så bevægende og smuk musik?

Siden dengang har vi haft yderligere to meget succesfulde koncerter, med fremtrædende og smuk deltagelse fra både russiske og kinesiske musikere, og musikere af høj kvalitet fra mange andre lande. Vi er blevet lovet, at den årlige koncert i 2020 kan finde sted i Kinas kulturcenters nyistandsatte faciliteter i København, som snart åbner.

Samtidigt har vi forsøgt at få information om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet ud til offentligheden på enhver måde, vi kan. I København afholdt Schiller Instituttet et seminar sammen med 'Confucian Business Institute' ved CBS, og i Sverige har Schiller Instituttet samarbejdet om stiftelsen af BRIX, Bælte-

og Vej-Instituttet i Sverige. BRIX har afholdt en række seminarer med pæn deltagelse fra akademikere og industrifolk, der er blevet adresseret i fællesskab af den kinesiske ambassadør og ledende medlemmer af BRIX og Schiller Instituttet. På samme tid har vi inter文eneret i mange møder og diskussioner om Kina, der finder sted i Danmark og Sverige, for at sikre, at den rigtige historie om Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet – og nødvendigheden af at de vestlige landes aktivt deltager i dette store foretagende for menneskeheden – kommer ud, så de løgne og falske bagtalelser om det i 'mainstream' medierne bliver modsagt.

Som det ses med udbruddet af det nye coronavirus i Wuhan er der mange udfordringer, når man søger at løfte 1,4 milliarder mennesker ud af dyb fattigdom og at blive en moderne nation. På trods af fremragende nationalt lederskab, kan lokal inkompetence skabe store problemer. Men jeg er sikker på, at Kina vokser med udfordringen, og vi ser nu, at den kinesiske regering intet sparer for at besejre denne trussel imod menneskeheden bestående af sygdom og død.

Da den nationale regering først blev opmærksom på epidemien, handlede den hurtigt for at besejre den. Oplysninger om coronavirus blev hurtigt sendt ud over hele verden, og resten af verden kunne forsvare sig mod sygdommen på en måde, som den lokale regering i Wuhan undlod at gøre. Og forhåbentligt vil samarbejdet mellem Kina og medicinske forskningscentre i resten af verden snart føre til behandling og en vaccine. I mellemtiden yder Kina enorme menneskelige og økonomiske ofre for at få epidemien under kontrol, og udgør menneskehedens bolværk imod en verdensomspændende pandemi.

Forhåbentligt vil de enorme ressourcer, som nu indsættes i Kina, og med hjælp fra verdenssamfundet, bære frugt, og besejre den nye coronavirus. Og forhåbentlig bliver det et eksempel på, hvordan Kina og verden kan arbejde sammen om en endnu farligere dræber: fattigdom. Kina har vist, hvordan det har været muligt at løfte 850 millioner kinesere ud af dyb

fattigdom. Og med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet har de igangsat det største udviklingsprojekt, som menneskeheden nogensinde har set. Vi behøver fuldt internationalt samarbejde for at sikre sejr over fattigdom overalt i verden, ved at anvende videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt til først at etablere den nødvendige infrastruktur, og derefter den nødvendige industrielle udvikling, til at løfte hele menneskeheden ud af fattigdom.

Men hvis Danmark og andre vestlige lande skal deltage i disse, for menneskeheden nødvendige tiltag, må vi først besejre det mentale angreb, der finder sted imod befolkningens sindelag. Kina og Rusland er ikke vores fjender, men er vores vigtige samarbejdspartnere i sikringen af den bedst mulige fremtid for hele menneskeheden. Lad os derfor erstatte den kunstigt skabte frygt og splittelse med en dialog mellem kulturerne, og lad os alle deltage i Bælte- og Ve-Initiativet. Så vil vi se en verdensomspændende renæssance af de bedste bidrag fra alle de forskellige kulturer, og vi vil se en eksplosion af menneskelig kreativitet og udvikling, der ikke alene forvandler livet på Jorden, men også vores solsystem, og det der ligger derudover, når vi får ubegrænset billig energi på Jorden ved at høste helium-3 på Månen og bruge det til fusionsenergi, som kineserne har tænkt sig at gøre.

Se på 'Verdens-Landbroen'. Dette er det levende billede af de smukke ord, som vi hører i Beethovens 9. symfoni:

Seid umschlungen, Millionen!
Diesen Kuss der ganzen Welt!
Brüder! über'm Sternenzelt
muss ein lieber Vater wohnen.

Vær omfavnede, millioner!
Dette kys til hele verden!
Brødre, over stjerneteltet
må der bo en kærlig far.

Og den kærlige far bliver realiseret gennem vores handlinger; mænds og kvinders handlinger for at forandre verden til det bedre.

Tom Gillesberg på Radio 4 om magnettog over Kattegat den 20. januar 2020. 18 min.

Lydfil:

Magnettog over Kattegat: Tom Gillesberg på Radio 4

Den 20. januar 2020 kontaktede programmet 4- toget på den nye nationale radiostation Radio4 Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Instituttet i Danmark og tidligere kandidat til Folketinget, og interviewede ham i 18 minutter om at opføre en magnettoglinje på tværs af Kattegat (en del af Toms slogan til Folketinget i 2007 var »Efter finanskrakket – magnettog over Kattegat«). Dette skete dagen efter, at regeringen besluttede at videreføre en forundersøgelse af bygningen af en kommende Kattegatbro, men i modsætning til den forrige regering, inkludere en togforbindelse.

Tom Gillesberg havde mulighed for at diskutere mange ting, deriblandt: Kina og Japan udvikler nye magnettog; Den Nye Silkevej; fordelene ved at gå til et højere teknologisk niveau; at tænke ud fra fremtidens teknologier og ikke reparere tidligere teknologier; at broen kunne betale sig selv ved at øge produktiviteten i den samlede økonomi; at han kunne forudsige den økonomiske nedsmeltning i 2008, fordi han lyttede til Lyndon LaRouche; behovet for videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt, inklusive fusionsenergi, i stedet for at blive et friluftsmuseum med forældede teknologier som

træflis og vindmøller. Efterfølgende sagde en af værterne, »Jeg håber, at DSB lyttede med. Det var oplysning, om noget.«

Her er interviewet på 4-Togets podcast. Interviewet er fra tidspunktet 6:21 til 25:11:

http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Tom-Magnettog-real-one_4_toget.mp3

Her er vores optagelse mens vi lyttede til interviewet:

Interviewet med Tom Gillesberg er også tilgængeligt på www.radio4.dk/programmer/ . Kik efter program *4-togets* podcast side den 20. januar 2020 time 2, tidspunktet 6:21 til 25:11.



Fra Transport og Boligministeriet pressemeddelelse den 19. januar 2020:



Billedet fra Transportministeriet.

Regeringen vil fortsat undersøge en fast forbindelse over Kattegat

Regeringen har besluttet at videreføre den igangværende forundersøgelse af en fast forbindelse over Kattegat, som blandt andet ser på mulighederne for en kombineret vej- og jernbaneforbindelse. Transportministeren offentliggør i dag delkommissorierne for de videre undersøgelser.

19. januar 2020

Regeringen ser store perspektiver i en fast Kattegatforbindelse, som vil kunne binde Øst- og Vestdanmark tættere sammen og forkorte rejsetiden mellem landets to største byer med op til halvanden time for både bilister og togrejsende. Regeringen har derfor videreført forundersøgelsen

af projektet på finansloven, ligesom regeringen i dag offentliggør delkommissorierne for undersøgelserne.

Regeringen er optaget af, at vi med forundersøgelsen får belyst de klima- og miljømæssige aspekter ved at anlægge en fast Kattegatforbindelse.

