

Den unipolære verden er ved at gå i opløsning; bring verden sammen gennem menneskehedens mission i rummet.

Den 17. juli (EIRNS) – På næsten alle fronter er paradigmet for en unipolær verden, der bygger på begrebet om et imperium, ved at gå i opløsning, mens et nyt paradigme af suveræne nationer, der samarbejder om udviklingen af hele menneskehedens produktive kræfter, som spreder sig fra Asien gennem ideen om den Nye Silkevej. Selv lederne af det døende finansielle imperium ser skriften på væggen: Den franske finansminister, Bruno Le Maire, der talte i dag ved en konference for lederne af IMF, Verdensbanken og den Europæiske Centralbank for at mindes 75-årsdagen for Bretton Woods-Systemet, sagde følgende: “Bretton Woods, som vi kender det, har nået sine grænser... medmindre vi formår at genopfinde Bretton Woods, kan den Nye Silkevej blive den nye verdensorden.”

Sandt nok. Men Le Maires opfattelse af at et sådant nyt paradigme er en trussel mod den vestlige verden er nonsens. Det begreb, som Franklin Roosevelt forestillede sig på Bretton Woods-konferencen i 1944, hvor Roosevelts “hamiltoniske” vision blev vedtaget frem for det Britiske Imperiums repræsentant John Maynard Keynes’, er systematisk blevet undergravet af det britiske “frihandels”-dogme og omdannelsen af det regulerede finanssystem til uhæmmet spekulation i tiden efter Glass-Steagall. Den igangværende opløsning af Deutsche Bank er et af tegnene på det hastige sammenbrud af den “billioner af dollar store” boble af derivater og gearede lån, der nu hænger over det vestlige finansielle imperium.

Det nuværende Bretton Woods-spøgelse er færdigt. Det kan ikke reformeres, men stedes til hvile gennem en total reorganisering af verdens finansielle system, som skitseret af Lyndon LaRouche for længe siden, med den enorme vækst og udviklingsproces, skabt af Bæltet & Vejen som udgangspunkt for samarbejde mellem Kina, Rusland, Indien, USA og andre i et helt nyt system. Den nuværende bølge af kulturel optimisme, skabt af 50-årsdagen for menneskets heroiske landing på Månen på lørdag, og den modige erklæring fra præsident Trump og hans NASA-direktør, Jim Bridenstine, om at en mand og en kvinde vil vende tilbage til Månen inden for fem år, og at vi vil blive på Månen som en base for at nå Mars og hinsides – denne bølge af optimisme må blive den kanal, gennem hvilken verdens folk genvinder deres følelse af en fælles menneskehed.

Tusindvis af begivenheder finder sted rundt om i verden i denne uge til ære for den store præstation for 50 år siden, og inspirerer folk og nationer til at slutte sig sammen om det der virkelig forener hele menneskeheden – den “udenjordiske forpligtelse”, at menneskeheden, og menneskeheden alene, kan forestille sig et univers med 2 billioner galakser, og forestille sig en fremtid hvor menneskeheden virkelig er udødelig, og bringer herredømme over stadig større dele af universet i løbet af de næste tusinder af år. Som LaRouche sagde i 1986: “Hvad er den gode persons ønske? Hvad, udover at opdage skabelsens love mindre ufuldendte, med det mål at vores viden som vejledning for vores praksis afviger mindre fra Skaberens vilje, som udtrykt i den lovmæssige orden i dette univers. Hvem kan blive god, hvem længes ikke efter at komme overens med Skaberens og på den måde mindske ufuldkommenheden i ens egen forståelse af den lovmæssige orden i skabelsen?”

I dag mødtes LaRouchePAC-organisatorer foran den amerikanske Kongres for at kræve, at LaRouches navn bliver rensset, for at hans dybtgående ideer kan blive formidlet til de mennesker der lever i dag, som en nødvendig forudsætning for at klare den store udfordring med at forberede menneskeheden til den forestående opgave, som illustreret af Måne-Mars-missionen. Megen morskab kom fra at gøre grin med den skøre prins Charles, der for nylig advarede om, at verden ikke kan overleve, hvis vi ikke stopper kulstofudledninger inden for 18 måneder. En organisator spurgte de underholdte og fornøjede forbipasserende: “Hvor mange vindmøller skal der til for at flyve til Månen?” Lederne af den psykotiske miljøplan i Kongressen, “Green New Deal”, (nu kendt som “Apokalypsens fire Damer”) er blot marionetter for den britiske kongefamilie og deres håndlangere, som Al Gore og George Soros, der forsøger at redde deres bankerotte finanssystem gennem nedskæringer, affolkning og krig.

Deltag i Schiller Instituttets fejring af månelandingen lørdag den 20. juli kl. 19.00, på https://youtu.be/6G_mx9ix68I under overskriften: “Menneskehedens fremtid må bestemme vores nutid – en dialog mellem kulturer om, hvordan man udvikler befolkningen og de produktive kræfter for Jordens næste halvtreds år.”

[NYHEDSORIENTERING JUNI 2019:](#)

Rens Lyndon LaRouches navn for at forhindre krig

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

Her er mere af Helga Zepp-LaRouches webcast fra side 2.

Renselse af Lyndon LaRouche er afgørende for at stoppe det Britiske Imperiums fremstød imod 3. Verdenskrig

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 21. juni 2019

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Goddag! Jeg er Harley Schlanger fra Schiller Instituttet, og jeg vil gerne byde dig velkommen til denne uges webcast. Det er den 21. juni 2019. Vi taler med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, grundlægger af, og præsident for, Schiller Instituttet.

Dette er et utroligt historisk øjeblik. Der er en uge til G20-topmødet i Osaka, Japan, hvor der er potentiale for et historisk vendepunkt omkring ideen om en fire-magts-aftale om etablering af et nyt finansielt system – et 'Ny Bretton Woods' – en idé som Lyndon LaRouche fremsatte for næsten to årtier siden. Samtidig kommer der en utrolig krigsmobilisering fra krigspartiet, som forsøger at forsvare et bankerot system.

Men jeg synes at vi, for at starte diskussionen, virkelig skal tage fat på spørgsmålet om LaRouches frifindelse, og det initiativ der er blevet taget af LaRouche PAC og Schiller Instituttet med frigivelsen af to nye videoer; den ene hedder "LaRouche-sagen: Robert Muellers første Lejemord"; den anden er en video om mindearrangementet, der fandt sted i New York City for to uger siden. Så, Helga, vil du ikke give os en fornemmelse af mobiliseringen, der er i gang omkring frifindelsen, og betydningen af at disse to videoer bliver udgivet, rent faktisk, i dag?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: For mange mennesker vildet sikkert ikke være indlysende, men hvis Lyndon LaRouches navn ikke renses, tror jeg ikke, at vi kan stoppe de nuværendetrommehvirvler for Tredje Verdenskrig. At rense hans navn

og neutralisere den krigsmaskine, som driver verden mod Tredje Verdenskrig, er en og samme ting. For det er netop det apparat, der retsforfulgte min mand på trods af, at han var uskyldig i alle anklager, som nu driver verden til randen af udryddelse. I dag har vi, på samme tidspunkt i mange lande rundt om i verden, søsat en international operation med udgivelsen, i særdeleshed, af dokumentarfilmen »The LaRouche Case (LaRouche-sagen)«. Jeg vil opfordre alle seere, alle jer som ser dette program, til straks at gå på vores hjemmeside, downloade videoen og se den; send linket til enhver mulig kontakt, I har – e-mail lister, sociale medier, bare nogen I kender – og hjælp os med at sprede dette internationalt (se: www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=27712).

Denne video, som viser den fuldstændig uhørte bøjning af loven i sagen mod Lyndon LaRouche, hvor vi har de absolut autoritative stemmer fra hans tidligere advokat, Odin Anderson, og USA's forhenværende justitsminister Ramsey Clark, der kommer ind på årsagerne til, at LaRouche-sagen er det mest utrolige tilfælde af bøjning af loven og ødelæggelse af det amerikanske retssystem i USA's historie. Nu er det vores mål at få disse videoer ud overalt, og få handlet på dem; hvilket betyder, at vi har brug for at rense LaRouches navn. Grunden til at dette er så absolut vigtigt er, at det efter min og mine kollegers bedste dømmekraft, er den eneste måde hvorpå Tredje Verdenskrig kan stoppes. Årsagen er meget enkel. Det apparat, der retsforfulgte min mand i 1980'erne, og fortsatte med det i 1990'erne og 2000'erne, er den samme maskine, som lige nu er den drivende kraft bag konfrontationen med Rusland og Kina. Blot for at nævne, hvor absolut påtrængende det er, og hvor tæt vi er på, hvad der kunne blive Tredje Verdenskrig, er det faktum, at ifølge et tweet af Trump, var ordren til at angribe Iran – efter at de skød den amerikanske drone ned – allerede givet; og 10 minutter før angrebet, der havde tre steder i Iran som mål, aflyste Trump angrebet. Ifølge hans eget tweet, spurgte han de relevante militære kommandanter, hvor mange dødsfald et sådant angreb på Iran ville have, og de sagde omkring 150. Så sagde han: »Dette er ude af proportion«, og han aflyste angrebet. Se, dette er en utrolig historie, for hvis det var sket, var vi måske på vej til Tredje Verdenskrig; og dette er ikke nogen overdrivelse. Trommehvirvlerne for krig var absolut utrolige. Tag blot et par skridt tilbage. Man havde artiklen i New York Times, der sagde, at de amerikanske sikkerhedsstyrker – Pentagon og såvidere – har optrappet cyberangrebene mod Rusland bag ryggen på Trump, hvilket Trump kaldte forræderi. Så havde man historien om at det angiveligt var den iranske Revolutionsgarde, der stod bag angrebet på de to olietankskibe i Oman-bugten. Dette er efter al sandsynlighed endnu en af disse falske nyheder, en falsk flagoperation. Og det peger på det faktum, at man i USA lige nu har en dobbelt magtsituation. Som du nævnte, eller som vi vil diskutere mere, sker det en uge før G20-mødet, hvor, hvis dette blæses op, den sidste chance for fred kan gå tabt. Og på den anden

side har man potentialet for at Trump mødes med Putin og Xi Jinping i særdeleshed og finder en løsning på de mange problemer i denne verden. Så vi er i en nedtælling. Men som jeg sagde, er rensning af Lyndon LaRouches navn helt afgørende; fordi den eneste måde man kan afvæbne og neutralisere krigspartiet i USA er at gøre denne sag til det mest prominente problem. Fordi det peger på sammenhængen mellem krigspartiet i dag og det apparat som er ansvarlig for mørklægningen af 11. september samt »Russiagate«, og folk er nødt til at forstå denne forbindelse.

Schlanger: Videoen er tilgængelig med et link på denne hjemmeside, og den er også tilgængelig på LaRouche PAC [<https://action.larouchepac.com/exonerate>]. Helga, hvad der står klart efter at have set denne video og talt med folk om det er, at selvom høringerne er fra 1995 eller 1996 – mere end to årtier gamle – er emnerne de samme, som det der sker i dag. Det er forbløffende, vil du ikke sige det?

Zepp-LaRouche: Ja, jeg mener at tribunalet, der fandt sted i 1995, hvor mange internationale VIP'er, amerikanske lovgivere gennemgik sagen og hørte vidnesbyrd fra Odin Anderson og Ramsey Clark; jeg synes at det gør det helt klart, at der må rådes bod på denne, min mands sag.

Jeg vil stærkt tilskynde folk til at se videoen om Lyndon LaRouches sag sammen med den, ganske vist, lange video af mindearrangementet, fordi man bør se de to ting sammen. Retsforfølgelsen og bagvaskelsen af min mand er i fuldstændig modstrid til hans virkelige liv og livsværk, hvilket man får et glimt af i den meget smukke video om mindehøjtideligheden. Det er i virkeligheden nøglebudskabet, som skal ud til verden. Som jeg sagde i tribunalet, var uretten mod Lyndon LaRouche ikke alene det, at han blev sat uskyldigt i fængsel; men hvad der så at sige også blev sat i fængsel, var hele tankegodset af hans ideer og løsninger til verdens kriser, og dette er endnu mere påtrængende i dag. Så igen beder jeg om, at man tager sig tid; se disse to videoer [<https://action.larouchepac.com/exoneate>]. Og hjælp os så med at få dem rundt om kloden ad hvilken som helst kanal man overhovedet kan, fordi det er nøglen til at løse faren for krig. Så det er min indtrængende appel til Jer alle.

Schlanger: Se, som du sagde, kunne vi have været i 3. Verdenskrig fra i aftes. Alt imens det blev undgået, fortsætter presset for denne konfrontation fra krigspartiet. Ser du nogen ændring i det, som følge af præsident Trumps beslutning om at holde sig tilbage?

Zepp-LaRouche: Det må tiden vise. Jeg synes, det er en hel utrolig demonstration af, at vi faktisk har en dobbelt magtsituation i USA. Det er blevet et emne for

offentlig diskussion. Bare for at gennemgå det igen, fordi især vores internationale seere måske ikke har bemærket det på samme måde, men det faktum, at *New York Times* havde en artikel, i hvilken de pralede af, og de henviste til, at John Bolton sagde dette på et seminar afholdt af *Wall Street Journal* for et par dage siden, at USA's sikkerhedsstyrker, efterretningstjenesten, Pentagon, optrappede den allerede eksisterende cyber-krigsførelse, som oprindeligt blev bestilt af Obama; at de optrappede dette og gik efter el-nettet i Rusland. Nu er dette ikke nogen lille affære, for naturligvis forsyner el-nettet i ethvert land energi til hospitaler, til militærkommandoen og kontrol, til vandforsyninger; så det må betragtes som en krigshandling.

Trump tweetede straks og sagde, at dette var forræderi. Han sagde også, at det på eller anden måde var falske nyheder, når hele historien blev lækket på denne måde. For eksempel påpegede professor Stephen Cohen, som er en meget kendt Rusland-analytiker i USA, det faktum, at {*New York Times*} efter al sandsynlighed lakkede denne historie i det øjemed at ødelægge potentialet for et topmøde mellem Trump og Putin på det kommende G20-topmøde; ligesom medierne har gjort det før ved mangfoldige lejligheder. Hver gang der er et potentiale for en løsning, lækker de noget, eller gør noget uhyrligt for at sabotere et sådant topmøde. Så dette er én ting; og det rejser helt åbenbart spørgsmålet om, at hvis præsidenten ikke er informeret, hvem er det så, der styrer USA? Det er et spørgsmål, der bliver stillet af mange mennesker rundt om i verden; mennesker der bemærker det faktum, at Trump er en ting – som demonstreret af at han holdt angrebet mod Iran tilbage – men at sådanne medlemmer af hans kabinet som Bolton, Pompeo og andre, klart er 'noget andet'. Så det er ikke klart, hvem der giver ordrene.

Det samme synes at være sket i tilfældet med Iran – hvor, du ved, denne historie er utrolig. Iranerne, som svar på beskyldningen om at de var ansvarlige for angrebet på de to olietankskibe – for hvilket der ikke er noget bevis; flere regeringer, herunder den tyske og japanske regering, har krævet beviser, fordi denne video som Pompeo udsendte, klart ikke udgør noget bevis. Så nedskød iranerne en drone. USA sagde, at denne drone var i internationalt farvand, men iranerne har nu udgivet en video der viser, at ikke kun dronen, men også et amerikansk fly lettet fra De Forenede Arabiske Emirater, gik ind i Oman-bugten, vendte tilbage og kom derefter ind i, ikke alene internationalt farvand, men iransk territorium. Ifølge de iranske militærkommandanter sendte de flere advarsler om, at disse to amerikanske fartøjer – drone og fly – var kommet ind i iransk territorium uden at få nogen respons. Derefter nedskød iranerne dronen, men ikke flyet, som en advarsel til USA.