– Det er afgørende, at vi undersøger en kombineret vej- og jernbaneforbindelse og ikke bare en ren vejforbindelse, som den forhenværende minister oprindeligt ønskede, siger transportminister Benny Engelbrecht ...

Resten af pressemeddelelsen kan læses her.

Hele koncerten: EN MUSIKALSK DIALOG MELLEM KULTURER den 29. november

Se også en video trailer 6 min.:

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Arrangører: Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog,
Det Russiske Hus og Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter

EN MUSIKALSK DIALOG
MELLEM KULTURER

Gratis adgang
29. november 2019 kl. 19

Russisk Center for Videnskab og Kultur
Vester Voldgade 11, København, ved Rådhuspladsen

Medvirkende: Musikere fra Kina, Rusland, Albanien, Poland,
Sverige og Danmark (se billedet)

Også: DANMARK: SCHILLER INSTITUTTETS KOR

I en tid, hvor der er alt for meget politisk splid i verden, og verdens lande i stedet burde arbejde sammen om menneskehedens fælles mål, er det ekstra vigtigt, at vi på alle måder bygger bro mellem verdens nationer og de mange forskelligartede kulturer. Når vi oplever det skønne i andre kulturer, skaber det gensidig forståelse og et grundlag for samarbejde og fred. Klassisk kunst er derfor en vigtig nøgle til en sådan dialog mellem kulturer, og det er grunden til, at vi afholder denne koncert!

Info: 25 12 50 33, 53 57 00 51
si@schillerinstitut.dk

**Video og afskrift: Fejring af
Berlin murens fald og
Friedrich Schillers
fødselsdag.
Konference i NYC med Helga**

Zepp-LaRouche som hovedtaler den 11. november 2019 (på engelsk)

A Three-Fold Anniversary

Address by Helga Zepp-LaRouche (Se afskriftet nedenunder)

Excerpt from video: "The Lost Chance of 1989"

Schubert/Schiller: Die Hoffnung

Michelle Erin, soprano – Margaret Greenspan, piano – Elliot Greenspan, speaker

Schubert/Schiller: An Emma

John Sigerson, tenor – Margaret Greenspan, piano

Shakespeare: Luciana's Monologue from Comedy of Errors, Act 3,
Scene 2

Leah DeGruchy

Max Caspar on Kepler as a Philosophical Mind

John Sigerson

Schiller: "Die Teilung der Erde"

Frank Mathis

Schubert/Schober: "An die Musik"

Lisa Bryce, soprano – Richard Cordova, piano

Download (PDF, Unknown)

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 LAROCHE: 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.

LAROCHE: 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]

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

Talere: Liliana Gorini, John Sigerson

Lyndon 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.

Grundlæggende er der imidlertid ikke noget specifikt italiensk knyttet til disse fremskridt; Italien er den gode muldjord, som bærer de nuværende frugter af de platoniske ideer, der opstod i det gamle Grækenland, videreført af Nicolaus Cusanus, Johannes Kepler, den tyske matematiker og fysiker Bernhard Riemann, og det musikalske geni Wilhelm Furtwängler. Furtwängler var omtrent ene om at redde den europæiske musikkultur fra at blive destrueret af den britiske *golem* Adolf Hitler. Senere blev han den ledende inspiration for LaRouches insisteren på at musik ikke udfoldes i lyd, men i det riemannske komplekse domæne.

Jordens næste 50 år – Foredrag # 2 (4. maj): LaRouches ufuldendte krig for en ny økonomisk verdensorden Udvalgt taler: 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 NWEØ blev udkæmpet, især i perioden 1979-1983, og begrebet om hvordan man fører denne krig, blev udviklet af Lyndon LaRouche. Hans tilgang var ikke blot at foreslå ideen, og at påvise at denne politik ville være til gavn for både nord og syd. Hans metode var faktisk 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.

**Schiller Instituttet
foretræde for
Erhvervsudvalget den 22.
november 2018**

Kun Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling og et Nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem kan forhindre finansssammenbrud

Jeg er Tom Gillesberg, formand for Schiller Institutet i Danmark. Tak fordi vi måtte komme.

Den danske offentlighed har haft en brat opvågning til den

sande tilstand i den danske finansverden. Danske Bank har i årevis været dybt involveret i hvidvask af enorme pengebeløb og både bankens ledelse og Finanstilsynet svigtede totalt, når de gennem mange år blev gjort opmærksom på problemet. Andre af de store SIFI-banker i Danmark er samtidigt blevet afsløret i medhjælp til skatteunddragelse og svigt i deres bekæmpelse af svindel og hvidvask. Endelig har mange af de danske banker, i lighed med deres internationale kolleger, været medvirkende til at den danske og udenlandske statskasser er blevet plyndret gennem svigagtige udbytteskatrefusioner. Alt dette viser, at det ikke drejer sig om enkelte problemer eller enkelte brodne kar, men er et systemisk problem, hvor hele bank- og finansverdenen er gennemsyret af ukontrolleret grådighed, hvor man sætter sin egen finansielle vinding over loven og det almene vel. Politikken med afregulering, og med at lade finansverdenen styre sig selv, har spillet fallit.

Dette var egentlig allerede tydeligt i forbindelse med nedsmeltningen af det internationale finansielle system i 2007-2008. Jeg, og andre aktivister fra Schiller Instituttet, advarede om dette allerede i 2007, da jeg stillede op til Folketinget med sloganet: Efter finanskraeket – Magnettog over Kattegat. Men man sad vore advarsler overhørigt. Da vi så efter krakket i 2008 – hvor kun en dansk statsgaranti, der dækkede alle finansielle institutioner, forhindrede en nedsmeltning i den danske bankverden – kom med forslag til, hvordan vi kunne rense op i finansverdenen gennem en gennemførelse af Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling, hvor man i processen vil skille skidt fra kanel – udskille samfundsvigtig normal bankaktivitet fra kasinoøkonomi – så nægtede man på institutionelt hold i Danmark og resten af den vestlige verden atter at lytte. Man ville ikke gøre op med den usunde adfærd i finansverdenen, der havde skabt sammenbruddet i 2008. Havde man nemlig ikke afreguleret hele den finansielle sektor, og i 1999 afskaffet Glass/Steagall-bankopdelingen i USA, så havde vi nemlig undgået finanskrisen.

Men nu blev fokuset at redde bankerne – og alle andre aktører i finansverdenen – med bankpakker og kvantitative lempelser; på bekostning af realøkonomien og almindelige menneskers levestandard. Derfor står vi i dag over for en kommende finanskriser, der er potentielt langt værre end den, som vi oplevede i 2008. De danske tiltag med at lade banker og realkreditselskaber polstre sig (med kundernes penge) vil ikke forhindre en ny krise. Uden en opdeling af aktiviteterne i de finansielle supermarkeder har vi stadig, som i 2007-2008, ingen branddøre, der kan forhindre, at ildebrand i en del af finansverdenen spreder sig til hele det finansielle hus.

Det forestående finansssammenbrud

Der er mange tikkende bomber under det internationale finanssystem. I kølvandet på den amerikanske føderalbanks rentestigninger er der stadigt flere advarsler om en kommende nedsmeltning af det 3.500 mia. dollars store marked for amerikansk virksomhedsgæld, hvor stadig mere usikre lån bliver pakket om og gensolgt i mange forskellige forklædninger – i lighed med dårlige amerikanske boliglån i 2007-2008. Dette har fået følgeskab af nedgang på børserne og et kraftigt fald i den økonomiske vækst i USA og Europa. Bank for International Settlements advarede om denne farlige udvikling i sin årlige rapport i juli og noget lignende gjorde Bank of England i oktober. Så kom IMF's udtrykkelige advarsel om faldende virksomhedsobligationsmarkeder i IMF-bloggen den 12. november.

Et kollaps af markedet for virksomhedsgæld vil have større konsekvenser end kollapsedet af den amerikanske subprimelånboble i 2008. Når først krisen er udløst, vil det ramme bankerne verden rundt, og bag den blankpolerede overflade er de blevet endnu større og endnu mere bankerotte, end de var i 2008. I lighed med optakten til krisen i 2007-2008 har der også været et kollaps og en kapitalflugt fra de såkaldte "emerging markets" og det gigantiske uregulerede marked for

finansielle derivater kan implodere når som helst.

Løsningen

Der er ingen lille lappeløsning, der kan rette op på dette, men Schiller Instituttet og den internationale LaRouche-bevægelse har fremlagt en sammenhængende løsning for, hvordan vi kan bortoperere den spekulative kræftsvulst og skabe kreditter til produktive investeringer – både på internationalt plan og her i Danmark.

1. Vi skal med i Den Nye Silkevej

Mens størstedelen af økonomien i den vestlige verden har ligget underdrejet i de seneste 10 år – hvor de fleste har oplevet en faldende levestandard – så har man i Kina oplevet fortsat kraftig økonomisk vækst og været i stand til at løfte stadig flere mennesker ud af fattigdom. Man brugte krisen i 2008 til at påbegynde massive infrastrukturprojekter, så Kina har nu flere kilometer højhastighedstog end resten af verden tilsammen. Man har bygget nye byer, vandprojekter, kraftværker og anden infrastruktur, der gør det muligt at tage sig af en voksende befolkning med en stigende levestandard.

I 2013 lancerede Kinas præsident Xi Jinping så denne udviklingspolitik på internationalt plan med Bælte- og Vej-Initiativet, også kaldet Den Nye Silkevej, der i dag er 12 gange større end USA's Marshallplan efter 2. verdenskrig og som over 60 lande nu deltager i. Danmark burde være en fremtrædende del af denne udviklingsdagsorden, specielt i Afrika og Sydvestasien.

2. Et Nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem

Den 30. november er der G20-topmøde i Argentina, og Schiller instituttet har foreslået, at topmøderne mellem præsident Trump, Xi Jinping og Putin bruges til at etablere et nyt Bretton Woods kreditsystem, i samarbejde med Indiens premierminister Modi. En ny version af det gamle fastkurssystem, der blev etableret efter 2. verdenskrig, men nu for at skabe langfristede kreditter til udvikling af alle nationer. Dette er det eneste, som kan forhindre, at den igangværende disintegration af det nuværende City of London- og Wall Street-baserede finanssystem fører til kaos og mulig krig.

3. LaRouches fire love

I Danmark kan vi i mellemtiden forberede tiltag, der kan beskytte vores økonomi imod den kommende finansielle tsunami. Schiller Instituttet har fremlagt Lyndon LaRouches fire love, der er en konceptuel drejebog for at få vores økonomi drejet væk fra finansiell spekulation og tilbage til fysisk økonomi og videnskabeligt og teknologisk fremskridt:

- Gennemførelsen af en Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling af den danske finanssektor, hvor vi sanerer banksystemet og adskiller normal bankaktivitet fra finansiell spekulation. De finansielle supermarkeder skal opdeles i normale banker, investeringsbanker, realkreditaktivitet og forsikringsvirksomhed. Bankerne og andre finansielle institutioner skal opdeles og reduceres i størrelse, så de ikke længere udgør en systemisk risiko, og den statslige indskudsgaranti vil kun gælde for normale banker.
- Vi må skabe statskreditter til produktive investeringer i økonomien;
- Vi må kanalisere en del af disse kreditter ind i store

infrastrukturprojekter og andet, der kan øge produktiviteten og energigennemstrømningstætheden i økonomien og skabe den næste højere økonomiske platform for Danmark, som f.eks. en Kattegatbro og et nationalt magnettognet, og faste forbindelser mellem Helsingør og Helsingborg og under Femern Bælt.

- Vi må investere massivt i forskning og udvikling af de områder, som skaber fremtidens teknologier som f.eks. kernekraft, fusionsenergi, rumforskning etc.

Den største fejl, som vi kan begå, er at tro, at vi kan overlade disse spørgsmål til den finansielle verden. Den har bevist, at den hverken har det moralske kompas eller de nødvendige løsninger, til at sikre vores fremtid. Derfor må staten nu påtage sig sit ansvar, og etablere de nødvendige love og regler, der kan sikre det almene vel og Danmarks og danskernes fremtid. Det er der, i lyset af de seneste bankskandaler, en bred offentlig opbakning til.

Tak for ordet.

Slides fra mødet:



Opdel Danske Bank: Hvad er Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling? Fra arkivet.

Schiller Instituttet har kørt en kampagne i mange år for at indføre Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling i alle nationer. F. eks. stillede aktivister fra Schiller Instituttets Venner op til folketingsvalg i 2013 udenfor partierne med det berømte slogan: "Glass-Steagall – eller kaos".

"En Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling vil fritage staten og skatteyderne for at skulle dække insolvente bankers spillegæld. Vi vil opdele bankerne i banker, der kun laver normal ind- og udlånsaktiviteter, og som vil have et statsligt sikkerhedsnet, og investeringsbanker a la Saxo-bank, der må leve på egen risiko. Realkreditlån skal igen adskilles fra bankerne og yde billige realkreditlån til kunderne i stedet for være en malkemaskine for bankerne. Der skal ikke længere være »banker, der er for store til at gå ned«, som får bail-out, i form af statslige bankhjælpepakker, eller bliver hjulpet af bail-in-aktioner, som den på Cypern, hvor bankerne får lov til at stjæle bankkundernes penge..."

Klik her for at læse mere om Glass/Steagall-bankopdeling fra Schiller Instituttets kampagneavis 16 fra 2013 (html-versionen), eller læs pdf-versionen nedenfor.

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

Bemærkninger af Dennis Speed til Schiller Instituttets mindekoncert med instituttets kor den 11. september i St. Antonius af Padua Kirke i New York

Vi er samlet her, ikke for at mindes en tragedie, men for at afværge den. Selv når vi samles her i aften, som det var tilfældet for 17 år siden, slås der på krigstrommerne af en gruppe af mennesker i verden, som spænder over forskellige nationer og agenturer, der søger at presse USA til et angreb på Syrien. Et Syrien, som sammen med Rusland og også med bistand fra USA, har reduceret og inddæmmet de kræfter betydeligt, som nogle gange kaldes Al-Nusra, andre gange kaldes al-Qaeda, men altid passende kaldes onde, der var en del af udførelsen af angrebene her for 17 år siden. Angreb, hvor denne kirke og flere andre områder i dette kvarter fungerede som fristed, som nødhjælps-hospitaler, og i nogle tilfælde som stedet, hvor den sidste olie blev givet.

Og det er vores situation i aften. Det er vigtigt at {sige} det, fordi vi er forledt til at tro, i vores verden, at tragedien er en nødvendighed. Det er den ikke. En amerikansk statsmand, en

senator ved navn Richard Black, er for nylig i sidste uge vendt tilbage fra Syrien. Han talte direkte med præsident Assad, og han forsøger, ikke egenhændigt, men meget modigt, at afværge krig. Han er ansat på livstids ved militæret, tidligere kampsoldat og veteran fra Vietnam-krigen, fløj over 200 luftmissioner der, og han har været involveret i den amerikanske efterretningstjeneste i mange årtier. Og som han

sagde i et interview, som han gav for nylig, kunne han som kampsoldat ikke vende ryggen til sit flag, marineinfanteriets flag, for at tillade at USA endnu en gang forsøger at udføre en blind, forkert intervention. Og i dette tilfælde, ville skæbnens ironi være, at i en sådan intervention ville det være USA som yder luftstøtten til samme al-Nusra og Al-Qaeda-styrker, der deltog i 9/11 angrebet.