Dette er absolut – hvem vågner ikke op og indser, at vi er på randen af Tredje

Verdenskrig? – En sådan person befinder sig ikke virkelighedens verden. Vi er tættere på Tredje Verdenskrig end på noget andet tidspunkt – jeg vil sige end på noget tidspunkt i hele efterkrigstiden. Denne fare er endnu ikke drevet over. Jeg synes det er en rigtig god ting, at Trump greb ind i sidste øjeblik, men det var 10 minutter før angrebet! Folk bør virkelig indse, at dette ikke er nogen vittighed. Men igen, på kort sigt er den eneste måde at respondere på at opretholde processen for at få rensset Lyndon LaRouche. Hvis man vil stoppe Tredje Verdenskrig, så hjælp os med at få frifindelsen af LaRouche på dagsordenen internationalt; men i særdeleshed i forhold til præsident Trump, som har en meget god grund til at gøre det, fordi det ville tage sigte mod de samme kræfter som står bag 'Russiagate', og dem der gør det vanskeligt for ham at gennemføre hans hensigter med hensyn til at forbedre forholdet til Rusland og Kina.

Schlanger: Helga, med korrupsion af medierne i USA, hvor disse ting ikke på nogen måde dækkes i detaljer eller selv i virkeligheden, synes russerne at være mere direkte end nogensinde før i at advare om krigsfaren. Hvad kan du sige om det, som kan hjælpe med at vække folk op til at indse, hvor tæt vi er på denne situation?

Zepp-LaRouche: Præsident Putin advarer om, at et angreb på Iran vil have katastrofale konsekvenser. Han sagde også – umiddelbart efter St. Petersburg International Economic Forum – i et interview til nyhedsbureauet Mir, at situationen mellem USA og Rusland forværres for hver time der går. Jeg synes det er en fair beskrivelse, i betragtning af hvad der er blevet offentliggjort netop nu – nemlig at 'The Joint Chiefs of Staff' (den amerikanske overkommando for hæren, flåden og luftvåbnet, red.) for første gang i flere år har offentliggjort deres atomstrategi. Lad mig læse et citat for dig, der gør det helt klart. Dette er en gennemgang af den atomstrategi, planlægning, målsøgning, kommando og kontrol, som omfatter ideen om brug af kernevåben i enhver konfrontation. Citatet, som jeg vil læse for dig er:

“Brugen af atomvåben kunne skabe betingelser for afgørende resultater og genoprettelse af strategisk stabilitet. Specifikt vil brugen af et atomvåben grundlæggende ændre omfanget af et slag, og skabe betingelser der påvirker hvordan kommandører vil få overhånden i en konflikt. “[Fælles publikation 3-72, Atomoperationer]

Dette er utroligt! Det er ideen om, at man kan bruge et enkelt atomvåben. Som om mange eksperter, som for eksempel Ted Postol, ikke har skrevet lange og meget overbevisende artikler om, at det ligger i atomvåbnenes karakter, at det ligger i logikken af den slags våbensystemer, at når man en gang er startet på at bruge

et sådant våben, vil de alle blive brugt. Det ville med al sandsynlighed betyde udryddelsen af vores civilisation.

Denne rapport var offentliggjort i en uge, og blev derefter pludseligt trukket tilbage, og det blev kun genopslået på initiativ af 'Føderationen af Amerikanske Videnskabsfolk', der ønskede at påpege denne doktrins faktum. Jeg tror, at alt skal ses i sammenhæng, og det understreger den absolutte nødvendighed af at neutralisere krigsfraktionen; hvis gruppering udtrykkeligt indbefatter briterne, om hvem Craig Murray, den tidligere britiske ambassadør, sagde, at for det britiske politiske system, regering og medier, er forskellen mellem fiktion og sandhed helt udvisket; og det burde vække alvorlig bekymring hos alle, fordi den britiske rolle i at anstifte alt dette er helt afgørende.

Det viser med al ønskelig tydelighed, at vi må ændre paradigmet; at krigsfraktionen skal stoppes; at Trump må sættes i stand til at gennemføre sine intentioner om at forbedre relationerne med Rusland og Kina, som han mange gange har sagt. Det er i virkeligheden dette, som jeg beder Jer, seerne, om at hjælpe os med at kommunikere ud: Fordi jeg tænker, at faren er virkelig som den var det i 1914. Uden en dybtgående mobilisering af mennesker over hele kloden, men især i Vesten, i Europa og USA, er vi i stor fare for – som søvngængere – at gå ind i en ny krig, præcis som det skete i 1914. Så kom med i vores mobilisering for at forhindre netop dette.

Schlanger: Hvis vi går tilbage til spørgsmålet om rensning af Lyndon LaRouches navn, så var det netop under lignende omstændigheder i slutningen af 1970'erne under Carter Administration, med galninge som Brzezinski og andre, der pressede på for krig, at Lyndon LaRouche intervenserede med SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative), og operationen imod ham kom som en konsekvens af Ronald Reagans vedtagelse af hans politik. Jeg synes, at dette er en anden parallel, der er ganske slående for at få folk til at forstå, hvorfor angrebet i dag er en parallel til, hvad der blev gjort imod Lyn i 1980'erne.

Zepp-LaRouche: Den eneste måde, hvorpå man i dette sene stadium af det strategisk spil, så at sige, kan komme ud af denne situation, ville være den slags samarbejde mellem – ikke kun USA og Rusland, som min mand i sin tid foreslog det mellem USA og Sovjetunionen – men som i særdeleshed også omfatter Kina og Indien. Fordi hans argument var, at der er behov for [enighed mellem] de fire mest magtfulde lande i verden for at afslutte det britiske system af imperialistisk kontrol over verden. Dette er yderst vigtigt. Det ville dybest set betyde, at der under G20-mødet forhåbentligt vil finde et topmøde sted, som der er planer for; men vær på tærne, for i ugen op til G20-topmødet må vi forvente en indsats for at destabilisere dette potentiale indtil sidste øjeblik;

som vi netop har set det med dette aflyste angreb imod Iran. Forhåbentlig kommer det til et topmøde mellem præsident Trump og Xi Jinping, og det ville ikke alene [kunne] afslutte handelskrigen, men barsle med en omfattende aftale. skulle forhåbentlig også komme et topmøde mellem Trump og Putin. Og hvis det skulle gå rigtig godt, ville der være et topmøde mellem de fire ledere. Husk på, at efter St. Petersborgs Internationale Økonomiske Forum og SCO's [Shanghai Samarbejdsorganisation] topmøde i Bishkek et par dage senere, mødtes de tre ledere – Putin, Xi Jinping og Modi – allerede i Bishkek; og sagde at de ville mødes igen i Osaka på G20-mødet.

Så det bedste der kunne ske ville være, at de inviterer præsident Trump til at deltage i dette topmøde, og at Trump accepterer det. Fordi medmindre der er enighed om at tage fat på det meget presserende spørgsmål om det truende sammenbrud af det finansielle system, og en overgang til en Ny Bretton Woods-aftale, som især ville tage sig af det nødvendige kreditsystem til industrialisering af udviklingslandene, samt afslutte det system med kasino-økonomi, som vi har nu, ved at etablere et nyt kreditsystem og indføre et nyt paradigme. Jeg tror vi vil diskutere spørgsmålet om et nyt paradigme lidt mere, men der er brug for en helt anden tænkning om hvordan disse strategiske spørgsmål gribes an, for hvis vi forbliver indenfor området af geopolitik, som i forestillingen om at Europa skal blive en stærk, forenet bastion mod andre stærke kræfter – USA, Rusland, Kina; og hvis USA mener, at Kina og Kinas fremgang må inddæmnes – hvis man bliver hængende i den slags tænkning, så er det kun et spørgsmål om tid, før hele denne strategiske situationen vil gå helt grassat og komme ude af kontrol. Så lad os mobilisere for at sætte spørgsmålet om en 'fire-magts-aftale' for G20 på dagsordenen, og hjælp os med at mobilisere for det, fordi dette kan være den sidste chance for at gøre det. Fordi det står meget klart, at vi både strategisk, militært, men også med hensyn til den økonomiske situation sidder på en krudttønde. Derfor har vi brug for en akut ændring i hele tilgangen...

Zepp-LaRouche: Folk husker muligvis Martins Niemöller ord, som lød: Først kommer de efter dine naboer, så kommer de efter sigøjnerne, og så kommer de efter jøderne. Ja, man kan blot tilføje: "De er allerede kommet efter Lyndon LaRouche; de kom efter USA's præsident; og nu må du hellere hjælpe os med at ændre hele denne dynamik". Så bring venligst disse videoer rundt, og studér dem. Mange mennesker har været bange for at gå ud med ideen om at LaRouche repræsenterede magtfulde begreber, som er nødvendige for at løse verdens kriser. Hele retsforfølgelsen blev gjort med kun ét formål: At forgifte brønden, at gøre folk bange. Men at overvinde frygten, lige nu, for at slutte sig til Lyndon LaRouche og den bevægelse han skabte, er hvad der gør forskellen mellem krig og fred. Så gå med i vores mobilisering

[Se foredragsrækken om LaRouches liv: Jordens sidste 50 år og Jordens næste 50 år](#)

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

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

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

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

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

[#3: Lyndon LaRouches unikke bidrag til videnskaben om universel historie. Klik her.](#)

Will Wertz. I et essay han skrev, som blev udgivet i foråret 1993 med titlen »Om

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

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

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

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

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

Ben Deniston og Paul Gallagher. Den 23. marts 1983 traf præsident Reagan en beslutning – trods stærk modstand fra sine rådgivere – om at gøre LaRouches strategiske forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) til USA's politik. Det var en del af LaRouches rumprojektforeslag for en ny æra af potentielt set ubegrænset fremskridt.

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

[Se og del: Dokumentarfilm om at rense Lyndon LaRouches navn.](#)

Læs også afskriftet (på engelsk) nedenunder.

Trailer:

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

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

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

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

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

Afskrift på engelsk:

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

The Case for the Exoneration of Lyndon LaRouche

June 21, 2019

[music]

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

For me, the biggest crime of what happened to my husband is not that he was innocently in jail. I'm not saying it was not a hard time, because it was. But

the lack of the ability to have important ideas govern history; that is the biggest crime. Lyn, while he was incredibly courageous of producing creative work while he was in prison – I mean, he did more in prison than any of us outside, and he put us to shame.

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

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

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

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

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

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

NARRATOR: Witnesses included: LaRouche’s attorney, Odin Anderson; former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had been LaRouche’s defense attorney in his appeal; Lyndon LaRouche’s wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche – from whom you just heard; and Lyndon LaRouche himself. The panel was comprised of leading national and international political figures, including the former Vice Premier of Slovakia, Jozef Miklosko; numerous state senators and other elected officials from across the United States; as well as Chor-Bishop of the Maronite Church, Monsignor Elias el-Hayek. Numerous international observers were present, including legendary Civil Rights heroine Amelia Boynton Robinson of Selma, Alabama.

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

[from Oct. 6, 1986]

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

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

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

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

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

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

During the evening of October 6th, moves to implement that plan seemed to begin with news stations broadcasting that now an assault was about to occur on the

farm. A telegram was sent in LaRouche's name to President Ronald Reagan, seeking his intervention to call off the raid. Coincidentally, at exactly the same time, President Reagan was in Reykjavik, Iceland, refusing to back down in negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev on his commitment to the so-called SDI – the Strategic Defense Initiative. The same SDI that Lyndon LaRouche had worked for years alongside top officials in the Reagan Administration to craft and support.

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

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

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

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

As can be seen, the failure to challenge the gross abuses of justice,

perpetrated by the Justice Department in the case of Lyndon LaRouche, has now brought us to the point, where the very Constitutional system on which our republic depends is being threatened.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

I'm thankful, as I looked up and counted names, there are only 11 of you. If

there had been a 12th, I would have been tempted to re-try this case in front of you, assured, I think, that Mr. LaRouche would finally get a fair trial...

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

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

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

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

What you see before you, is an FBI memorandum from the SAC, the Special Agent-in-Charge, of the New York Field Office of the FBI, to the Director. It's dated March 1969. And, it requests authorization of the Director to issue a false leaflet, to stir up antagonisms between these various aspects of SDS. Now, I'm sure that's a tactic familiar to all of you, if in slightly different form. They want to disseminate this leaflet under false cover, to various of these groups, and stir up as much controversy between them, hopefully, undermining their ability to act in concert, and getting them into faction fights, which would destroy their efficiency and cohesion.

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

look at the bottom – what was called “Cointelpro,” or “Counterintelligence Program.”...

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

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

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

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

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

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

And Mr. Kissinger writes to (on his letterhead) William Webster, the Director of

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

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

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

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

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

Well, that's precisely what happened in the LaRouche case, probably more so than in any other case.... In the LaRouche case, the press began, not by accident, because we all know who owns the press: It's not owned by individuals, and as a matter of fact, there's an awful lot of ownership of the press which represents certain political and financial interests.

So, the fact is that beginning in the same period of the 80s, a private financier in New York City, John Train, with reach into the media community, by

virtue of his social and financial circumstances, convened a group of media types in a salon that he hosted in his apartment, to plan a press campaign against LaRouche, and his political movement. Their objective was threefold: to tar and feather Lyndon LaRouche and his colleagues as best they could; to advocate and press for prosecutions of any kind, in any place; and, ultimately, to destroy and jail LaRouche, and destroy the political movement which he headed.

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

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

I want to move on briefly and specifically to the LaRouche cases, which are, in fact, a series of cases, that began in 1984.

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

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

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

We sued NBC in Alexandria, Va. As soon as that case was over, NBC in Boston, on

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

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

But, if you know anything about credit cards, the only way a person can re-capture money charged to his credit card, which has been charged to the account, is to say “it was unauthorized.” Those are the magic words. If you don’t use the magic words, you can’t collect the \$100. So, in order to reverse a credit card charge, one must say, “I never authorized it.”

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

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

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

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

months and months, on governmental misconduct, the case dragged on, and the jury sat in the jury box.

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

This is an article from the {Boston Herald} that printed that day. [Exhibit No. 6] I'm only showing it to you for one reason, not because of the highlight, "LaRouche Jury Would Have Voted `Not Guilty'" – although that's true, and those come out of the words of the jury foreman, who was interviewed – but, in the first line of text, there are some very important words, from the foreman:

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

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

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

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

There's a great book, and it's not a novel, it's a factual book. It is the history of the case shown by the documents of the case; it's called {*Railroad!*} and I commend it to your attention. If you're to see how that system worked in this particular case, it's all there, and it's not somebody else's words, it's the words from the court documents.

In any event, LaRouche was convicted, as were all of his co-defendants, {*again*},

on conspiracy charges. That was the seminal charge, the rest were just tacked on. This time it wasn't credit cards. It was allegations of wire fraud, the allegation being that loans were taken from contributors, without intent to repay, or with reckless disregard of that fact that payment wouldn't take place.

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

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

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

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

The \$20 million the government sought, was a ruse. In fact, what they intended to do, and what they did do, was close the conspiracy that they alleged in the Alexandria indictments, on the very day that they filed the bankruptcy. The point of the bankruptcy being that from the moment a bankruptcy is filed, an order issued, that no one can pay any debts without order of the court. So it was physically impossible for any debts to be repaid after that, thereby creating a pool of persons who were owed money, who couldn't be repaid. They [the government] got five or six of these people to come forward and say, "I was promised repayment and didn't get it," and that was the basis of the conviction for loan fraud.