Hvornår vil krigen ophøre? Krigen vil ophøre, når menneskeheden vokser op. Beethoven, som vi nogle gange har nævnt, sagde: Hvis folk tog min musik seriøst, ville der ikke være krig. Og i det program, vi har sammensat for denne aften, forsøger vi at trække på, egentlig ikke forskellige genrer af musik, men på det Klassiske princip i musik. Det klassiske princip accepterer ikke, at tragedien er uundgåelig. Ja, der er græske tragedier, og de er klassiske stykker; men så er der værkerne af digteren Friedrich Schiller. For eksempel i den græske tragedie, som citeret af Robert Kennedy, der, i anledning af mordet på Martin Luther King, sagde: "Selv i vores søvn, vil smerter, som ikke glemmes, falde dråbe efter dråbe på hjertet, indtil til sidst, i vores fortvivlelse, mod vores vilje, visdom kommer, gennem den forfærdende nåde af Gud," og ja, det var synspunktet hos Aeschylus. Men der er en anden indsigt, og det er anskuelsen hos digteren Friedrich Schillers, der sagde:

+++ "Et formål, som højere Fornuft, har undfanget, at mænds trængsler trang, ti tusind gange besejret, kan aldrig være forladt." +++

Formålet med oprettelsen af USA var at skabe frihed, og frihed til tænkning, som forudsætning for statsborgerskab. Og krig, specielt krig der anvendes af finansielle og andre kræfter mod menneskeheden, er en gift for denne frihed. Formålet med USA, og formålet som denne idé blev udbredt og vedtaget over hele verden, betyder, at Amerika ikke er et sted, det er en idé. Denne idé er hvad vi ønsker at styrke i

aften, fordi når vi bringer mennesker sammen, og vi bruger musik for at komme ud over det hverdagsagtige, det banale, det bogstavelige, det didaktiske, ideologiske,- kan de bedste sider af vores sind blive parate og væbnet til at vælte vore egne ønsker om uvidenhed, og blindhed.

Som en mand sagde engang, der er ingen rigtige mysterier, der er kun blindhed. Og blindhed kan altid overvindes af sandheden. Men for at befæste velmenende mennesker, der måske har mistet deres retning, skal sandheden nogle gange ikke tales – men synges. Og vi håber, at vi i aften, når vi står her for at ære dem der døde ved bunden af World Trade Center, og dem der er døde efterfølgende på grund af sygdomme og på grund af deres tapre indsats den dag, vi håber, at det vi gør her i aften for at forny vores engagement, og engagement i selve USA, via idealet om frihed, kan fortsætte gennem skønhed, i stedet for krig.

Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen Webcast, 16. feb., 2018

Gæst Paul Gallagher.

Vært Matthew Ogden: Titlen på vores show i dag er »Genopbyg Amerikas infrastruktur: Optrap kampagnen for LaRouche-planen«. Jeg har inviteret Paul Gallagher, økonomiredaktør for

Executive Intelligence Review, på showet i dag, og vi er glade for at du tager dig tid til at komme, Paul. Vi har nu mulighed for at få en meget seriøs og nøgtern diskussion om LaRouches økonomiske program: De »Fire Love«, og lige nu er dørene vidt åbne.

Med udgivelsen af den såkaldte »Udkast til Lovgivning for Genopbygning af Amerikas Infrastruktur« – Dette er programmet fra Trumps Hvide Hus, som blev sendt over til Kongressen. Det blev udgivet mandag. Alt imens indholdet af denne rapport er, for at sige det mildt, uheldigt – det har Wall Streets fingeraftryk over det hele, alene det, at dette forslag er kommet frem; men det er rent ud sagt en total taber, der har galvaniseret diskussionen nationalt, og det er virkelig begyndt at katalysere kongresmedlemmer på begge sider midtergangen til at begynde at tænke over spørgsmålet på en meget mere seriøs måde: Hvordan finansierer man infrastruktur? Hvis vi taler om \$1,5 billion, hvor skal de komme fra?

(Her følger engelsk udskrift):

And this includes, frankly, Trump himself. As President Trump said in the Letter of Transmission, that was sent over as the opening to this legislative proposal, he said: "Our nation's infrastructure is in an unacceptable state of disrepair, which damages our country's competitiveness and our citizens' quality of life. For too long, lawmakers have invested in infrastructure inefficiently, ignored critical needs, and allowed it to deteriorate. As a result, the United States has fallen further and further behind other countries. It is time to give Americans the working, modern infrastructure they deserve.... My

administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact a law that will enable America's builders to construct the new, modern, and efficient infrastructure throughout our beautiful land."

Now, on Tuesday, President Trump held an open, televised roundtable with different Senators and Representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, and this was ostensibly to discuss the

aluminum, steel industries and trade policy around that, but during that roundtable, which was televised, the discussion of the infrastructure program came up. And I'd like to just play a

short clip from that roundtable; this is an exchange between President Trump and Sen. Sherrod Brown [D] from Ohio, and then Senator Blumenthal [D-CT] also gets in on this. And what you hear is that President Trump says, look, I want to have a bipartisan plan. Come back to me with a counterproposal. What

we put out was an opening bid, but I really want a bipartisan plan. I'm ready, willing and able.

So, here's a clip from that roundtable:

[start video]

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I actually think that we can go bipartisan on infrastructure, maybe even more so, than we can on DACA. ... On infrastructure which is the purpose of what we're doing tonight, come back with a proposal. We put in our bid – come back with a proposal. We have a lot of people that are great Republicans that want something to happen. We have to rebuild our country. I said yesterday, we've spent {\$7 trillion} – when

I say "spent," and I mean wasted – not to mention all of the lives, most importantly and everything else – but we've spent \$7

trillion as of about two months ago, in the Middle East – \$7

trillion. And if you want to borrow two dollars to build a road
someplace, including your state, the great state of Ohio, if you
want to build a road, if you want to build a tunnel, or a bridge,
or fix a bridge because so many of them are in bad shape, you
can't do it. And yet, we spent \$7 trillion in the Middle
East.

Explain that one. [crosstalk]

SEN. SHERROD BROWN: I've love a bipartisan – we have a
bipartisan proposal. We can [crosstalk] dollars on it in
infrastructure. We're glad to work together on a real
infrastructure bill with real dollars, plus what you can
leverage
in the communities and private sector.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: Do a combination.

SENATOR BROWN: It needs real dollars.

President Trump: I would love to have you get back to us
quickly, 'cause we can do this quickly and we have to rebuild
our
country. We have to rebuild our roads and our bridges and our
tunnels, so the faster you get back, the faster we can move.
Focus on document this week, if you don't mind, right? But
the
faster you get back, the faster we move.

SEN. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL: I come back to Senator Brown's
point, I think there's a opportunity for real bipartisanship
here, in these two areas.

PRESIDENT TRUMP: I agree, and I'd like you to come back
with a suggestion on infrastructure in the plan, and I think
that's a bipartisan plan. I really would like to see you come
back with a counterproposal on the infrastructure. I think

we're
going to get that done. I really believe that's – we're
going
to get a lot of Democrats, we're going to get a lot of
Republicans. We're going to get it done. It's something we
should do. We have to fix our country: We have to fix our
roads
and our tunnels and bridges and everything, so, if you can
work
together on that, and I am ready, willing and able, on
infrastructure – that is such a natural for us to get done.
And
I think we could probably do it.
Thank you all very much. [End video]

OGDEN: So as you can see, asking them to come back with a
counterproposal, he said, this is our opening bid, but the
point
is clear: Now is the time for us to mobilize like never
before,
to put the LaRouche plan on the table. {This} is the
counterproposal.
Let me put on the screen here: first we've got our Campaign
To Win the Future. This is obviously the national statement
of
intent for the elections in 2018. LaRouche PAC is mobilizing
a
national movement and galvanizing discussion around this
program.
And then the content of that campaign can be seen on the next
slide, this is "The Four Laws To Save the United States: The
Economics Principles Necessary for a Recovery – Why the United
States Must Join the New Silk Road" and this contains full
elaboration of Lyndon LaRouche's four economic laws.
So, I know that Paul is very short on time, and I would just
like to ask you: Please address what the situation is now in
Washington. What's coming out of this release of this so-

called

legislative proposal? And what actually has to be done?