In any event, I want to say that we have fought as vigorously as anyone can through the appeals process, without success and through the *{mandamus}* process, 2255s in federal court. And are now at a stage, where, Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, who has been with me on all of the

appeals, – he joined the effort just after the sentencing of Mr. LaRouche and his colleagues in 1990. Recently, he wrote a letter to the Attorney General, asking for a departmental review of the LaRouche case. I'd like to read you some portions of his letter. He'll be here tomorrow to speak to you personally. I'd like to leave you with the following words of Ramsey Clark:

“Dear Attorney General Reno,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And yet, all this law enforcement was coming down on them. We didn't have that kind of violence, that physical violence, in the LaRouche case. But the potential from one side was entirely there. The day they went out to seize 2 million documents, as I recall (I may be off a million or 2 million), a big

warehouse! These people produce a lot of paper, and it's not trash; it's not bureaucratic paper-keeping; you may not agree with it, but it's all saying things. They had several times more agents, armed, than the ATF force that initially attacked the Mount Carmel Church outside Waco on Feb. 28, 1993. They just didn't have people on the other side, who were shooters....

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

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

We're going to have a billion more people before the end of this millennium, century, decade, and the vast majority, 80% of them are going to have beautiful, darker skin. And they're going to live short lives, *{short lives}* of sickness, hunger, pain, ignorance, and violence, *{unless we act radically}*. And these books have ideas! Some will work, some won't work, but they're ideas. They can be "tested in the marketplace," as we used to say.

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

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

have financial crunch, where you can't pay back.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There's a continuing effort. I think it will bear fruit. We've asked the Department of Justice for a comprehensive review. Lyndon LaRouche has always asked for a review, not only of his case, but of all cases where there are allegations of serious misconduct, and usually names a bunch of 'em. And so,

we've always done that. That's his vision. It happens to be my vision, too, of how you correct things.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MANN: The session will come to order.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the course of this, a number of these students who participated in these classes, became associated with me, and, out of this association, came the birth of a nascent political organization, as much a philosophical organization as

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

And that was essentially our commitment as an association.

We became rather unpopular with a number of institutions, including McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation. About 1969, we made a mess of a few projects he was funding, by exposing them. And we also became unpopular with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, perhaps on the behest of McGeorge Bundy.

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

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

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

It started, according to the record – of which I had some sensibility this was going on at the time – of Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State (with whom no love was lost between us), went to William Webster and others, soliciting an FBI or other government operation against me and my associates. This led, as the record later showed, to a decision by Henry Kissinger's friends on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, recommending an

operation against me and my associates. This was adopted during the same month of January by Judge Webster, the Director of the FBI, who passed the implementation of this instruction along to his subordinate, Oliver "Buck" Revell, recently retired from the FBI, I believe.

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

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

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

This salon, including the Anti-Defamation League, NBC-TV, others, the Associated Press, actively collaborated, beginning sometime in 1984, with forces inside the government, which were determined to have a criminal prosecution against me and my associates. The criminal prosecution was launched at about the time of the 1984 presidential election, in October-November 1984. And from that point on, it was a continued escalation, until a Federal case in Boston led to a mistrial, occasioned largely by government misconduct in the case, in May of 1988.

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

The motivations of the case against us, I think, are, in part, obvious, perhaps

partly not.

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

So I proposed, that the debt crisis be used as the occasion for united action, by a number of governments of South and Central American countries, to force a reform in the international debt relations, and to force a reform within international monetary relations. This report was entitled *{Operation Juárez}*, largely because of the relationship of President Lincoln to Mexico during the time that Lincoln was President; with the idea that it was in the interest of the United States to accept and sponsor such a reform, to assist these countries in the freedom to resume development of the type which they had desired.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have an out-of-control Justice Department, in my view, where the rot is not in the appointees, as much as it is in the permanent bureaucracy. We have a

permanent sickness, in the permanent bureaucracy of part of our government.

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

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

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

MANN: Thank you.

J.L. CHESTNUT: You and I had a little chat in Selma, Alabama. ... I guess you can understand, that even somebody like me, sometimes, feels {*overwhelmed*}, and wonders whether or not America is just a lost cause. I hate to sound that way, but after 40 years, I've got {*serious*} reservations about whether we can save this country, about whether this country even {*wants*} to be saved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[closing music]

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 20. juni 2019:

Vil Trump samarbejde med Kina og Rusland ved G20 eller blive manipuleret ind i krig med Iran?

Se også 2. del inkl. diskussionen

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: 2. del:

Kommer senere. Der skal rettes op på et lyd problem. I middeertid, kan slutning høres i lydfilen nedenfor, inkl. "Hvad er Schiller Instituttet?". (begynd på 1 time 47 min.)

Lyd:

Russiagate-fupnummer kollapser. Bring USA, Rusland og Kina sammen nu for at erstatte det Britiske Imperium

for evigt

Den 22. maj (EIRNS) – Det russiske svindelnummer startede ikke med Obamas efterretningsholds forræderi rettet mod Donald Trump. Det begyndte i 2014, da det samme hold af korrupte efterretningsfolk, sammen med Obamas udenrigsministerium og deres følgesvend George Soros, bakket op af den falske nyhedspresse, iværksatte det Britiske komplot for at vælte den folkevalgte regering i Ukraine, ved åbent at støtte de neo-nazistiske bander, som udfører en voldelig “farve-revolution” mod regeringen i Kiev. Ved at tildele 5 milliarder \$ til anti-russiske NGO’er, uddele små kager til hagekorsbærende bøller på Maidan-pladsen, gennemførte Obamas repræsentant, Victoria Nuland, og hendes ven Christopher Steele – den samme MI6-agent, der senere opdigtede det falske dossier om Trump – et kriminelt, voldelig kup, skød skylden på russerne, og igangsatte deres operation for en 3. verdenskrig.

Derefter opfangede kandidat Donald Trump stemningen fra en amerikansk befolkning, der afskyede den økonomiske nedgang, evindelige koloniale krigsførelse, den forsætlige overmedicinering af deres venner og børn, og kulturen af pessimisme og grimhed. Hans løfte om at genoprette det amerikanske system fandt genklang hos borgere, der havde oplevet 50 års organisering af LaRouche-bevægelsen, som både advarede om truslen om depression og krig under den britisk dominerede monetære og strategiske politik fra familien Bush og Obama, og samtidig fremsatte de nødvendige økonomiske, strategiske og kulturelle politikker for at opnå en ny, produktiv og fredelig verdensorden.

LaRouche, ene og alene, advarede om det onde i den grønne psykose, der forgiftede den historiske amerikanske optimisme. LaRouche alene identificerede det faktum, at “Dope, Incorporated” (A/S Narkotika –red.,) blev drevet af bankerne i London og Wall Street, de samme spekulative banker som organiserede og finansierede de endeløse krige, der krævedes af “det militær-industrielle kompleks”. LaRouche alene kæmpede for et Måne-Mars-projekt for at realisere menneskehedens “udenjordiske imperativ”. LaRouche alene fremsatte nødvendigheden af at gøre en ende på det Britiske Imperium, en gang for alle, med dets geopolitiske, dyriske syn på mennesket – intet mindre – og at dette udelukkende kunne opnås ved, at USA sluttede sig til Rusland, Kina og Indien, som et minimum, for at erstatte det fallerede britiske monetære system med et nyt kreditsystem, baseret på de hamiltoniske principper, der havde skabt det oprindelige amerikanske system. LaRouche alene foreslog “Den Nye Silkevej” for at forene øst og vest efter Sovjetunionens sammenbrud, som et middel til at afslutte geopolitikken for evigt og etablere en ny verdensorden baseret på suveræne stater viet til menneskehedens fælles mål.

Alt dette er nu inden for vores rækkevidde, og er blevet foreslået eller i det mindste antydnet af præsident Trump. Hvis dette skal opnås, må det amerikanske folk indse, at forfølgelsen og retsforfølgningen af Lyndon LaRouche i 1980'erne, af de samme mennesker der udførte det fejlslagne kup mod præsident Trump, forhindrede denne politik i at blive gennemført dengang, før de sidste 30 års katastrofale degeneration.

LaRouches frifindelse af præsident Trump ville bringe denne sandhed frem for verden, og give præsidenten den offentlige og internationale støtte han behøver for at smide den britiske spændetrøje, der er pålagt af den korrupte Kongres, de falske nyhedsmedier, de neokonservative og de neolibérale. Tiden er knap. Tiden er inde. Potentiallet for sejr har aldrig været større.

[Hæfte: Genopret USA's sjæl: Rens Lyndon LaRouches navn](#)

To dele af følgende hæfte er oversat til dansk:

[1. Underskriftindsamling: Rens Lyndon LaRouches navn og få ham rensat for den uretfærdige forfølgelse, domfældelse og fængsling han var udsat for](#)

[2. Nekrolog: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. \(1922-2019\)](#)

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

[Bøger af Lyndon LaRouche og hans medarbejdere,](#)

[som kan bestilles via Amazon eller Schiller Instituttet i Danmark](#)

Her er en oversigt med nye og genudgivne bøger fra LaRouche-bevægelsen . Bøger markeret med et "*" er tilgængelige fra Amazons Print on Demand system. De andre bøger kan også bestilles gennem Amazon.com

Nogle af bøgerne kan bestilles direkte fra Schiller Instituttet i Danmark. Ring +45 53 57 00 51 for at høre, om vi har dem på lager.

A Fifty Year Development Policy for the Indian Pacific Ocean Basins, af Lyndon LaRouche

*A Manual on the Rudiments of Tuning and Registration**

*Against the Current! A Critique of the Trade Policy of the German Realm from the Standpoint of Carey's Researches**

Cold Fusion: Challenge to U.S. Science Policy, af Lyndon LaRouche

Colonize Space: Open the Age of Reason

Development Is The Name For Peace

Earth's Next Fifty Years: EIR Edition, af Lyndon LaRouche*

*Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom, Vol. I**

*Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom, Vol. III**

*Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom, Vol. III**

*Friedrich Schiller, Poet of Freedom, Vol. IV**

How The International Development Bank Will Work, af Lyndon LaRouche

*How The Nation Was Won**

How We Got To The Moon (Amazon only)

Now, Are You Ready To Learn Economics?, af Lyndon LaRouche*

Poetry is the Science of Reason, af Lyndon LaRouche og W. Allen Salisbury*

Reflections of an American Political Prisoner

Saint Augustine, Father of African and European Civilization

So You Wish To Learn All About Economics?, af Lyndon LaRouche*

Stop Club of Rome Genocide in Africa!, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The Case of Walter Lippmann, af Lyndon LaRouche*

*The Civil War and the American System**

The Economics of the Noosphere, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The EIR's Policy of Republican Grand Strategy of the United States, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The Four Powers, af Lyndon LaRouche*

*The Hitler Book**

The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land Bridge

The Political Economy of the American Revolution

The Power of Reason 1988, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The Renaissance and the Idea of Progress

The Science of Christian Economics, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The Secrets Known Only to the Inner Elites, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The State of Our Union: The End of our Delusion, af Lyndon LaRouche*

The Toynbee Factor in British Grand Strategy, af Lyndon LaRouche*

*The U.S.-Russian Entente That Saved the Union**

*The Vision of Hamilton**

There Are No Limits To Growth, af Lyndon LaRouche*

*Toward a New Council of Florence**

Treason In America

Why Credit Can Be Greatly Expanded Without Adding To Inflation, af Lyndon LaRouche*

Frifindelse kan nu ændre alt

Den 25. marts (EIRNS) – Præsident Donald Trump kaldte korrekt “de retslige” begivenheder i den forløbne weekend for sin frifindelse, og det kan nu føre til meget dybtgående ændringer af den nationale og globale situation, der var ved at blive ekstremt farlig. Præsidentens personlige advokat, Rudy Giuliani, talte straks om at komme til “navnet på den person, der startede dette”. Vi ved, at den nu eksploderede “Russiagate” blev startet fra British General Communications Headquarters (GCHQ) signalefterretninger og MI6’s oversøiske efterretningstjeneste i 2015, et netværk der drives af Sir Richard Dearlove og Sir Andrew Wood; Præsidenten og hans advokat ved, at angrebet var britisk. Derfor vil en målrettet modforskning, der ledes fra Det Hvide Hus, sprænge det amerikansk-britiske “særlige forhold” og det Britiske Imperiums krigs- og koldkrigspolitik. Det ville afslutte den geopolitiske krigskonfrontationspolitik, som London har trukket Trump ind i gennem ubønhørlig, McCarthy-agtig “Russiagating” på skamfuld vis, anført på stedet af ledende Demokrater – de nye, sande “neo-konservative”.

Præsident Trump kunne forholdsvis blive meget friere til at føre den politik, som han har talt for, men er blevet forhindret i at udføre, og samarbejde med andre stormagter – især Rusland og Kina – for fred. Og måske endda for udviklingen af tidligere krigshærgede regioner. Det bedste er, at dette pludselige skifte er startet lige så internationalt, som det nye paradigme for

økonomiske og videnskabelige fremskridt, der er indbegrebet af Kinas Bælte- og Vejinitiativ fra store infrastrukturprojekter, som breder sig i Asien, Afrika og Latinamerika, og nu i Europa med den nye aftale mellem Italien og Kina.

Men LaRouche-bevægelsen – som først sporede dette skændige angreb på præsidentskabet til britisk efterretningstjeneste og bragte denne afgørende sandhed frem – må føre an med disse ændringer. Ikke alene har den kæmpet for de økonomiske forandringer til at gøre det muligt, begyndende med Glass/Steagall-bankseparation og hamiltonisk nationalkredit, samt for videnskabelige gennembrud i atomkraft og rumforskning snarere end "grøn" radikal pessimisme.

Mere om sagens kerne: Retsforfølgningen og mediernes forfølgelse af Lyndon LaRouche og hans bevægelse etablerede et USA med tre årtiers afindustrialisering, kulturel demoralisering og krig. De fratog USA det økonomiske og strategiske lederskab, som LaRouche repræsenterede med hensyn til de økonomiske sammenbrud han forudså så præcist, og berøvede dem for de store projekter og videnskabelige fremskridt han udarbejdede til så mange regioner i verden. Og dem der organiserede angrebene på ham var netop de bevægelser, som hans bevægelse nu har afsløret igen i "Russiagate" – britisk efterretningstjeneste, som frygtede hans trussel mod den kongelige families "øko-fascisme"; Anglofile her som Henry Kissinger, som i officielle organer krævede LaRouches retsforfølgning; Wall Street-bankfolk; frem for alt de nationale liberale medier. LaRouche må nu frifindes, som påkrævet af en national underskriftindsamling, for at frifinde og frigøre landet til hans ideer. Og det er Præsident Trump, der kunne være fri til at rense LaRouche og frigøre sig selv til at handle, som han havde til hensigt i Det Hvide Hus.

Schiller Instituttets præsident, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der talte til dem der organiserede denne indsats i dag, sagde: "Det må naturligvis føre til briterne. Ved Trump og Giuliani og disse folk, at det var den britiske efterretningstjeneste? Det kan du være 100% sikker på, at de gør. Men det er tydeligvis helt klart op til os at fremskynde denne kampagne, og den bedste måde at gøre det på, er at presse på for Lyns frifindelse, for, som vi mange gange har sagt, det var nøjagtigt det samme apparat, der nu er taget i at udføre et kupforsøg mod USA's præsident – og mislykkes med det – som var bag retsforfølgelsen af Lyn og hans medarbejdere, og som stod bag mørklægningen af 11. september. Og disse mennesker skal stilles for retten, og Lyn skal også frifindes: Fordi så længe der er denne tilstand af, at der var nogen som helst legitimitet for hvad der blev gjort mod Lyn, vil folk være forhindret i at få adgang til hans ideer."

[NYHEDSORIENTERING MARTS 2019: Nekrolog, Lyndon LaRouche \(1922 – 2019\)](#)

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

[Nekrolog: Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. \(1922-2019\)](#)

Lyndon LaRouche døde den 12. februar 2019. Han stiftede en politisk bevægelse midt i 1960'erne, som Schiller Instituttet, stiftet af LaRouches kone Helga Zepp-LaRouche i 1984, er en del af.

Den 21. februar (EIRNS) – Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr., den US-amerikanske økonom og statsmand, der fra 1957 til 2007 udarbejdede og fremlagde verdens mest nøjagtige række af økonomiske forudsigelser, sov stille ind tirsdag morgen den 12. februar 2019. Han udgav i sit lange virke tusindvis af artikler og mere end hundrede bøger, boglange hæfter samt strategiske studier. LaRouche var en af de mest kontroversielle politiske personer i hele USA's historie.

En afgørende årsag dertil var, at LaRouche igen og igen stolt og energisk førte i alt otte præsidentkampagner til hvert valg mellem 1976 og 2004 med den hensigt efter mordene på John F. Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr. og Robert F. Kennedy mellem 1963 og 1968 at genetablere USA som en selvstyret nation på grundlag af den amerikanske forfatning. En anden årsag var, at det lykkedes ham at etablere det, der vurderedes som verdens bedste uafhængig nyhedstjeneste, med et efterretningsapparat, der gav ham og hans samarbejdspartnere evnen til at indsamle ufiltrerede efterretninger fra hele verden. Dette gjorde dem i stand

til på nøjagtig vis at gengive og rapportere om USA's økonomis sande tilstand og om US-amerikanske og internationale politiske processers egentlige forløb, der ellers forekom mystiske.

LaRouche skabte også en international filosofisk forening, hvis udgangspunkt det var at genskabe en forståelse af det årtusind-gamle kontrovers, der har udspillet sig mellem den platoniske tradition og den aristoteliske skole, kampen mellem den republikanske statsmodel og det oligarkiske imperielle system.

LaRouches internationale rækkevidde opstod som et resultat af hans vellykkede rekruttering af hundredvis af studerende med interesse for politik fra mange nationer, især europæiske samt syd- og nordamerikanske. Denne selvudpegede intelligentsia gav ham magten til at fostre og iværksætte politiske kursændringer via beskedne, men veluddannede og yderst velinformerede enheders indsats, der katalyserede meget større kræfter i forskellige nationer og undertiden gjorde, at disse fungerede som »ét sind på tværs af mange kontinenter.«

LaRouche var kendt for sin insistensen på, at hver borger i USA – såvel som borgere fra enhver suveræn nation – har ansvaret for at uddanne sig selv på de områder, der har afgørende betydning for de politiske beslutninger, som berører deres nationers og menneskehedens fremtid; for udelukkende at lave og forsvare politiske forslag, der »fremme[r] almindelig velfærd [...] for os selv og vore efterkommere« (fra fortalen til USA's forfatning – red.); og for at bekæmpe rovgriske økonomiske foranstaltninger, der vedtages for at opnå klodens affolkning, undertiden forklædt som »miljøbeskyttelse« eller »bæredygtig udvikling« og især rettet imod nationer i Afrika, Asien og Syd- og Centralamerika.

Selvom fremtrædende internationale personligheder og institutioner på det seneste er begyndt at rapportere om LaRouche, har ingen »større mediekilde« endnu haft modet til at citere Lyndon LaRouche for hans faktiske synspunkter på nogen af de områder, som han bidrog væsentligt til. Dette til trods for, at

LaRouche var en af USA's mest produktive forfattere. Denne frygt for LaRouche er bemærkelsesværdig, men ikke ny. Det har altid været tilfældet, at LaRouches modstandere havde en mindst lige så dybfølt frygt for den kraft, som LaRouches idéer besad, som de havde for personen LaRouche. Denne frygt vil ingenlunde aftage med hans fysiske bortgang.

Det anses stadig for utilladeligt, at LaRouches Fire Love; hans forslag til en firemagtsaftale mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien; hans opfindelse af Det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI) – som daværende præsident Ronald Reagan præsenterede på nationalt TV 23. marts 1983 – og hans enestående fem årtier lange kamp for udviklingen af fusionskraft nævnes i massemedierne, sågar i anledning af LaRouches død. Kendte USA's befolkning til disse politiske idéer, og dermed til, hvordan en påtvunget stilhedens sammensværgelse i årtier har nægtet dem adgang til LaRouche – især under de sidste 15 års finansielle kriser og nytteløse ødelæggende krige – ville de straks komme frem til, at nogen med stor ihærdighed i alle disse år må have prøvet at holde dem væk fra Lyndon LaRouches idéer.

Disse mennesker ville ikke længere finde sig i ordene »LaRouche er en slem fyr, men vi kan ikke fortælle dig hvorfor,« som forklaring på, hvorfor de ikke – heller ikke nu – bør vide, hvem Lyndon LaRouche er. Lykkes det os i dette historiske øjeblik at bryde de falske nyheders grænser ned, kan den virkelige Lyndon LaRouche endelig blive hørt og kendt. Til dette formål præsenteres følgende korte og meget ufuldstændige redegørelse for hans liv og arbejde.

Udviklingen af en global statsmand

LaRouche etablerede sig gennem mere end fire årtier som Det Britiske Imperiums største fjende, både i den form det tog før Anden Verdenskrig og i dets nuværende Commonwealth-form. At LaRouche tjente i Anden Verdenskrig, især i Indien-Burma-Kina-området, var personligt afgørende for ham: »Min livslange kamp for, at USA i efterkrigstidens skulle blive en verdensleder i arbejdet for at etablere en verdensorden viet til at fremme den økonomiske udvikling af de lande, vi i dag kalder 'udviklingslande', tog sin begyndelse med oplevelsen i

Kolkata i 1946,« skrev LaRouche i sin selvbiografi *The Power of Reason*: 1988. LaRouche begyndte at kæmpe med den moderne udgave af Det Britisk-Ostindiske Kompagnis »politisk-økonomiske teoretikere« og slavehandlere, hvis teorier dominerede de US-amerikanske universiteters økonomiske fakulteter i kølvandet på Anden Verdenskrig.

LaRouche modsatte sig heftigt den opfattelse, som udbredtes af Francis Bacon, Thomas Hobbes, Parson Thomas Malthus og John Locke, at mennesket er et dyr. I stedet genoprettede LaRouche videnskaben »fysisk økonomi« i USA, en videnskab etableret i 1672 af den tyske polyhistor Gottfried Leibniz, ophavsmanden til calculus og medopfinder af dampmaskinen. Gennem en intensiv studietid mellem 1948 og 1952 gjorde LaRouche fremskridt i sine uafhængige studier af fysik for at kunne udvikle sin metode til økonomiske forudsigelser. I bogen *LaRouche: Will This Man Become President?* hedder det: »I 1952 anerkendte LaRouche for første gang, at han ved at antage en opfattelse af energi, der er aldeles i overensstemmelse med Riemanns afhandling fra 1854 med titlen *Om de hypoteser, der ligger til grund for geometrien (Ueber die Hypothesen, welche der Geometrie zu Grunde liegen – red.)*, kunne måle både teknologi og økonomisk vækst med denne forståelse af, hvad energi er. I LaRouches værker måles økonomisk værdi – reel økonomisk vækst – primært i form af stigninger i samfundets relativt mulige befolkningstæthed.«

LaRouche anså imidlertid alt sit arbejde med fysisk økonomi som et særligt udtryk for og en del af en dybere epistemologisk opgave. I sit skrift *Beethoven as a Physical Scientist* fra 1988 skriver han:

»På alle de områder, hvor jeg har bidraget, grunder mine vigtigste opdagelser i min vellykkede afvisning af det berømte kantiske paradoks, som gentages i Immanuel Kants Kritik af dømmekraften. Kant hævdede to ting, der er relevante her.«

»For det første insisterede han på, at, omend der findes kreative processer, som er ansvarlig for gyldige grundlæggende videnskabelige opdagelser, ligger det

hinsides enhver menneskelig mulighed at forstå disse processer. Jeg beviste, at dette var forkert. Og fra dette bevis udviklede jeg en måde, hvorpå disse kreative processer, og dermed underforstået målingen af teknologisk udvikling som sådan, kunne fremstilles på forståelig vis.«

»For det andet argumenterede Kant på baggrund af den første antagelse for, at der i æstetikken ikke kan opstilles nogen forståelige kriterier for sandhed eller skønhed. At Tyskland og andre har godtaget denne tese, som Kant og efter ham Friedrich Carl von Savigny udbredte, har været årsagen til, at der i dag er så udbredt en tolerance indenfor alle kunstformer for enhver type af moderne irrationalisme.«

Lyndon LaRouches store produktion af skrifter om musik, økonomi, historie, sprog og de fysiske videnskaber inspirerede mange samarbejder og udvekslinger med mennesker over hele verden. LaRouche var først og fremmest en statsmand – ikke en politiker. Han udøvede statsmandskunst på en sokratiske-athenske vis.

Han etablerede organisationer ved at undervise. Først gav han adskillige forelæsningsrækker i 1966, i løbet af hvilke han gjorde yderligere fremskridt i og debatterede om sin metode for at lave økonomiske forudsigelser, især på universiteterne. Mange stødte først på LaRouche, mens han debatterede med de personer, der skulle blive 1970'ernes økonomiske og politiske akademiske autoriteter. Dette stoppede efter LaRouches berømte debat med økonomen Abba Lerner i 1971. Lerner tabte, da han gav udtryk for sin holdning om, at hvis man havde fulgt den tyske finansminister Hjalmar Schachts nedskæringspolitik i 1920'erne, »ville Hitler ikke have været nødvendig.« Indenfor få måneder kunne man ikke længere finde nogen, der ville debattere med LaRouche, og ingen yderligere debatter af denne art fandt sted.

LaRouches foredrag om, hvad der på det tidspunkt blev kaldt »dialektisk økonomi« var netop det – dialoger mellem LaRouche og filosofiske, økonomiske og videnskabelige personligheder fra historien, der er skildredes af ham med en fortællers nøjagtighed, altid uden noter og ofte uden nogen bøger overhovedet.

De studerende blev forsynet med et omfattende pensum af læsemateriale, med foreslåede læseplaner, der angav hver uges anbefalinger. En student fortæller, at »vi blev henvist til passager fra et værk som Kants Kritik af den praktiske fornuft, for eksempel. Vi blev bedt om at læse det. Hvis man gjorde det og kom til forelæsningen den næste uge, ville han først beskrive, hvordan han forstod passagen, hvilket han gjorde både overbevisende og nøjagtigt. Han ville derefter splitte det ad stykke for stykke, og fordi man havde læst det og accepteret det, opdagede man nødvendigvis vildfarelserne, der lurede på bunden af ens eget sind. Han viste os forskellen mellem at læse og at tænke. Det var ikke forelæsninger, det var en dramatisk monolog. Og det var sådan vi blev interesserede.«

LaRouches kerneorganisation, »National Caucus of Labor Committees« (NCLC), som senere blev til »International Caucus of Labor Committees« (ICLC), var en filosofisk forening organiseret omkring et »system af konferencer,« som normalt afholdtes to gange om året. Fra denne forening udsprang mange andre organisationer såsom »Fusion Energy Foundation,« »the U.S. Labor Party,« »the National Democratic Policy Committee,« the »Anti-Drug Coalition« og andre. LaRouche grundlagde og arbejdede også med organisationer i Frankrig, Tyskland, Italien, Sverige, Canada, Danmark, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Australien og mange andre nationer.

I december 1977 giftede LaRouche sig med Helga Zepp fra Tyskland, der senere grundlagde Schiller Instituttet, en politisk institution til fremme af statsmandskunst og en renaissance i klassisk kultur.

»I efteråret 1977 foreslog jeg, at vi skulle gifte os. [...]. Jeg var lidt overrasket, men på behagelig vis, da hun indvillige i det. [...]. Der var intet ordinært ved nogen af vore liv, og det var heller ikke sandsynligt, at det nogensinde ville blive anderledes. Vi blev gift i Wiesbaden 29. december 1977. Vielsen foregik på tysk; tjenestemanden fra Standesamt spurgte mig på tysk, om jeg vidste, hvad der foregik. Dette spørgsmål gav i de følgende uger anledning til megen latter blandt mine venner.« De nåede at dele et godt 41 år langt ægteskab.

Den kamplystne karakter og polemiske stil i LaRouche og hans samarbejdspartneres kampagner, valgkampagner såvel som andre, var unikke i USA's politiske liv i 1970'erne, 1980'erne og 1990'erne. Da LaRouche i 1976 købte 30 minutters sendetid til udsendelsen af hans Emergency Address to the Nation, var det første gang nogensinde, at en uafhængig kandidat havde købt den mængde tv-tid i et US-amerikansk nationalt valg. Under præsidentvalget i 1984 optrådte LaRouche femten gange på fjernsyn i 30-minutters segmenter og opfandt så at sige, hvad senere tider efterlignede med de såkaldte »infomercials.« LaRouches præsidentkandidatur og hans samarbejdspartneres kandidaturer ved forskellige valg, herunder opstillingen af omtrent 1000 kandidater til valg i 1986 alene, skræmte hans modstandere i USA. Og de inspirerede andre og gav dem mod til ikke blot at stille op til valg, men at bakke op om politiske idéer skabt til at gavne hele menneskeheden, og ikke kun deres »lokale mudderhul.«

Den Internationale Udviklingsbank (International Development Bank, IDB), som LaRouche fremlagde som koncept fra 1975 og fremefter, og som skulle erstatte Den Internationale Valutafond (IMF – red.) og udvikle det, der blev kaldt »Den Tredje Verden,« ved at skabe grundlag for eksport af hele byer og ikke kun US-amerikansk bygget teknologi, er et godt eksempel på et sådant politisk koncept. Disse byer skulle opføres som træningscentre, hvor befolkninger i udviklingssektoren hurtigt kunne tilegne sig de kompetencer, de skulle bruge, for at de kunne skabe deres egne på alle områder selvforsynende økonomier, frem for at blive gældsslaver, hvilket var, hvad der faktisk skete.

Personer som Frederick Wills, den daværende udenrigsminister for Guyana, talte for LaRouches IDB-forslag ved FN's generalforsamling 27. september 1976. Mexicos daværende præsident José López Portillo og Indiens daværende premierminister Indira Gandhi mødtes med Lyndon LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche og vedtog aspekter af hans forslag, som ofte blev udgivet i boglange afhandlinger såsom Operation Juárez for Mexico og The Industrialization of India: From Backwardness to Industrial Power in Forty Years (Indiens industrialisering: fra tilbagestående til industriel magt på fyrre år) og A Fifty-Year Development Policy for the Indian-Pacific Oceans Basin (50 års udviklingspolitik for Stillehavets og Det Indiske Oceans bassiner), hvis kernebetragtninger, på trods af at de alle er skrevet i begyndelsen af 1980'erne, stadig er aktuelle, ikke kun i dag, men for det næste årti eller mere.

Den ukonventionelle metode, som LaRouche anbefalede til at sprede disse idéer, var sokratiske: at tale med mennesker direkte og personligt. Den daglige gadeorganisering fandt sted ved jobcentre, posthuse, lufthavne, trafikryds og på gadehjørner, i midtbyen og i indkøbscentre. Denne direkte kontakt med USA's befolkning resulterede i, at LaRouche havde en bedre føling med, hvad der rørte sig blandt den almindelige befolkning i USA, end nogen anden politisk kraft i landet. Korrupte elementer i justitsministeriet, og »angiveligvis-ikke-statslig organisationer« som blev givet grønt lys til ulovligt at afbryde LaRouches samarbejdspartneres forfatnings-garanterede ret til at organisere, var nødt til at karakterisere organisationen som en »kult« for at afskrække borgerne fra at bidrage til LaRouches organisationer.