PAUL GALLAGHER: Thanks, Matt. My first reaction, when the White House plan was released – I call it the “White House plan,” not the Trump plan, but the White House plan – when it was released, was that closed a certain door of people in elected

offices around the country and in Washington, constantly saying

“what is the White House going to come up with? what is the White House going to come up with? what are they going to give

us in the way of what they can get started towards infrastructure

investments? because we desperately need it?” And when it finally came out, and it was very, very, very lacking – as you said, a Wall Street plan – that closed a certain door, and immediately, thus, opened another one.

OK, now they have come out with that. Now, we have to come out with something. It’s up to the rest of us, particularly those in elected office, but all of us who are active in fighting

for this: It’s up to us now to shape the alternative, because this one just isn’t going to work. And it’s good to see that that definitely includes the President – that view. He, on another occasion, immediately after the plan was rolled out on Monday, he said that compared to the tax legislation and the military spending increases and so forth, that this infrastructure plan that the White House has put out, was really

quite unimportant. A rather surprising thing for him to say. But it indicated, when it was followed the very next day by the

comment you just saw, “give me an alternative,” and then the very

day after that, in another meeting with members of Congress,

when, as soon as he was prompted in any way by any of them, he came out very strongly for increasing the Federal gasoline tax by

25 cents a gallon, and applying that through the Highway Trust Fund, to infrastructure investment – not at all something which

is part of the White House plan, so-called; and not part of the

Republican leadership's plan at all.

But when he was asked, he went with that. He hasn't said this publicly, but a number of senators and representatives who

were at that second meeting, have reported it publicly in the same way. It's clear that he did say that he was for that increase in the gas tax, and as he said, he would take the political heat for backing it as President, if they would go forward with it.

So you've had, in rapid succession, a number of indications that this plan, as poor as it was that came out from the White House, is not in fact the President's plan, and it simply closes

the door on all this waiting, and now says, where are the alternatives?

And that is very definitely what is in the LaRouche Four Laws, is the one alternative to this that will work.

Let me get into this in another way, unless you want to break it up, Matt. And if you have questions, please, interrupt.

But I wanted to read a piece that was written just two days ago by a Chinese scholar John Gong; he's a very prominent professor University of International Business and Economics in

Beijing; and he's a former executive editor of the {Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies}.

OGDEN: We actually have a slide with the title of that article which was written for China Global Television Network

(CGTN), "Make America Great Again – With Chinese Money." And I can read some of the quotes that people can see on the screen, and then maybe you can address what the content is. This is what he had to say: "Trump is absolutely right that Americas crippled bridges, potholed highways, and crooked railways cannot wait any longer. America needs to be great again. The only question is, where is the money coming from?" And then later in the article he said, "I have a great idea. Bank of China and other major banks from China are now flush with dollar cash and other dollar-denominated liquid assets, totaling over \$3 trillion, mostly in the form of holdings in U.S. Treasury bills and bonds. This money can be readily used for Chinese investors to participate in America's infrastructure boom. By that I mean Chinese investors can participate in those infrastructure projects as active equity investors, and maybe contractors or suppliers at the same time. "Call it the Belt and Road. Call it America-belt-America-road. I don't care, as long as Chinas current account trade surplus can be somehow transformed into a capital account stock, in the form of money invested in America as permanent equity shareholders, and more importantly permanent stakeholders of a stable and prosperous Sino-U.S. economic relationship. This could be a win-win mode for both countries."

[https://news.cgtn.com/news/79596a4d33677a6333566d54/share_p.html]

So that's Dr. John Gong.

GALLAGHER: Now, that's very important, in the way it is formulated, in the precision of it. He's talking about Treasury

holdings, – he's not the first Chinese official to do this. In

fact, a year ago, in late January of 2017, Ding Xuedong, the then-chairman of the Chinese Investment Corp., which is one of their two big sovereign wealth funds, made essentially the same

proposal. He said, we have such and such a volume of long-term

U.S. Treasury holdings, they're not earners, their interest rates

are very low, their return is very low; we would like to trade them for a long-term investment in a U.S. infrastructure bill, as

he put it. And he, at the time, estimated that really, the need

for investment in the United States for new infrastructure, was

{ \$8 trillion }, a figure which may seem impossibly large to many,

but actually isn't.

[http://www.larouchepub.com/pr/2017/170116_chinese_invest.html]
]

Nonetheless, Helga Zepp-LaRouche has written in articles which have been published in the Chinese press, she's frequently

interviewed and quoted there, – she has written exactly this proposal in articles which have been published there. I have presented exactly this idea to Chinese officials in Washington.

This is part of LaRouche's Four Laws.

But to start with, the first action implied by his four actions that have to be taken legislatively and from an executive

standpoint, is the restoration of the Glass-Steagall Act and

the
breakup of the Wall Street banks and the hiving off of all of
the
casino speculative investment vehicles, special purpose
vehicles
and all of that, in order to protect and use the commercial
banking system for investments.
You cannot get to real, major infrastructure renewal without
doing that, and you could see this in the meeting that you
played
the clip from. There was at least one representative from
Missouri, who brought up the issue, when the discussion was
about
trade, and specifically whether there might be tariffs against
aluminum imports from China, he brought up the fact that there
is
a grave lack of capacity to produce sufficient aluminum for
industry in the United States, and where is that lack coming
from? The lack of power supplies. So that, this is an
infrastructure question, although if you ask the simple
question,
“Is there an apparent sufficient amount of kilowatt-hours per
year per capita in the United States?” Yes, there is. But is
there sufficient, reliable electrical power supply –
constantly
online, reliable, electrical power supply – for an expansion
of
industry? The answer would in many cases be, “no.” And that
was
what he was bringing up, in particular with respect to more
aluminum plants in the United States. You have a grave
inability
to produce enough power, particularly since the fiasco of
electricity deregulation out on the West Coast 15 years ago:
That
deprived the aluminum industry and shut down a very
significant

amount of it.

Now, if there's going to be that kind of investment in infrastructure across the country, it's not going to be one, or

two, or three, or four, very famous big projects, like the renovation of the whole Northeast rail corridor of Amtrak, and the bridges and the tunnels in New York and so forth. It's not

going to be simply those things. It's going to be, at many, many

levels around the country, the production of enough clean water

supplies, the production of enough electrical power supplies; the

replacement and renovation – mostly replacement – of the river navigation systems, locks and dams, and many of these things.

And for those, the commercial banks have to be ready to lend, because it takes a lot of employment, a lot of contracting, a lot

of local borrowing: The banks have to be ready to lend and if you allow them to stay the big commercial banks, and the mid-size

regional banks – if you allow them to stay in the Wall Street casino, that's where they'll stay. If you say, "no, your business as a commercial bank is lending," then you have a credit

channel through the banking system through which national credit

can flow, and cooperate in this kind of thing.

So it starts with restoring bank separation under

Glass-Steagall. We're going to have a group of elected officials

from Italy in a couple of months come over and help us organize

in Washington on this, because they're fighting for it in Italy

at the national and also the local level.