Ingen af LaRouches kritikere er i stand til at benægte den række af korrekte økonomiske forudsigelser, som han har fremlagt, herunder Bretton Woods-systemets sammenbrud 15. august 1971, sammenbruddet af Wall Streets aktiemarked i oktober 1987 (forudsagt af LaRouche i maj samme år) og forudsigelsen 25. juli 2007, der udsendtes som et webcast med titlen The End of the Post-FDR Era, af det finanskraks, der fra september 2008 og fremefter førte til en billion-dollar-stor redningspakke. Nogle af de mest forbløffende af LaRouches forudsigelser var imidlertid ikke strengt taget økonomiske. På Columbusdag 12. oktober 1988 sagde Lyndon LaRouche i en tale på Kempinski Hotel Bristol i Berlin:

»Af profession er jeg økonom i tradition med Tysklands Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz og Friedrich List og USA's Alexander Hamilton og Matthew og Henry Carey. Mine politiske principper er de samme som Leibniz', Lists og Hamiltons, og de er også i overensstemmelse med Friedrich Schiller og Wilhelm von Humboldts principper. I lighed med vor republiks grundlæggere har jeg en kompromisløs tro på princippet om aldeles suveræne nationalstater, og jeg er derfor imod enhver overnational myndighed, der ville kunne undergrave nogen som helst nations suverænitet. Men ligesom Schiller tror jeg, at enhver person, der stræber efter at blive en smuk sjæl, bliver nødt til at være en sand patriot for sin egen nation og på samme tid verdensborger.

»Af disse årsager er jeg gennem de sidste 15 år blevet specialist i mit lands udenrigspolitiske anliggender. Som et resultat af dette arbejde har jeg opnået en voksende og betydelig indflydelse blandt visse kredse i min egen regering

vedrørende USA's udenrigspolitik og landets strategi, to indbyrdes forbundne emner. Et godt eksempel på dette er den rolle, jeg spillede i løbet af 1982 og 1983, hvor jeg arbejdede med USA's nationale sikkerhedsråd for at få gennemført vedtagelsen af et politisk initiativ, der blev kendt som Det Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ (SDI). Selvom detaljerne er hemmelighedsstemplede, kan jeg godt fortælle jer, at mine synspunkter om den nuværende strategiske situation har større indflydelse i USA i dag end på noget tidligere tidspunkt. Derfor kan jeg forsikre jer om, at det, som jeg nu præsenterer for jer om udsigterne for genforeningen af Tyskland, er et forslag, som vil blive studeret seriøst blandt de relevante kredse i det US-amerikanske etablissement. Under de rette forhold ville mange i dag være enige om, at tiden er kommet til at tage de indledende skridt mod Tysklands genforening med det åbenlyse perspektiv, at Berlin kunne genoptage sin rolle som landets hovedstad.«

Udpeget som mål for eliminering

To dage efter hans tale på Hotel Kempinski rettede den US-amerikanske stat anklager mod Lyndon LaRouche og adskillige af hans samarbejdspartnere. Senere, da han talte om anklagerne i den Nationale Presseklub, udtalte LaRouche: »Man kunne sige om selve anklagen, at alle, der begår lovovertrædelser mod Gud, menneskeheden eller begge, før eller siden straffes.« Anklagerne fulgte to år efter et mordforsøg mod LaRouche 6. oktober 1986, om hvilket LaRouche i 2004 skrev følgende i sit hæfte med titlen 'Convict Him, or Kill Him!' The Night They Came To Kill Me (»Døm ham eller dræb ham!« Natten de kom for at dræbe mig):

»6. oktober 1986 holdt det, der praktisk talt var en hær på mere end firehundrede bevæbnede personer, sit indtog i byen Leesburg, Virginia, for at gennemføre en politirazzia mod EIR (Executive Intelligence Review – red.) og dets medarbejdere, og for at gennemføre en anden, mere dyster mission. De lokaler, hvor jeg på det tidspunkt opholdt mig, blev omringet af en væbnet styrke, mens luftfartøjer, pansrede mandskabsvogne og andet personel ventede på ordre om at rykke frem og åbne ild. Heldigvis fandt drabet ikke sted, fordi en person med højere myndighed end chefen for justitsministeriets afdeling for kriminalitet, William Weld, beordrede angrebet på mig afbrudt. De styrker, der stod klar til at trænge ind på mig, min kone og en række af mine samarbejdspartnere, blev trukket tilbage om morgenen.«

»Dette var det andet fuldt dokumenterede tilfælde, hvor USA's justitsministerium var involveret i operationer, der var målrettet mod at eliminere mig personligt fra politik.«

Omend LaRouche og seks andre blev fundet skyldige ved en domstol i Alexandria, Virginia, i december 1988 og blev fængslet 27. januar 1989, fortsætter den internationale og nationale protest mod disse korrupte domme til denne dag. Den tidligere amerikanske statsadvokat Ramsey Clark karakteriserede LaRouche-sagen som følger: Sagen »repræsenterede en bredere vifte af bevidst udspekuleret og systematisk embedsmisbrug over en længere tidsperiode ved brug af statsapparatets magtmidler end nogen anden retsforfølgelse ført af den US-amerikanske regering i min tid eller til mit kendskab.« Executive Intelligence Reviews dossier fra september 2017 med titlen Robert Mueller Is an Amoral Legal Assassin: He Will Do His Job If You Let Him (Robert Mueller er en amoralsk juridisk lejemorder: Han gør sit job, hvis du giver ham lov) giver et omfattende indblik i, hvordan Donald Trumps nuværende særlige anklager var en nøglekomponent i denne politiske forfølgelse af Lyndon LaRouche i 1980'erne.

Under sin afsoning fortsatte LaRouche med at skrive, hvilket ofte foregik ved, at han dikterede hele kapitler af et bogmanuskript over telefonen, naturligvis uden at have adgang til nogen form for baggrundsmateriale. Udover samlingen med titlen The Science of Christian Economy and Other Prison Writings (Videnskaben der ligger til grund for kristen økonomi og andre skrifter fra fængslet), skrev eller optog LaRouche mange andre dokumenter, hvoraf nogle er ved at blive samlet med andre ikke tidligere offentliggjorte skrifter.

Da det i løbet af 1989 blev klart, at Sovjetunionens indflydelsessfære kendt som Comecon oplevede stigende økonomiske vanskeligheder, indledte LaRouche og Helga et intensivt samarbejde om et program, der fik navnet The Productive Triangle Paris-Berlin-Vienna (Den produktive trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien), som efter Sovjetunionens opløsning blev udvidet til Den Eurasiske Landbro. Efter jerntæppets fald foreslog han med dette program, at Europas befolkninger og industricentre skulle sammenkædes med Asiens gennem såkaldte udviklingskorridorer. Det var den eneste omfattende fredsplan for det 21. århundrede, som på daværende tidspunkt lå på tegnebrættet, en mulighed, som briterne og USA's anglofile neokonservative heftigt modarbejdede. Disse

gennemtvang i stedet deres ideologi om en unipolær verden med et neoliberalt system. Den Eurasiske Landbro blev snart kendt som Den Nye Silkevej. Mere end to årtier senere er det kinesiske Bælte og Vej Initiativ, som voksede ud af dette koncept, blevet det primære lokomotiv for verdens fysiske økonomi.

Forandrede tusinder af menneskers liv

Efter hans løsladelse fra fængslet 26. januar 1994 fortsatte LaRouche sin karriere med at lave forudsigelser. Han udviklede i 1995 et pædagogisk værktøj ved navn »tripelkurven« for at illustrere for ikke-økonomer, hvordan en proces af »hyperinflation à la Weimarrepublikken« havde grebet den transatlantiske verden og havde udplyndret den i en sådan grad, at der ikke kunne gøres noget for at bevare det gængse pengesystem, og hvordan det var nødvendigt at omorganisere pengesystemet fra top til bund, idet man tog Glass-Steagall-loven fra Franklin Roosevelts »New Deal« i brug som første skridt i en reorganisering af bankerne. I januar 2001 advarede LaRouche om faren for et voldsomt terrorangreb på en eller flere amerikanske byer. En advarsel han fremlagde i forbindelse med en gennemgang af, hvorfor og hvordan det finansielle system var overgået til en tilstand af en »high-tech boble« i 1999-2000.

LaRouche talte om muligheden for en slags rigsdagsbrand i takt med, at USA, der med hastige skridt nærmede sig økonomisk ruin, blev stadigt mere umuligt at regere. I tråd med hans forudsigelse fra maj 1987 om et sammenbrud af aktiemarkedet i oktober samme år, udtalte LaRouche 25. juli 2007, et år før nedbruddet af Lehman Brothers/AIG i september 2008:

»Det verdensomspændende monetære finanssystem er faktisk i øjeblikket i færd med at falde fra hinanden. Der er intet mystisk i det; jeg har talt om det i nogen tid, det har været under udvikling, det tager ikke af. Hvad der er bogført som aktieværdier og markedsværdier på de internationale finansielle markeder er nonsens! Disse værdier er rene fiktive beløb. Der er ingen sandhed i det; bedraget er enormt. Der er ingen mulighed for, at det nuværende finanssystem ikke går ned – ingen! Det er slut, nu!«

»Det nuværende finanssystem kan ikke fortsætte med at eksistere under nogen omstændigheder, under nogen præsident, under noget lederskab eller nogen form for internationalt lederskab. Kun en grundlæggende og pludselig forandring af verdens monetære finanssystem vil forhindre et alment, øjeblikkeligt kædereaktionslignende sammenbrud. Hvor hurtigt det vil gå, ved vi ikke, men det vil fortsætte, og det vil være ustoppeligt. Og jo længere det fortsætter, jo værre vil tilstanden blive.«

LaRouche fortsatte, som det fremgår af ovenstående forudsigelse fra hans 84. leveår, med selv at frembringe originale bidrag op i en enestående høj alder, men det var ikke alt. Ved årtusindskiftet gik LaRouche i spidsen for en bevægelse, der rekrutterede unge mennesker – en bevægelse der fik så stor success, at Demokraterne i forskellige dele af landet forsøgte at overtage den. Tusindvis af unge gennemgik denne dannelsesproces. LaRouches ungdomsbevægelse frembragte banebrydende bidrag, bl.a. i deres præsentation af fysikeren Johannes Keplers arbejde, i oplæringen i bel canto klassisk sang af både gymnasieelever og som modgift imod kulturel selv-degradering og i audiovisuelle præsentationer af USA's historie, herunder US-amerikansk nutidshistorie (i modsætning til »aktuelle begivenheder« eller de endnu mere ødelæggende »nyheder«), såsom dokumentaren 1932, som er blevet set af over 1,2 millioner mennesker.

Siden LaRouche for første gang optrådte som offentlig person for over halvtreds år siden, har den eneste tragedie, der karakteriserede hans liv, været, at han aldrig, hverken som præsident eller som rådgiver for en siddende præsident, fik lov til at føre de økonomiske reformer ud i livet, som ville have forbedret livet for millioner af US-amerikanere og for milliarder af mennesker rundt om i verden.

Selvom Lyndon H. LaRouche Jr. vil være savnet af mange venner blandt ledende figurer indenfor videnskab, musik, økonomi og politik, var hans største ven – når vi tillader os at se bort fra hans enke Helga Zepp-LaRouche – de glemte mænd og kvinder i USA og i mange, mange andre lande.

Schiller Instituttets Konference på Præsidentens Dag – panel I, II & III

Schiller Instituttet afholdt den første amerikanske nationale konference i mere end femten år i weekenden på Præsidentens Dag, hvilket var en enorm succes i henseende til kvaliteten af præsentationerne og deltagelsen af tilhængere fra hele verden der deltog på konferencen. Konferencen, der nu præsenteres i sin helhed nedenfor, giver et sandfærdigt og optimistisk syn på mulighederne for menneskeheden som helhed for at overvinde den krise, som verden står overfor, mens det tidligere regerende, nu døende Britiske Imperium, kæmper for sin overlevelse mod den nye verdensorden, som tager fat i visionen fra Lyndon og Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

Panel I

Lyndon

LaRouche taler:

Et talent, der blev brugt godt

Jacques

Cheminade,

Præsident for Solidarité & Progrès: Lyndon LaRouches kommende verden

John

Gong,

Professor i økonomi ved 'University of International Business and

Economics', Beijing: Kinesiske investeringer og amerikansk infrastruktur under nye sino-amerikanske relationer

H.E.

Ambassadør Vassily A. Nebenzia,
Ambassadør and Permanent Repræsentant for den Russiske Føderation
ved de Forenede Nationer, præsenteret af rådgiver
Theodore Strzhizhovskiy,
den Russiske Føderations mission ved FN: Prospekter for øst-vest
samarbejde: Den Russiske Føderations Synspunkt (transkript)

William
Binney,
tidligere teknisk direktør, NSA

Jason
Ross,
Schiller Instituttet, medforfatter af "Udvidelse af den Nye
Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika": Det presserende behov for et nyt
paradigme i Afrika

Dennis
Small,
EIR's redaktør for Latinamerika: Retfærdighed i Verden – Hvorfor
Donald Trump må rense Lyndon LaRouche nu

Panel II

Video

af 'Den æstetiske uddannelse af mennesket for skønheden af sindet og sjælen' – Panel II

Schiller

Instituttets kombinerede kor:

Benjamin

Lylloff, arrangement: "Mo Li Hua" ("Jasmin Blomst")

Benjamin

Lylloff, dirigent

H.T.

Burleigh,

arrangement: "Dyb flod" ("Deep River")

William

L. Dawson,

arr: "Hver gang ånden kommer over mig" ("Ev'ry Time I Feel the Spirit")

Diane Sare, dirigent

Megan

Beets,

LaRouchePAC Videnskabelige Forskningsteam, "Kunstnerisk og moralsk skønhed" ("Artistic and Moral Beauty")

Bruce

Director,

kasserer, Schiller Instituttet i USA:

"Om LaRouches begreb om

betydningen af kunst for videnskaben, og videnskab for kunsten"

Diane

Sare,

administrerende direktør for Schiller Instituttets kor i New York
City: "Kor princippet"

Johannes

Brahms:

"Dem dunkeln Schoß der Heil'gen Erde"

(tekst fra Schillers

"Sangen om Klokken" ("Song of the Bell")

Schiller

Instituttets kor

John Sigerson, dirigent

Johann

Sebastian Bach:

Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 in D-dur, BWV 1050

I. Allegro

Schiller

Instituttets Orkester

John Sigerson, dirigent

Solister: Gregor

Kitzis, violin; Laura Thompson, fløjte; My-Hoa Steger, klaver

Ludwig

van Beethoven:

Choral Fantasia, Op. 80

Schiller Instituttets Orkester, Kor, og

Solister

John Sigerson, dirigent

My-Hoa Steger, klaver

Spørsmål

& svar session

Panel III

Kesha

Rogers,

LaRouchePAC Politiske Komité, tidligere kandidat for den amerikanske Kongres – Rummets grænseområder: Opfyldelsen af menneskehedens skæbne som mennesket i universet

Thomas

Wysmuller,

Grundlæggende medlem af 'Det rette klima stof' ("The Right Climate Stuff"): Hvad NASA har gjort, og hvor NASA er på vej hen

Larry

Bell,

Grundlægger, Sasakawa Internationalt Center for Rumarkitektur, 'College of Engineering', Universitetet i Houston: Hvad der gør mennesker enestående

Benjamin

Deniston,

LaRouchePAC Videnskabelige Forskningsteam: LaRouches Strategiske Forsvar af Jorden

Hal

BH Cooper, Jr. PhD PE: Infrastrukturelle
behov for jernbane-, energi- og vandsystemer til at fremme den
fremtidige økonomiske udvikling af Afrika

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 21. februar 2019:

**Lyndon LaRouche er død, men hans ånd
og ideer lever videre
i det nye paradigme vi skaber.
Se også 2. del her.**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

1. del:

2. del:

Lyd:

LaRouches metode, nye opdagelser og tapperhed er fremtiden

Den 12. februar (EIRNS) – Det er med bedrøvelse at vi må meddele, at Lyndon LaRouche gik bort i dag i en alder af 96 år. De, der elskede ham, sørger over ham. Det er et stort tab. Det er hverken muligt eller passende i disse første triste øjeblikke at forsøge at opsummere det dybtgående bidrag, som Lyndon LaRouche har ydet til menneskeheden. Men i lyset af dagens vurderinger, kan vi ære ham ved at oprette et imperativ, som han gentagne gange fremsatte: bedøm ideer og handlinger på grundlag af hvordan de bidrager til den fremtidige udvikling af menneskeheden. I dette perspektiv befinder vi os i et kritisk øjeblik i kampen.

For at begynde med den negative side, er der fortsat vildt dumme geopolitiske manøvrer i Europa, hvor regeringer slår om sig af mangel på at følge LaRouches paradigme om fremskridt. For eksempel blev der for nylig udgivet en ny rapport, "The Great Puzzle, Who Will Pick Up the Pieces" ('Det store puslespil, hvem samler brikkerne op') af 'Münchens Sikkerhedskonference', som mødes senere i denne uge. Rapporten henviser til uorden i den "liberale internationale orden", hvilket har givet anledning til forslag, såsom at de vigtigste europæiske NATO-medlemslande ville være tjent med at distancere sig fra USA og NATO, og i stedet tilslutte sig Frankrig for at komme med ind i præsident Macrons nye militærblok.

I mellemtiden har USA's udenrigsminister Mike Pompeo besøgt Ungarn og Slovakiet i denne uge og opmuntrer centraleuropæere til at distancere sig fra Kina og Rusland og i stedet slå sig sammen med USA-blokken. Alle sådanne former for at spille den ene ud imod den anden er en intrigant blindgyde og meget farlig. Det er orkestreret lige ud af den britiske imperialistiske drejebog. Der vil sandsynligvis komme mere af samme slags i morgen i Polen, når den britiske udenrigsminister Jeremy Hunt kommer og tilslutter sig Pompeo og vicepræsident Mike Pence i et møde om sikkerhedsplaner for Mellempøsten.

Den modsatte, positive impuls ses i de gentagne opfordringer fra præsident Donald Trump, om at USA afslutter sit engagement i "evige krige." Dette er en

forudsætning for en fremtid til gavn for alle. For eksempel er planlægningen for Hanoi-topmødet den 27.-28. februar mellem Trump og den nordkoreanske leder Kim Jong-un, stærkt på vej. I dag er vietnamesiske embedsmænd i Pyongyang for at arrangere, ikke alene topmødet, men også et muligt statsbesøg af Kim i Vietnam, hvilket ville være det første af sin slags siden Kims bedstefar, Kim Il-sung, for 50 år siden. Kinesiske og russiske udsendinge mødtes i dag for at hjælpe med at Trump-Kim-mødet bliver fuldt vellykket. Om blot to måneder vil der være en verdenskonference med en oversigt over denne win-win-dynamik, nemlig det 2. Bælte- og Vej Forum for Internationalt Samarbejde i Kina. Præsident Xi Jinping henviser til processen som opbygning af et "fællesskab med en fælles fremtid for hele menneskeheden."

Lyndon LaRouches livsværk har lagt grunden til dette, og meget, meget mere. Som han elskede at minde os om: Fremtiden bestemmer nutiden.

NYHEDSORIENTERING JANUAR-FEBRUAR 2019: Overvind geopolitik og rens Lyndon LaRouches navn

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

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 4. oktober 2018: Trump i FN: Afskaf supranationalt diktatur og vend tilbage til national suverænitet

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Lyd:

Lyndon LaRouche: En Firemagtsaftale kan skabe et nyt, globalt kreditsystem

Leder fra LaRouchePAC, 2. maj, 2018 – Det britiske Imperium og dets allierede kræfter har lanceret en række koordinerede angreb på globalt plan, som er udtænkt at skulle sikre, at ingen holdbar koalition for udvikling og fred skabes omkring planetens fire, ledende magter – Rusland, Kina, Indien og USA. Disse angreb inkluderer eskalerende provokationer, der har til formål at udløse surrogatkrig i Mellemøsten (Iran og Syrien); i Ukraine; og på Koreahalvøen – og som alle igen har til formål sluttelig at eskalere til en global krig, med USA imod Rusland og Kina.

Samtidig, og med en omhyggeligt koreograferet timing, har samme britiske kræfter optrappet deres heksejagt mod præsident Donald Trump og tyer til at fiske efter potentiel skadelig information – en aktivitet, der er lige så ekstrem, som den er farlig. Den seneste af disse er den *lækkede* trussel, at den særlige anklager Robert Mueller måske vil indstævne præsident Trump til at besvare Muellers *ligeledes lækkede* 40 spørgsmål, ifald præsidenten nægter at besvare dem »frivilligt«.

Præsident Trump svarede selv skarpt i et tweet her til morgen: »Der er ikke tale om nogen forhindring af rettens gang (det er et set-up & en fælde). Det, der er tale om, er pågående forhandlinger med Nordkorea om atomkrig ...«

For nu at sætte sagen på spidsen: Det britiske fremstød for krig, og det britiske fremstød for at afsætte USA's præsident, er parallelle operationer, der har et enkeltstående formål. Der kan ikke være noget heldigt forsvar af præsidentskabet imod Muellers beskidte operationer uden samtidig at stoppe fremstødet for at bruge Iran, Syrien, Korea og Ukraine til at udløse krig mod Rusland og Kina. Og modsat; det britiske fremstød for krig og for at kuldkaste hele det westfalske system ved at rive gyldig, international lov, folkeretten, i stumper og stykker med militærangreb og krige, kan ikke stoppes uden at besejre Mueller-FBI-kuppet imod præsident Trump.

Både Demokrater, Republikanere og Uafhængige – såvel som også folk i andre nationer – må vågne op til denne kendsgerning, før det er for sent. I kan ikke vælge, hvilken del af denne forenede, britiske operation, I ønsker at gå imod,

og hvilken del, I ønsker at støtte, baseret på de ideologiske fordomme, I inderligt holder fast ved.

Tiden er inde til moral, anført af videnskab, sådan, som det eksemplificeres af Lyndon LaRouches forslag om en Firemagtsaftale.

LaRouches første, betydningsfulde præsentation af denne idé til en politik, kom på et Forum for strategiske og sikkerhedsmæssige studier i New Delhi, Indien, 3. dec., 2008. Dernæst udvidede LaRouche denne strategi i en tale den 10. okt., 2009, han holdt på det Globale offentlige Forum for Dialog mellem Civilisationers syvende årlige forsamling. LaRouche opsummerede denne tale fra Rhodos under et privat frokostmøde for diplomater i Washington, 4. nov., 2009.

Bemærkningerne ved dette frokostmøde, som vi her bringer uddrag af, blev fremsat næsten fire år før den kinesiske præsident annoncerede sin Nye Silkevejspolitik, som i dag kendes som Bælte & Vej Initiativet.

»Det var min opgave [på Rhodos] klart at præsentere, hvad en Firemagtsaftale mellem USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien, samt andre lande, der bringes ind i samme aftale, ville betyde for planeten. Det ville betyde, at vi kunne få en konvention, en aftale, om skabelse af et nyt system, der skrotter det nuværende, monetære system, som kan skrottes, fordi det allerede er bankerot ...

»Rusland og Kina stod på randen af en aftale, i denne periode, i hvilken Kina har for en billion dollar i amerikanske statsobligationer, som USA skylder Kina ... Det, der grundlæggende set skete i forhandlingerne mellem Rusland og Kina, var et arrangement om at anvende den legitime gæld, som skyldes til Kina mod en forpligtelse fra USA's side, og til at bruge dette; monetisere det, ved at investere det i noget, der er produktivt, som ville være gavnligt for Asien. Og Rusland og Kina aftalte et storskala-projekt for transport og relaterede systemer.

Planen var, ikke at stoppe dér: Planen er at udvide denne form for aftale til Sydøstasien generelt, og til at inkludere Indien. Nogle af os har en plan for at bringe USA ind i samme arrangement. For, den kombinerede magt af USA, Rusland, Kina, Indien og nationer, som ønsker at være tilknyttet dem i denne form for venture, er den største, økonomiske magt på planeten. Hvis denne planetære magt beslutter at gøre det, der må gøres, kan vi reorganisere og genopbygge verden og hurtigt skifte over fra en nedadgående udvikling og til en opadgående udvikling. Det er den valgmulighed, vi har.

Omdrejningspunktet er: USA, Rusland, Kina og Indien. Uden en aftale mellem disse

fire nationer vil en sådan økonomisk genrejsning af verden ikke være mulig. Med disse fire nationer, samt andre nationer – såsom, umiddelbart, Sydøstasien, Korea, Japan og så fremdeles – andre nationer kommer med ind, og nu taler vi om muligheden for et generelt program, om skabelse af et nyt fastkurssystem, som et kreditsystem, ikke et monetært system, men derimod et kreditsystem baseret på fastkursaftaler, til langfristet samarbejde om infrastrukturinvesteringer, som vil være drivkraft for udviklingen af produktive investeringer.

Med infrastruktur mener vi først og fremmest storskala-transport: moderne jernbaner, og overlegne jernbanesystemer [maglev], til transport over land. Formålet er at kunne rejse over land igennem Eurasien, gennem Beringstrædet og ind i landene på det amerikanske kontinent; og gennem Mellempøsten og ind i hele Afrika. Vi kan således skabe forbindelser med denne form for massetransit, som er mere effektive end transport over vand, og som vil udgøre en drivkraft for udvikling i alle de områder, igennem hvilke et sådant jernbanesystem og relaterede systemer rejser.«

»En dialog om tre præsidentskaber: Bøj universets moralske bue mod retfærdighed«

Hovedtale af Helga Zepp-LaRouche på Schiller Institut Konference i New York, 7. april, 2018 (Video og engelsk udskrift)

Introduktion:

Den amerikanske præsident Donald Trump, den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin kunne, i løbet af de næste par måneder, sammen træffe en række af de absolut vigtigste beslutninger, som ville indvirke på menneskeheden, siden renæssancen i det 15. århundrede. Den mulige løsning på Korea-spørgsmålet er blot et enkelt eksempel. De rette beslutninger, truffet af disse tre nationer og deres allierede i de næste par uger, kunne, i den nærmeste fremtid, begynde at fjerne fattigdom, kolonialisme og krig fra planeten.

Løsningerne for at fjerne dette tredobbelte onde ligger både i stjernerne og i os selv.

Britiske imperiekræfter har midlertidigt mistet kontrollen over den svigtende transatlantiske, geopolitiske proces. Nu forsøger de at genvinde fordelene. Ligesom med den britiske efterretningsagent Christopher Steeles Russiagate-svindler, er det nu svindlen med »Rusland forgiftede Sergei Skripal og hans datter«, der efter planen skal drive en kile ind mellem præsident Trump og Vladimir Putin. Hvis denne bestræbelse lykkes, vil alt det arbejde, der er udført af Devin Nunes' Husets Efterretningskomite og andre, for at afsløre den korrupte rolle, som FBI, Justitsministeriet, Udenrigsministeriet og andre har spillet i det britiskførte kup imod det amerikanske præsidentskab i 2016, have været forgæves.

Evindelig krig, som de amerikanske administrationer Bush 41, Bush 43 og Obama var fortalere for, kan nu erstattes med en ny økonomisk platform og en ny kulturel platform.

Lørdag, 7. april, er Schiller Instituttets stifter Helga Zepp-LaRouche hovedtaler på denne konference, der skal samle amerikanerne omkring dette optimistiske perspektiv. En vedtagelse af de økonomiske forholdsregler og standpunkter, der kendes som LaRouches Fire Love [\[1\]](#) samtidig med en accept af det stående, kinesiske forslag [om USA's deltagelse i den Nye Silkevej] ville give grundlaget for at skabe en hurtig forøgelse i amerikansk, produktiv beskæftigelse, levestandarder og uddannelse af ungdommen i USA.

Grundlaget for en dialog mellem de »tre store« præsidentskaber er indeholdt i et dokument af Lyndon LaRouche fra marts, 1984, med titlen, »Udkast til aftalememorandum mellem USA og U.S.S.R.« [\[2\]](#)

Indledningen lyder således:

»Det politiske fundament for varig fred må være: a) Alle nationalstaters ubetingede suverænitet, og b) Samarbejde mellem suveræne nationalstater med det formål at fremme ubegrænsede muligheder for at blive delagtig i fordelene ved teknologisk fremskridt, til gensidig fordel for enhver nationalstat, og alle nationalstater.

Det mest afgørende aspekt ved en aktuel implementering af en sådan politik for varig fred er en dybtgående ændring i de monetære, økonomiske og politiske relationer mellem de dominerende magter og de relativt underordnede nationer, som ofte klassificeres som »udviklingslande«. Med mindre de uligheder, der

stadig dvæler i kølvandet på moderne kolonialisme, gradvist afhjælpes, kan der ikke være nogen varig fred på denne planet.«

Sidstnævnte tema vil blive behandlet på mødet 7. april i en præsentation af Jason Ross, medforfatter af Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport, »Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: En vision for en økonomisk renæssance«.[\[3\]](#) Med en befolkning på størrelse med Indiens og med den yngste befolkning i noget kontinent i verden, ville Afrikas fysisk-økonomiske udvikling gennem fælles arbejde, udført af USA sammen med Kina, gøre de gamle koloniregimers racister tavse for altid. Verdens to største økonomier kunne, ved hjælp af Sun Yat-sens og Abraham Lincolns »Tre principper for folket«[\[4\]](#), udgøre spydspidsen for en anti-koloniudvikling og fjerne den fattigdom, som er udløser af racisme og krig.

Her følger engelsk udskrift af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale:

Schiller Institute Conference with Helga Zepp-LaRouche
New York City, April 7, 2018

A DIALOGUE OF THREE PRESIDENCIES:

BENDING THE ARC OF THE MORAL UNIVERSE TOWARD JUSTICE

DIANE SARE: Good afternoon. I'm Diane Sare with the Schiller Institute here in Manhattan and at the conference called "The Dialogue of Three Presidencies: Bending the Arc of the Moral Universe toward Justice."

Fifty years ago this year, our nation suffered two major assassinations: The first, on April 4th, 1968, was that of Martin Luther King, Jr.,[\[5\]](#) who was gunned down while he was participating in organizing for a sanitation workers' strike in Memphis, Tennessee; then, on June 6th, Robert Kennedy – the second Kennedy to be assassinated – who was likely on a trajectory to become the President of the United States. I think it's very important to reflect on that change in the United States 50 years ago. I was very struck a few weeks ago, having heard about a speech by Chinese President Xi Jinping, where he spoke in China of the Century of Humiliation. Starting in 1840, the Opium Wars against China, which were absolutely devastating and destructive, run by the British Empire – which is still the

enemy of civilization today; to the Japanese occupation in the 1940s, under which 35 million or more people died. What President Xi said to these young people is that, in effect, we have to take this as a source of strength; that our sacred honor is that we will never allow ourselves to be humiliated in such a way again. And that we will never impose such humiliation upon any other human being.