Then, the specific second law of LaRouche, a national credit institution, which is able to produce large volumes of productive credit for productive employment of the people, and for increased productivity. And that is where not only the White House plan, but many other plans that have been put forward, are really completely inadequate, where we do have to talk about several trillions of dollars at least of investment, and the way to do that, is exactly the way that was reflected in that comment by Dr. Gong: That is, there is a lot of long-term Treasury debt held out there; three major holders of this long-term Treasury debt, which totals \$7.5-\$8 trillion, are the commercial banks of the United States, again, which hold it in their reserves and all their excess reserves which are very large right now; second, Japan, which holds more than \$1 trillion in primarily long-term U.S. Treasury debt; thirdly, China, which actually holds now somewhat more than Japan; about \$1.2 trillion of the same kind of debt. Those are potential shareholders, equity holders, subscribers of that Treasury debt into a new bank created by Congress for the purpose of generating this kind of credit. That is exactly how we have proposed and circulated and organized that this is the way to form – without a tremendous amount of new borrowing – to form a sufficiently large national bank for infrastructure; essentially by swapping existing long-term Treasury debt holdings for equity in such a new national bank created by Congress with a guarantee from the Treasury for the payment of the dividends on that equity. And with taxes – this is not free; it's never free, – but with taxes assigned to make sure that those dividends can be paid.

That's where the increase in the Federal gasoline tax and potentially the use of other what you would call infrastructure excise taxes, like the port excise tax and the navigation tax on the locks and dams, that's where these would come in. Because if you simply go and raise the gas tax by 25 cents and spend the money for infrastructure projects, it will not produce nearly, nearly enough. But if you use it in this way as leverage to guarantee the equity in a new national bank in exactly the way that we're seeing reflected in that proposal, that article from Dr. Gong, then it'll work. As I said, he's not the only person, not only among leading Chinese thinkers about this, but also from Japan, there's the same kind of positive view of this idea. Potentially, there you have it – an infrastructure bank. Then you have to go on and what are you going to use that credit for? It can't be used simply to repair roads and repair bridges. There are entirely new areas of technological and scientific breakthroughs which will raise productivity in the economy to a far greater extent. One of them that we identify is that a crash program is necessary to develop not only thermonuclear fusion electric energy, but the plasma technologies of infrastructure, which will probably come from such a crash program even before commercial nuclear fusion electricity arrives. We will have plasma technologies being spun off from that crash program, which will address themselves exactly to the production of the kinds of capacities that have died out in deindustrialization in the United States. But they'll do it at a

higher level of technology. Those kinds of investments, are one of the Four Laws that LaRouche has called for. Also, a big increase in NASA's capabilities, going back to the Apollo Project level of effort by NASA to really go back to the Moon; industrialize, develop the Moon, develop the raw materials there, including for fusion energy production. And from there, go deeper into the Solar System and ultimately into the galaxy. This is the kind of science driver which leads up-shifts in productivity in industry. And infrastructure is really the way that these up-shifts get introduced to the economy. For example, in a high-speed rail system of cars using magnetic levitation and similar technologies, this is the way it gets introduced. So, that opening from the President is very important. Yesterday you had comments which I think are very significant from the two leaders of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee – the Republican chairman William Shuster of Pennsylvania, the Democratic ranking member Peter DeFazio – they are normally quite a bit at odds. But in interviews yesterday which were reported today, they were reporting that they are already jointly working on a legislative alternative to exactly what you saw the President asking for there. A legislative alternative again, with real Federal dollars; the language which Senator Brown used – actually it was Senator Wyden was the other Senator – real Federal dollars. An alternative to present which the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is where legislation along these lines will have to start. So, you're seeing that; you're seeing the

gas tax being discussed very widely, including by those same two leaders of that committee. You're already seeing an infrastructure bank act in the House – HR547 – of Representative Rosa DeLauro, Democrat from Connecticut, which has the backing of fully half of the Democratic Caucus in the House and is not a national infrastructure bank which would operate in the way that we've described and therefore would not be as large or as capable. But nonetheless, it's legislation which in my view is quite similar to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which operated under Franklin Delano Roosevelt's administration and did so much to recover the country and then to lead the mobilization for the war and through the war in the 1940s. So that is also something definitely within the purview of LaRouche's Four Laws.

OGDEN: The idea of national banking is, I think, really the critical idea; and it takes us obviously directly back to Alexander Hamilton. If you look at Hamilton's view on infrastructure, the idea of public infrastructure is very much an American idea, and is a major pillar of the American System. Hamilton's emphasis on the necessity for the rapid upgrading of the national infrastructure, the ports and dredging the harbors and things like this, what was called "internal improvements." But this idea of public infrastructure has an American idea to it. In fact, it was written directly into the Constitution in the form of the General Welfare. There were huge fights, including Hamilton's defense of the Constitutionality of a

national bank against Thomas Jefferson around this idea of the General Welfare. I know you have to go, so maybe one more aspect

that you can address before you leave, and then I can conclude the remaining portions of the show on my own. But just on this

subject of the idea of the public good, the United States used to

be the world's gold standard, in great modern infrastructure, public infrastructure. You can see that obviously by what Franklin Roosevelt did during the New Deal. Nations around the

world were banging on our door to try to imitate what we accomplished with the Tennessee Valley Authority and so forth and

so on. But now, the gold standard is swiftly being set by China

and what China has done in an unparalleled way. Create this amazing public infrastructure in a very rapid and swift manner.

Two things I think maybe could be addressed in what we need to now learn from China or relearn in terms of what we used to be committed to, is: 1) the policy approach that has made this possible in China; but also, 2) the philosophy that China is clearly committed to when it comes to this idea of the public good, the common good, or what we call in American Constitutional

language, the General Welfare. Maybe you can address that just

briefly before you leave, Paul.

GALLAGHER: There was, in the 19th Century, the American Whig and then Republican leaders were all very conscious Hamiltonians. They realized that they were attempting to develop

the country, and they were doing it – at least a lot of the time

– extraordinarily successfully with a commitment to the “internal improvements” what we call infrastructure, but the internal improvements, the national credit provision, the protection of industry; which came from Alexander Hamilton. But his overriding premise was actually none of those particular policies, but rather his stating against the tide of opinion in the 1790s when he was Treasury Secretary and the decade before and after. He definitely took on the tide of opinion that the United States was going to be an agricultural country, a country of yeoman farmers with all of their well-known virtues and so on and so forth. He said that the wealth of a country is found in the inventive qualities of its people, and in the freedom and opportunity that they have to turn their inventive qualities into enterprise. And he really was responsible for the emergence of the first banks of the United States; not only the First Bank of the United States, the first national bank, but also the first private banks of the United States, of which there were very few at that time. He saw the creation of a national bank as essentially the necessary link or liaison between the actions of the government to assist the economy and the actions of the private banks; that this was the necessary way, in which they should be related. But his principle was that the mind of the individual and the freedom of the individual and opportunity to make that into enterprise, that that was what defined the ability to produce the wealth of a country and that the wealth of a country was produced within it; it was not gained by trading with other countries – fairly, freely or otherwise. It was gained primarily by producing the wealth which the inventiveness of the people and the resources

of
the country made possible. And that was the function of
protection when it was used, but of course, Hamilton favored
more
what we would call industrial subsidies than he did what we
call
tariffs. So that, right through Abraham Lincoln, was the
creed
of the great leaders of the United States in the 19th Century
and
considerably thereafter. We became the greatest industrial
nation on Earth that way.
Franklin Roosevelt revived that general outlook, although he
did so without the creation of a national bank, really because
of
what he was working with in Congress. Otherwise, he might
have
preferred to do that. But he did it through such institutions
as
the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the TVA, which
became
wonders of the world. We have not really improved on that
much
in the 70-80 years since. But that idea, Hamilton's ideas
spread
very rapidly through Friedrich List, who spent a lot of time
in
the United States and was a leading Hamiltonian in the 1820s
and
1830s, and then was in the middle of the unification of
Germany
for the first time in the Customs Union of Germany in the
middle
of the 19th Century. This spread through Bismarck's policies,
who knew that he was a Hamiltonian, later in the 19th Century.
They spread through the Japanese adopting and learning a lot
of

the works of Hamilton; late in the 19th Century inviting Hamiltonian economists from the United States to come over and advise them. This kept being repeated in Korea again. China has taken this far beyond, because as you said, they're not only applying those policies, but they're also as they always say doing them with Chinese characteristics. Particularly now with Xi Jinping as the President of China, he has really defined and enshrined in their Constitution the principle of what a country's leadership is judged for is its ability to strive for the common welfare, the common aims of the population; what we call in the Constitution, the General Welfare. That has really had a very distinctive effect on Chinese policy in the country and also on the policy of the Belt and Road Initiative which Xi Jinping launched, but was really already underway before he made the formal speech three and a half years ago. Already the investments by big Chinese commercial banks outside China, in these projects of energy, mining, but also a lot of infrastructure projects. These big investments were already underway in 2011, 2012; then he made the announcement in 2013, which was so very close to the policy of the World Land-Bridge which had been promoted by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche since the later 1980s. And since that time, that has really been recognized in China; they call Helga the Silk Road Lady. This policy of the common welfare is clearly one reflected in the way that they've eliminated almost entirely down to the last few tens of millions of people, they've almost entirely eradicated extreme poverty in China. I just heard the World Bank chairman the

day

before yesterday praising that to the skies and saying it's the

one model for the world. He said the World Bank has been trying

to do this for so many decades, to eradicate poverty, without making too much progress. China has done it, and now they are seeking to help do it in Africa and other places. They want to

invest in the Middle East in reconstruction. But this is really

the test that you are acting for the general good, for the common

welfare, which is what our Constitution commits us to.

So, in that sense, they've gone beyond, and in the process, really developed a lot of technological breakthroughs in infrastructure; and that's where you find them. That's where Roosevelt found them. The projects of the 1930s, which many people think of as just creating a lot of work for people, and building a lot of airports and roads and bridges and things like

that; those projects – especially the hydro-electric projects and especially the Tennessee Valley Authority – were technological breakthroughs at the time. They built dams, navigation systems, hydropower systems technologically in ways which not only hadn't been done, but had been denied that they could be done even right up to that time. John F Kennedy spoke

about this later, that experts were saying that you couldn't build dams that were simultaneously for water management, for navigation, and for hydropower. The TVA did 57 such dams. So,

they completely transformed an area of the country. These breakthroughs were made in all of this infrastructure building in

such a way, that the productivity of the U.S. economy leaped up in

the 1930s at the fastest rate of the last 150 years. A close second was the 1940s, including the war mobilization. So that's what China is experiencing now, as they make these kinds of investments; and they're doing it with a very common welfare orientation.

OGDEN: Wonderful! So, thank you very much, Paul. I'm going to let you go before we finish the remainder of our show.

But I think you've made it very clear that we are uniquely positioned to inform and ultimately shape this counterproposal and what must ultimately become the infrastructure and general economic policy of this Presidency. So, I know we have a lot of work to do. Thank you for joining us, Paul.

GALLAGHER: Thank you. I'm sure you'll talk about the necessity to bring this up from the bottom as well; from the local elected officials, from the state legislatures in particular and apply it to the election campaign. I think it's probably true what Chairman Shuster said, which is that work on this legislation will be going on until the summer. I think that's definitely true. It will become a part of the election campaign, no question. If we can get candidates out there and local elected officials out there who are for the Four Laws, we're going to shape this. So, thanks for the opportunity and having me on, and have a good time.

OGDEN: Thank you, and we'll talk to you again soon. What Paul said is absolutely correct. This is the ultimate principle or thought behind the campaign to win the future. This is the LaRouche PAC election mobilization in 2018. We've already had a number of state legislators endorse this campaign. We're really

on the ground in various places, including in West Virginia; doing some very significant meetings with people who are involved in the China-West Virginia deals. We've also mobilized in a very big way in the Midwest, which was key to the Trump election victory. We know that these former industrial states really are the most significant in swinging these elections and creating the constituency blocs around this idea of the LaRouche Four Economic Laws and everything that you just heard Paul go through. This is the urgent necessity as we mobilize around this kind of program. I think everything that you just heard from Paul, makes it very clear that we are uniquely well-positioned to shape this entire discussion. I think the opportunity is even greater now than it was previously. Now, let me just go over a few things that I think will make it very clear to you that there is an opportunity for a moment of awakening, you could say, among people who have recognized that everything that we've been committed to for the last several decades up to this point has completely failed. There were two very informative or entertaining articles over the last week and a half, which point to exactly this; indicate exactly this opportunity for people to perhaps open their minds and begin a more sober and serious discussion around the true principles of

economics. One of these is an article which appeared in Bloomberg, this was {Bloomberg Business Week} I believe. The title of this article was "What if China Is Exempt from the Laws

of Economics?" This is by a fellow named Michael Schuman, but the subtitle is "Beijing's policymakers seem to be doing a lot of

things right – and that may upend much of basic economic thinking, especially our faith in the power of free markets."

So, here are a couple of excerpts from that article. He says:

"Over my two decades of writing about economics, I've devised a list of simple maxims that I've found generally hold true...

"But recently, my faith in this corpus of collected wisdom has been badly shaken. By China.

"The more I apply my rules of economics to China, the more they seem to go awry. China should be mired in meager growth, even gripped by financial crisis, according to my maxims. But obviously it's not. In fact, much of what's going on right now in

that country runs counter to what we know – or think we know – about economics. Simply, if Beijing's policymakers are right, then a lot of basic economic thinking is wrong – especially our

certainty in the power of free markets, our ingrained bias against state intervention, and our ideas about fostering innovation and entrepreneurship.

"On the surface, that probably sounds ridiculous. How could one country possibly defy the laws that have governed economies everywhere else?...

"Yet as China marches forward, we can no longer dismiss the possibility that it's rewriting the rulebook. Beijing's policymakers are just plain ignoring what most economists would

recommend at this point in its development. And, so far,

they're

getting away with it...

"... Perhaps China really is refashioning capitalism.

"Perhaps. I, for one, am still clinging to my maxims...

"... Maybe my rules of economics will hold firm after all.

But thanks to China, I'm prepared to edit them."

Now, it's not that China is rewriting the rule book. I think that what you just heard from Paul is that it's the West,

it's the United States under the influence of British free market

ideology; this free-market school economics. It's the United States and the West which have been playing by the wrong rulebook

for decades, if not generations. We've neglected the rulebook that we originally wrote. It was Alexander Hamilton, it was our

first Treasury Secretary; that's why it's called the American System of economics. Other countries have applied these principles of Hamiltonian economics and experienced the same phenomenal growth that we experienced under the influence of Hamiltonian policy. That is exactly what China is experiencing

right now. It's leaving these economists scratching their heads,

but perhaps they merely have to open a few history books.

I think as you can tell from that Bloomberg article, it's

beginning to dawn on people. "Gee! Maybe we've been wrong.

Maybe we've been duped by this British free trade, free market ideology. Perhaps that's why our economies are in shambles right

now."

Here's another article. This is in the {New York Times Magazine}. It came out earlier this week. This one is very interesting and goes through a lot of the history you just heard

Paul elaborate on. This is called "The Rise of China and the

Fall of the 'Free Trade' Myth." The subhead is "China's economic success lays bare an uncomfortable historical truth. No one who preaches free trade really practices it." So, here's an excerpt from the article:

"[T]o grasp China's economic achievement, and its ramifications, it is imperative to ask: Why has a market economy directed by a Communist state become the world's second-largest?