So, I was reflecting on the last 50 years in this country, what we have tolerated. And before I came here today, I was reading a little bit from Martin Luther King's book about the process leading into his leadership of what became the Montgomery Bus Boycott. He described that the unity of the people – because people may know, it wasn't just that Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus and got arrested and somehow there were demonstrations. People went on for nearly a year, refusing to ride the bus. That meant that people with the postal service were organizing all these elaborate carpools; and people in their 60s and 70s were walking 12 miles a day to not take the bus. And I was thinking to myself, how many Americans today would be prepared to walk 12 miles a day until we got the Manhattan subway system fixed, for example? Or until we found out who actually was behind the 9/11 terrorist attacks? Or until the torture of people, which is completely degrading to man as in the image of God? How many Americans would be prepared to do that kind of hard work over an extended time? I began to think that this is the – when Lyndon LaRouche a few years ago, we did a series of memorial concerts on the 15th anniversary of 9/11; and he talked about the humiliation of Americans not having done anything. I thought that's kind of an odd term; what does he mean "humiliation"? When I was reading what Dr. King had to say this morning, I thought, "Well, of course. We should be humiliated." In a sense, we should be ashamed that we have allowed our nation to be in the shape that it is, and not have acted sooner. If we would take this opportunity this year, to come to that conclusion firmly as strongly as Xi Jinping means it in China, then there is absolutely nothing that can stop us.

The person whom I am about to introduce, has been a very important leader for 40+ years, 50+ years, in that fight. It is a very challenging world right now. The American people clearly rejected a continuation of British imperial perpetual war and Wall Street bail-out policies when they rejected the election of Hillary Clinton. Because President Trump represents an

opportunity, as this conference is called "Three Presidencies: Trump, Putin, and Xi Jinping." Because there is a potential represented by this administration to end the long reign of the evil British Empire; everything is going a bit crazy. I heard this morning, apparently there was a car that plowed into a crowd in Muenster, Germany, killing several people and injuring many others, today while we're here. In the United States, we are bombarded; the American news media is violent in its coverage, because what it does to you is, it causes whipsaw. You're reading one thing one day, another thing the other day. President Trump says he wants to get the troops out of Syria; and then we hear, "The White House says the troops must remain in Syria." Well, who is the White House? It's apparently not the same thing as President Trump. So, this causes a great deal of confusion and anxiety among the American people.

Mrs. LaRouche, who not only is the founder and chairwoman of the international Schiller Institute, is also a brilliant writer and scholar. She is an expert on Nicholas of Cusa, who wrote a very important paper called "The Coincidence of Opposites." So, I am confident that her address to us here today, will help all of us to make sense of the situation and give us an idea of how we can conduct ourselves to end this 50 years of humiliation in the United States. So, with that, I'd like to introduce Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I want to say "Hello" to you, and I'm very happy to talk to you, at least via video, so I can share with you my ideas.

I think in the recent weeks, many people in many countries have been very distraught about the so-called Skripal affair. This was the assassination attempt, the poison gas attack on the former double agent Sergei Skripal and his daughter. Immediately, the Theresa May government accused Russia that they did it. I think that this particular situation has demonstrated in a way we have not seen it ever, what is the role of the British Empire, the British government, British policies in the present escalation against Russia, and in a certain sense against China. This affair was immediately made an issue of NATO, of the European Union. Many EU members immediately declared unconditional solidarity with Theresa May, and they agreed on the formulation that there is no other plausible explanation than Russia did it. I think this reaction is very telling, because it

shows on the one side, the degree of British control in NATO, and in part in the European Union. Fortunately, about half of the European Union members did not agree. But it also demonstrated the incredible Orwellian character of the present Western democracies of the so-called "liberal" Western system. Because the idea that you immediately abandon the principle that {in dubio pro reo}, that the innocence is relevant until proven guilty; that this was abandoned and that truth was replaced by a consensus among countries. If that is the principle of international policy, then we are all in very bad shape. The immediate danger is naturally that this thing is not just leading to mass expulsions of diplomats. The United States expelled 60 diplomats; the British expelled a similar number, and Germany four. Altogether, I think 23 diplomats in the other European countries. But obviously, this has the implication of leading to a broader escalation of confrontation with Russia and possibly even war; because this is a prewar propaganda. If you look at the timing of this affair, first of all the two Skripals fortunately seem to be in much better condition. That raises a whole bunch of questions because if it was Novichok nerve gas, then the question is, how did the British have so quickly an antidote that they are now happily surviving? Or, maybe it was not Novichok. How could they come so quickly to the conclusion that it was Russia, when Scotland Yard said it would take several weeks to find out what really was the nerve gas agent used in this attack.

The timing was at a point where, in the United States, the whole focus of Congressional investigations of the House Intelligence Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, similar committees in the Senate, was about the role of the British Empire in the Russia-gate affair, or the Trump-gate, or the Mueller-gate, depending on how you want to call it. The focus of several committees started to really put into the limelight the role of Christopher Steele, the so-called "former" MI6 agent, the role of the British government, the collusion not with Russia but with the British in the whole attempt to make a coup against President Trump. So, that was very convenient, because all of a sudden, it was the Russia issue again. May, in these days, you could always say that the days of Theresa May seemed to be numbered; because she was in such an unstable position. Now, *cui bono*? Who has the motive? In whose interest would be such an affair? Well, Russia really has no motive; why

would this occur just weeks before the Presidential election in Russia? Would Putin really want to have such notoriety just before the election, and just before the World Soccer World Cup? So, also Russia would have had many opportunities to kill Skripal; he was, for many years, in a Russian jail, he lived for many years in Great Britain without any problem. Nevertheless, despite that, Merkel and Macron, half of the EU immediately came out saying, "No, it is the only plausible explanation that it was Russia." Boris Johnson gave an interview to a German radio called Deutsche Welle, where he said that he had absolute scientific proof from the scientists of the Porton Down laboratory, who had definitely said that they had 100 % proof that it was Russia. In the meantime, the scientists refused to provide the after-the-fact evidence, and the head of the lab, Mr. Aitkenhead, said that they could identify that it was Novichok; but that they absolutely could not identify the source of the origin of this poison gas. This was a very lamentable situation, so the Foreign Office immediately deleted the tweet in which this was stated; which now has Boris Johnson's stand there as a liar. That does not prevent the Theresa May government from continuing to push the lie that Russia did it.

Many officials in Russia – Foreign Minister [Sergey] Lavrov; Foreign Ministry spokeswoman [Maria] Zakharova, the head of foreign intelligence [Sergey] Naryshkin – the all pointed to the fact that the {cui bono} and the likelihood, and who has the capacity and motive, actually points to British intelligence. This whole operation – and this was pointed out by many experts and commentators – this absolutely parallels what the British did in the Iraq case in 2003; where also MI6 produced a dossier supposedly proving that Saddam Hussein was in the possession of weapons of mass destruction which could reach every city within 45 minutes around the globe. That Saddam Hussein supposedly had absolute connections with al-Qaeda; which was a blatant lie, because Saddam Hussein used to throw al-Qaeda people into jail and other things. But this was then used as a pretext. So, Colin Powell gave the famous speech in the United Nations motivating U.S. participation in the Iraq War. Then, the war against Iraq occurred, with many hundreds of thousands of people losing their lives as a result.

This is what some people in Russia in the meantime have called "Goebbels" propaganda. Why is there such a demonization of Russia? Why is there a demonization of President Putin coming

essentially from the same people who are also demonizing President Trump and President Xi Jinping? This is the same foolishness which already led to the Second World War and which could easily trigger a Third World War. There is the danger that these war-mongers are repeating the same methodological mistake, stupidity, which led to two world wars.

What is behind that is a mixture of desperation because the financial powers of the City of London and their Wall Street backers and collaborators see clearly that their system is failing. Obviously, they have a complete fear that this would go with a complete loss of their political and financial power. But it is also an obsession that their schemes will function, and if they just have enough containment and escalation then their system will be proven superior. They are confronted with their system not succeeding, but failing; they don't have the intended unipolar world, but they are confronted with the emergence of a completely New Paradigm in the world.

If you want to understand why Russia is such a focus of Russophobia right now, you have to take the situation back to the end of the Soviet Union. Because in the United States, at a point when the Soviet Union started to disintegrate and there would have actually been the possibility for a peace order for the 21st Century, you had in the United States the consolidation of the neo-cons. They revived the American Century doctrine, which originally was formulated by Walter Lippmann in 1943, when he published a book with that name which then became the entire basis for the post-war order; the legitimacy of NATO, the whole Cold War. It was the idea to revive that with the project for a new American Century and the idea that you would replace the two superpower system with an unipolar world based on the Anglo-American special relationship, and a neo-liberal monetarist system. This was essentially a continuation of the idea that you would control the developing countries, keep them in relative backwardness, and deregulate the financial system in order to bring back the power of Wall Street and the City of London, and basically control the world that way.

In 1989, when the German reunification happened, this was actually combined with the promise that NATO would never expand eastward. You have to remember that the Soviet Union agreed to the dissolution of the GDR and German reunification without the use of force. You could say, in light of the history of the Second World War, where the Soviet Union had suffered tremendous

losses of life and naturally had a very terrible memory of Nazi Germany that it was extremely generous of the Soviet Union to agree to that. The promise was clearly given not to expand NATO eastward; this was emphasized many times by the former American ambassador in Moscow at that time, John Matlock. In the recent publications of the archives from George Washington University, it was also clear that this was, indeed, a promise made.

In 1990, the General Secretary of NATO at that time, Manfred Wörner, made a speech in Brussels which is worth remembering. He at that time said, "The goal for the next decade is the creation of a European security structure, including the Soviet Union and the states of the Warsaw Pact," and that the Soviet Union would play an important role in the construction of such a security system, and that he would understand the wish of the Soviet Union not to be excluded from Europe. "The West cannot answer to the erosion of the Warsaw Pact with a weakening or dissolution of [NATO]"; and therefore, "the only answer is the creation of a security framework which includes both alliances" and which includes the "Soviet Union into a cooperating Europe... The very fact that we are ready not to deploy NATO troops beyond the territory of the Federal Republic [of Germany] gives the Soviet Union firm security guarantees," Wörner said.

This is all proven by these new documents which have been published that the West obviously, or the neo-cons and their British partners, were clearly promoting a different policy and making fake promises. On the surface, the offer to the Soviet Union continued. Still in 1994, President Clinton said the NATO expansion is not anti-Russian; it means inclusion instead of exclusion. But then, things became more dramatic. In 1999, there was the famous Tony Blair speech in Chicago, which was the definite elimination of whatever relic of the Peace of Westphalia system existed; and by that, also the elimination of the principles of the UN Charter – namely, guaranteeing the sovereignty of every country. This was clearly a foreshadowing of what Blair did later in 2003 with the Iraq War. What replaced the idea of respect for the sovereignty of countries was the idea of "humanitarian" interventions. Naturally, then in 2001 with the September 11th attack, which was a complete assault on all civil liberties and civil rights which had been fought for, for decades. And it imposed an international regime with the pretext of the war against terrorism.

What followed then was regime change, color revolution. You

had the Orange Revolution in 2004 in Ukraine; you had the Rose Revolution in Georgia. In the meantime, both the Russian and Chinese militaries respectively stated that they regarded color revolution as an absolute total form of warfare. Naturally, the Maidan coup against the Ukraine government belongs in this chain. Also, already in 2002, the United States abandoned unilaterally the ABM [Anti-Ballistic Missile] Treaty, and proceeded to build up a global ABM system, which Russia had said at the very beginning, they could not tolerate the Phase 3 and Phase 4 of it to be implemented, because it would completely undermine the strategic stability and therefore be a threat to the security interests of Russia.

In the 16 years of Bush, Jr. and Obama, these interventionist wars continued. Bush declared the "Axis of Evil," and the various wars in the Middle East and northern Africa started to eliminate governments which were not agreeable to this idea of a unipolar world. The world was slowly and steadily going to more Hell, more refugee crises, more misery; millions of people dying in the Middle East and northern Africa. Then, in 2013, the world suddenly changed for the better. President Xi Jinping announced a new model of international relationships in Kazakhstan – the New Silk Road. In the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, which was an incredible exchange not only of goods, technologies, cultures, ideas, but also laid the foundation of a dialogue among nations; this New Silk Road took on a development which is unprecedented I think in all of history. In the last 4.5 years, this new Spirit of the New Silk Road started to catch on, so that by now, more than 140 countries are cooperating in Asia, in Latin America, in Africa, even in Europe, with the New Silk Road. You have a tremendous sense of optimism in Latin America, where practically all Latin American countries are now building and planning to build bi-oceanic projects; bi-oceanic railway between Brazil and Peru, bi-oceanic tunnels between Argentina and Chile, and many other projects. So, the Spirit of the New Silk Road has definitely caught on in the Caribbean and Latin American countries. It is for sure the case in the Asian countries, and many corridors are being built. Africa has completely changed with the building of railways from Djibouti to Addis Ababa; all along the eastern African countries, the western African countries. If you look at the map of Chinese investments in railway systems and industry parks and hydropower in many other agricultural projects, there

is a completely new spirit and self confidence among the Africa nations that they can now overcome poverty and under-development for the first time, in the near future. Even in Europe, where the EU has been absolutely blocking any cooperation, the New Silk Road Spirit has absolutely caught on. You have the 16+1 Eastern and Central European countries; you have the Balkan countries. Italy is now engaged together with China in a major project called Transaqua, which will change the lives of 12 African nations and bring industrialization into the heart of Africa. But also, Portugal and Spain want to be the hubs not only for the western end of the Eurasian part of the New Silk Road, but to be also a hub for the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa and Asia and Latin America. So, the New Silk Road Spirit is absolutely on the agenda. Also in Switzerland, in Austria, and even in Holland, Belgium, and some of the Scandinavian countries.

This is based on the idea of a win-win cooperation of respect for the sovereignty of the other country and respect for the other social system. This has been an incredible development. It's already 12 times larger than the Marshall Plan was, but the amazing thing is that for 4.5 years where this project is now progressing, the Western mainstream media and Western politicians have virtually ignored it; they have not reported it, and only in the recent period have they suddenly realized this is unstoppable. What is now occurring is a flood of attacks from the main think tanks, saying this is just an authoritarian effort by the Chinese to replace the Anglo-American imperialism with a Chinese one, and they want to take over the world. It was quite a sudden change in the coverage and in the comments.

A similar shock happened when they realized that Russia was absolutely not a regional power as Obama had told, but that basically it was about to become, under the leadership of President Putin, a major power again. So therefore, when Trump suddenly won the election, the same apparatus which is now behind the Skripal affair – British intelligence in collusion with the intelligence heads of the Obama administration – started a policy of a coup against President Trump. There was an article in January 2017 by the British paper {The Spectator}, which said that President Trump would be gotten out of the White House either through a coup, impeachment, or an assassination attempt. That was obviously the policy which these people followed, and

the aim clearly was to prevent President Trump – who had promised in the election campaign to improve relations with Russia and bring it back on a stable and good basis – to prevent Trump from doing it by saying, “If you dare to speak to President Putin, that just proves you are a Russian agent.” It took indeed until the G-20 meeting in Hamburg last year, before Putin and Trump had a personal meeting and actually hit it off very well. Also, between President Trump and President Xi Jinping, contrary to what Trump had said in the election campaign where he was actually on a quite strong China-bashing mode, he received President Xi Jinping in April last year at his private residence in Mar-a-Lago. And they established a very good positive relationship between the two of them. Then, when President Trump went to Beijing for a visit in October last year, President Xi Jinping returned this and gave Trump what they called a “state visit plus.” President Xi Jinping had the Forbidden City closed down to visitors for an entire day, and gave a huge long history lecture on Chinese history to President Trump and his wife. They established and deepened their relationship.