Or, to rephrase the question: Why shouldn't it have? Why shouldn't China's rise have happened the way it did, with state-led economic planning, industrial subsidies and little or no regard for the rules of 'free trade'?...

"Indeed, economic history reveals that great economic powers have always become great because of activist states. Regardless

of the mystical properties claimed for it, the invisible hand of

self-interest depends on the visible and often heavy hand of government. To take only one instance, British gunboats helped impose free trade on 19th-century China – a lesson not lost on the Chinese.... The philosophical father of economic protectionism is, in fact, Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the

American financial system, whose pupils included the Germans, the Japanese and, indirectly, the Chinese."

After some history, he lays out the case of Germany, and this one is interesting to focus on. He says:

"... Unified in 1871, Germany was scrambling to catch up with industrialized Britain. To do so, it borrowed from recipes

of national development proposed by Hamilton soon after the

Americans broke free of their British overlords. In his 'Report on the Subject of Manufactures', submitted to Congress in 1791,

Hamilton used the potent term 'infant' industries to argue for economic protectionism.

"... In his view, infant nations needed room to maneuver before they could compete with established industrial powers. The

United States embraced many of Hamilton's recommendations; the beneficiaries were, first, the textile and iron industries and then steel.

"It was Hamilton's formula, rather than free trade, that made the United States the world's fastest-growing economy in the

19th century and into the 1920s. And that formula was embraced by

other nations coming late to international economic competition.

Hamilton's most influential student was a German economist named

Friedrich List, who lived in the United States from 1825 until the 1830s and wrote a book titled {Outlines of American Political

Economy}. On his return to Germany, List attacked the free-market

gospel preached by Britain as sheer opportunism... Applying List's lessons, Germany moved with spectacular speed from an agrarian to an industrial economy.

"... Closely following Germany's example, Japan heavily subsidized its first factories

"... South Korea, too, found solutions for its problems in Friedrich List rather than Adam Smith. The country's leader, Park

Chung-hee ... was also deeply familiar with German theories of protectionism. (The economist Robert Wade reported coming across

whole shelves of books by List in Seoul bookstores in the 1970s.)...

"But little did I know that Hamilton (and List) would achieve their greatest influence in post-Mao China. 'The rise of

China resembles that of the United States a century ago,' the Chinese scholar Hu Angang writes. He is not exaggerating."

Now, that's a very interesting article to appear at this moment. I'm not saying that everything the author says in his analysis is entirely accurate, or that all of the conclusions that he draws are necessarily correct. But what he does make clear is that what made America great was the policies of Alexander Hamilton. And what's making China great today are those very same Hamiltonian policies. This realization shows you

that we have a very fertile field for the reception of our so-called Four Laws campaign – Lyndon LaRouche's revival of Hamiltonian policies. The fight which Lyndon LaRouche has led for decades to liberate the United States from this imposed free

market, free trade hoax; this British ideology. To return us to

the principles of Alexander Hamilton. What he did simultaneously

abroad to educate these other nations on the policies of the American System and Hamiltonian economic policies. That's where

China got this from; that's where you can credit the great Chinese economic miracle of the last 15 years. Do not write out

of the equation the role that Lyndon and Helga LaRouche have played as spokesmen for this great Hamiltonian tradition, and urgently with updates and a profound scientific depth that Lyndon

LaRouche has brought to this discussion. But the time is now, and the field is very fertile for the reception of this idea that

the time has come for a Hamiltonian coalition of nations. We must join hand-in-hand with China to do exactly that; to bring development to all the nations on the planet using these American, but universal, economic principles.

Now, let me just play a very short clip from a broadcast that Helga Zepp-LaRouche had yesterday. Because the biggest problem that you run into – and I think this is something that you run into as an organizer or as an activist – is that people

fail to make the necessary leap in terms of understanding these

principles because they have an axiomatic problem. There's a disconnect. The biggest problem that we have when it comes to economics today is that money is essentially God. Money has achieved this status in economics where it is everything to everyone. It's the Genesis of economics; it's the root, it's the

prime mover; it's the measuring rod, it's the purpose, it's the

medium. Money is everything. And Helga Zepp-LaRouche addressed

exactly this pathology in her webcast yesterday. And she called

for a public debate on this. She said, as it begins to dawn on

people who have believed that everything that they had believed

about economics may perhaps have been wrong, we need to question

some of the most basic economic assumptions that we hold dear, and ask ourselves the question, "What is the ultimate purpose of

an economy and what is the true source of true economic wealth?"

So, here's Helga LaRouche:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the system of the free market, which after all is not that free, given the fact that all central banks

did was to bail out the banks and keep money pumping for the benefit of the speculators, so that the rich become richer, and

the poor become more poor, and the middle class is shrinking.

This article by Bloomberg which you referenced earlier, is very interesting, because the author admits that according to his

theory, China should be collapsing, it should have meager economic growth, but obviously the contrary is the case. And he

says that China is doing everything which according to his theory

are terrible, like state intervention, party control, – things like that – and China is prospering. And actually, he says, he's not yet ready to completely overturn his theory, but he's willing to make corrections.

There will be a lot more corrections, because I think we need a public debate, what are the economic criteria for a functioning economy? And obviously, the works of my husband, Lyndon LaRouche, and his development of physical economy, going

back to Leibniz, to Friedrich List, to Henry C. Carey, to Wilhelm

von Kardorff, who was the economic advisor of Bismarck and was one of the key influences to bring about the industrial revolution in Germany; as compared to the so-called free market

model, I think we have to have a real debate, what is the cause

of wealth? Is it money, or is it the idea of the creativity of

the individual, which then leads to scientific and technological

discoveries, which applied in the production process leads to an increase in productivity, which then leads to more wealth, longevity, and all of these things.

We need a discussion about that, because the notion of what is economy, equating that with money, has really become one of the axiomatic assumptions of a failing system. So we need a debate about that. [end video]

OGDEN: So the time has come. As I said, it's a very fertile field, and this is one of the most important reasons why

we've now launched a new LaRouche PAC class series, which gets directly at these principles; not only of economics, but this is

what drives global policy. What is the purpose of economy? What

is the true identity of man? And what should be the collaborative between peoples and between nations, to what end?

So, I'll take that as an opportunity before concluding, to remind

our viewers that tomorrow we will have the second class in our 2018 class series. This class will be titled "The End of Geopolitics, Part I: The History of Geopolitics." The guest speaker will be Harley Schlanger. Again, you can register for this entire class series, which is called "The End of Geopolitics. What Is the New Paradigm?" The registration is now

open. If you have not registered for this class series, I strongly encourage you to. The link is available on the screen

– lpac.co/np2018. You can also visit discover.larouchepac.com which will be the central hub of all of the material for this class series. Again, if you're a registered participant, not only do you have the opportunity to participate in the live public forums, such as the inaugural class that was delivered

last Saturday by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, but you also have the opportunity for an in-depth engagement around the syllabus, the required reading materials, the homework assignments, the live feedback from the teachers and from the leaders of the LaRouche PAC class series, and also some discussion periods which are only open to registered participants. Registration has continued to increase. We have a large number of registered participants from all across the United States and elsewhere around the world, too. So, we're putting together the educated grouping, the cadre which will be able to lead this discussion for a new economics, a New Paradigm. The field is wide open. The door is there, and all we have to do is walk through it. We are in a unique position to inform this discussion today; and it is a very urgent debate which needs to take place as Helga Zepp-LaRouche just said. So, thank you for joining me here today. I thank Paul for joining me. Please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; we have a lot of work to do, and we'll see you next week.