In the meantime, also Russia and China established the deepest strategic partnership in their history. Putin gave a speech on March 3, 2018 to the Federal Assembly, where he announced new weapons systems; basically, a long-range missile which does not follow the ballistic curve, but is highly maneuverable. Then also, a nuclear-powered cruise missile which the West absolutely does not have, and a nuclear-powered underwater drone which is quicker than above-water ships, and laser weapons. This combination of these and other weapons means that all of sudden, the entire global ABM system the United States had proceeded to build is obsolete. President Putin said, well, the West refused to even respond to all the offers made by Russia since 2002; but now, they have to respond. It is quite amazing that, except the demand of four American ambassadors, they have not yet responded. Western media tended to belittle these new weapons systems, or ignore them for the most part. [Chinese Foreign Minister] Wang Yi and the Chinese Defense Minister Wei Fenghe just attended the very large 7th Moscow International Security Conference, which was attended by 900 guests and 700 media. Wang Yi said that Russia can pursue its own interests and play a larger role in the international and regional stages. The Chinese Defense Minister Wei Fenghe said he came in order to send a signal to Washington that the

Russian-Chinese alliance is absolutely the strongest and that there is a very close cooperation between the Russian and the Chinese armed forces.

All of these things have to be seen as a dynamic process, where we are now on the verge also of a full-fledged trade war. Admittedly, the trade deficit of the United States with China is untenable; but when President Trump said that he wants to impose tariffs first on \$60 billion trade deficit, and then on another \$100 billion trade deficit, this was met by an unusually sharp response from the Chinese. *Global Times* wrote yesterday that China will not submit to the U.S. trade intimidation; that China is prepared to react with a full list of their own tariffs on American imports; that the trade war will cause pain for China, but the Chinese society will rally and unite around the government and the Party; and that they will also present a detailed plan to respond, and then the Americans would have to choose if they back their President in doing so, or if they hold him accountable for the consequences. *China Daily* even mentioned that the Chinese countermeasures could include the dumping of U.S. Treasuries, of which they have \$1.4 trillion as securities.

All of this comes at a moment where, at any moment, we could have a new financial crash much worse than that of 2008, because all the central banks did absolutely nothing to remove the root causes of the crisis of 2008. They just did quantitative easing, zero interest rates, and naturally many corporations took that gratis money to buy back their own stocks so that their stock exchange values would go up, but the corporate debt would increase. Now, as the Federal Reserve is trying to increase the interest rate, the blow-out of these corporate debt situations could trigger a complete systemic collapse. That is just one of the many facets of this crisis.

An insider in the banking system, a well-placed one, told us very recently that there is actually the possibility that some of the financial forces could even deliberately trigger a crash which they know is inevitable to come, as a deliberate plan to pull the rug out from underneath President Trump; to bring back the neo-cons, and that way to solve the problem which they could not solve with the failed Russia-gate attempt. One thing is very clear. If that would happen and the neo-cons would get fully back in the United States, World War III is as good as secure and certain.

In the middle of this Skripal affair, President Trump and President Putin telephoned; and President Trump absolutely refused to send out tweets on this affair or otherwise join in the present Russia bashing.

I want to make the strong point that there is a solution to all of the problems I just mentioned. That is, that there are many possibilities. For example, when Presidents Trump and Putin will have a summit in the near future, they could discuss this. Also, the Chinese Prime Minister Li Keqiang had recently pointed to the fact that there is actually another way to solve the trade deficit; namely, by massively increasing the trade. President Xi Jinping has offered to the whole world, including all the European nations and the United States, that they should cooperate with the Belt and Road Initiative. China could decide and choose not to dump U.S. Treasuries as a punishment for the U.S. trade measures, but they could invest the \$1.4 trillion in U.S. Treasuries in infrastructure in the United States. Diane mentioned the Manhattan subway system in her remarks, and if you look at the infrastructure – not only in Manhattan, but in all of the United States – the condition of the highways, the absolute absence of a fast train system; it is very clear that the United States urgently needs investment in infrastructure. President Trump had promised in the election campaign that he would invest \$1 trillion in infrastructure build-up; but so far, he has not been able to find any financing, because the private investors want an 11 % to 12 % return and a complete return of their capital within 10 years. Which means it is not possible to finance it through private investment. The neo-cons in the Senate and in the Congress do not want to spend it in the Federal budget. The idea to distribute it to the regional and state governments is just not practical.

So, if on the other side, China, which has a fantastic fast train system of I think 25,000 km of fast train, and is planning to connect every major Chinese city with a fast train system and build 40,000 km of fast train systems by 2020; China could help to build such a fast train system in the United States and connect every major city with a fast train system going 350 mph and in that way, completely transform the infrastructure of the United States. This would help not only to overcome the trade deficit, but it would open the way for joint ventures between the United States and China in third countries. In Latin America where, contrary to what former Secretary of State Tillerson had

said, China is not trying to build an imperial system in Latin America. But China and the United States could join hands in building up the industries of the Southern Hemisphere. Also, the same could happen in Asian countries along the Belt and Road; and also naturally in Africa. It could happen in the reconstruction and economic build-up of the war-torn region of Southwest Asia, and naturally of Africa in general.

This could even include Great Britain eventually, if they change their government and if they get their crimes cleared up which they clearly have committed. But it would mean absolutely the necessity to reform the financial system of the United States and Western Europe.

My husband, Lyndon LaRouche, has already developed several years ago a package which together would absolutely remedy the situation. It would mean that the United States should go back to a Hamiltonian banking policy, to a banking system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton; including the Glass-Steagall banking separation of Franklin D Roosevelt. Then, have a national bank, a credit system, then have a crash program for thermonuclear fusion and joint space cooperation with other countries in order to increase the productivity of the economy in a qualitative way.

What people really don't realize, or most people don't realize, is that the present Chinese model of economy and the early U.S. republic model are very similar. They're based on Hamiltonian principles. In China, they have now made a huge effort to eliminate the speculative area, to forbid Chinese investors abroad to invest in speculation. It is very clear that China, even if they don't call it way, is actually very close to the American System. And it is no coincidence that the most popular economist in China is Friedrich List, the German economist who was sort of the predecessor to Henry C. Carey, and who wrote important writings about the different between the British and the American systems. Germany also has a tradition of that; namely, the Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau, the Credit Bank for Reconstruction, which was based on the Roosevelt Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was the basis for the German economic miracle in the post-war reconstruction. So, also in Europe, you have some relevance and memory of this system. Now after Xi Jinping had announced the New Silk Road, the Schiller Institute and our organization published a study which we had worked on for 26 years with the name "The New Silk Road

Becomes the World Land-Bridge," which is actually the absolute blueprint and outline for an international economic cooperation of all nations overcoming geopolitics.

Now just imagine if we could mobilize the American people to exert pressure on President Trump and give him backing, and he would accept the offer of Xi Jinping to cooperate with the New Silk Road in this way and also the European countries would eventually recognize – most of them are doing it already – but even the remaining ones would recognize that the cooperation with Russia, with China and the other nations who already have jointed the Belt and Road initiative—that this would be much more in their self-interest, than the present course of the British confrontation with Russia and with China.

If such an international economic cooperation could be realized, it would also be the realistic basis for a global security architecture which would include among others also Russia and China. It would then require that we do exactly what Xi Jinping has said many times, that mankind needs to move in a new phase of international cooperation, what he calls the "shared community of the future of mankind" or a "community of destiny," then we could start to focus on the real problems, the common aims of mankind. We could build a system to make nuclear weapons obsolete, a new form of the SDI, what my husband had proposed, in the end of the 1970s and then it was in the works for several years; and then on March 23, 1983, President Regan had announced the SDI as a way for both superpowers to cooperate to make nuclear weapons obsolete. I think in light of the present danger of a new arms race and the already-existing arms race and the danger that this gets out of control, we need such an approach as a new SDI; and also a new SDE [Strategic Defense of the Earth], because the planet as a whole is threatened by dangers from space, from asteroids, from comets, which could really extinguish life on this Earth.

We should instead concentrate on the common aims of mankind—the alleviation of poverty, the creation of a living standard for a decent life for every human being on this planet, and a system of earthquake precursors and joint space research and travel. We should concentrate on space colonization as the necessary and possible next phase of the evolution of the human species. I think that if we combine that with a dialogue of cultures where each nation would emphasize and revive the best traditions of its own culture, and then have a dialogue among all

of these nations and cultures, we could absolutely create the basis for a new Renaissance.

Skeptics would say that this is completely unrealistic. But I'm saying that the fact that you have these three Presidents—President Putin, who is obviously recognized and loved by the Russian people, and has just been reelected with an overwhelming majority; with Xi Jinping, who is an exceptional leader who obviously is equally loved by the Chinese population, and basically they decided to eliminate the limits to his term in office so that he can guide China in these very, very important coming years; and President Trump, who is absolutely not what the media are making out of him, but who has shown again and again that he has outflanked a pretty difficult factional situation in his own party, and naturally with a Congress and a Senate which are very obstructive for the most part. I think that if the three Presidents join hands and do what they clearly did very successfully so far, in the attempt to solve the crisis of the Korean Peninsula, I absolutely think this is a realistic option. However, we should not sit on our hands, but we should really get into an international mobilization to propose this agenda, and do everything in our means to make it possible. It is the life of civilization which depends on it.

Thank you. [Applause]

SARE: Thank you. We can now take questions from the audience here. Please say your name, and if you represent an institution or a press agency, please state what you're representing as well.

Q: I would like to ask you a question on behalf of Weiwei TV. As you may know, President Donald Trump has already instituted trade policies on China and China made a serious response. So I would like to know how you see the relationship between the United States and China? And what direction do you think this relationship is going to? Thank you.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think that we have a very serious danger, because if it comes to this trade war, as I mentioned, you have already a collapsing financial system of the trans-Atlantic region. And a trade war could easily be one of the elements triggering a complete meltdown of the financial system and that would obviously be much worse for the West than for China, which

has taken certain measures to eliminate speculation and put the whole Chinese economy on a solid ground. Nevertheless, the consequences of a financial crash would be potentially extremely dangerous. As I said, if the neo-cons would come back and Trump would be ousted in this context, we would be back to Hell in no time.

On the other side, the trade war has not yet started. So far, it's just lists, and there is room to put on the agenda a different proposal. I think Prime Minister Li Keqiang already pointed to it, to increase the trade in joint ventures in third countries. I think that the more people talk about this idea of U.S. investments in infrastructure and, for example, Xi Jinping could reiterate the proposal for the United States to join the Belt and Road Initiative, I think the trade war can still be avoided. But it does need determined action.

And I think that the possibility exists simply because the relationship between Xi Jinping and Trump has so far lasted over a year, and they have telephoned around many crises; and basically the Korea situation is on a very good course. There will be a summit between [Shinzo] Abe and Trump, who also wants to play a positive role. There will be a meeting between Putin and Trump, hopefully very soon; and Kim Jong-Un and Trump. So I think there is a diplomatic framework where many initiatives can be made, and I think the New Silk Road is definitely the answer to solve all of these problems.

Q: Hello. I think what you have said today is just enlightening. My name is Alan S. I'm a screenwriter and producer of a World War I mini-series, called "The 42nd Rainbow Division." I think history is our greatest weapon and if we start actually thinking back to what Russia actually did, for not only World War II, but also World War I. We would have lost both world wars. And actually the United States wouldn't have even been in World War I, because we would have lost it before we even got in. They were a huge ally.

I think history needs to be taught to the young and that's why I'm doing this series, is because the younger generations don't realize that Russia has been an ally. And now we're vilifying Russia and making them into a villain when it should be the opposite. How do we actually teach this to the young? The younger generations are our hope and they're our future.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think we need to change the narrative of the neo-cons. Because when the Ukraine crisis started to develop, President Putin said if it would not have been Ukraine, they would have found another way to escalate the confrontation with Russia. And I think that this is absolutely the case.

I think to change the narrative of the Ukraine, because this is really when the total escalation against Putin as the demon started, is a very urgent matter because right now President Poroshenko has announced that he wants to basically have a military solution for the east Ukraine, which could easily provoke a war with Russia.

I think the narrative has to be replaced by the truth. The truth is that Victoria Nuland bragged that she and the State Department spent \$5 billion in building up NGOs to cause regime change in Ukraine. The former Chancellor Helmut Schmidt—even he admitted that the Ukraine crisis started with the EU expansion summit of Maastricht in 1992, when the eastward expansion of the EU was decided, and the crisis was triggered when the EU wanted to have the association of Ukraine (basically at the end of 2013, which was the point when President Yanukovich decided he couldn't do it because it would have given NATO access to the Black Sea; it would have flooded Russia with EU products. This then triggered the Maidan, which was immediately supported by these NGOs financed by Nuland and the West, supported by neo-Nazis which were then causing the violence, and finally the coup in February 2014, imposing a fascist government as a reaction to that. And the threat to forbid the Russian language, the people in the Crimea decided to hold a referendum and they voted to be part of Russia, so Crimea was not annexed, but it was a vote for self-determination of the Crimean people.

I'm telling you all of this because part of the demonization of Putin, is the Ukraine story and what he supposedly did with Crimea, and all of this is not true. I think we have to really make an effort, to maybe produce many more movies and maybe we can work together to this effect because we have documented many of these wrong narratives and we must make them known. Because if the mass media are just portraying this idea that Russia is about to do everything, and behind every – it is worse than the McCarthy period and people are just hyped up which can only be characterized as a prewar propaganda. Because why do you build up an enemy image, because you want to make war against this nation. This is a mortal danger in which the whole world is. And I think

this Skripal affair—the fact that it backfired, the fact that the British were caught lying, is really also a chance.

I would suggest that we work together on making more movies. We have already put out a lot of them, but I think we need and call upon all of you to help to distribute them, and make them known to as many young, middle-aged, and old people as we can.

Q: Mrs. LaRouche. Thank you very much for your speech. I think everyone here—we're very pleased to hear what you said. My name is Amber J. I'm political activist right now working with several groups for supporting Trump and also for the midterm election. And also, I'm working for fighting for Chinese-American minority civil rights kind of thing.

I have a question – I believe everybody came to this conference understands your speech and understands the principle of three countries cooperating with each other. But there are some Trump supporters, they stand for Trump because Trump is starting a trade war right now. How would you persuade those Trump supporters to understand this win-win cooperation between these three countries, to maximize the effort for these three countries to cooperate together?

And also I believe a while ago, I heard India and Japan and probably the U.S.A. talking about starting another kind of international cooperation in terms of the infrastructure. That is the kind of thing similar to the Silk Road, the One Belt, One Road. How would you like to define that, or could you say about something about it? Thank you.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think this is again another narrative which needs to be replaced by truth. And that is, what is actually the Chinese policy? Part of this problem is that for a long period of time the Western media and certain political circles in the United States have also painted a very negative picture about China. I think Chinese-Americans, and you yourself could help to correct that.

I must say, my image of China is incredibly positive;

because I was there for the first time in 1971. This was in the Cultural Revolution. And this was an unbelievable experience because at that time, the country was completely distraught. People there were unhappy. The Red Guards took people out of their homes in the night. They painted all the cultural

buildings, the Summer Palace and other places in Beijing, with red paint.

Anyway, I'm just reporting that to say that when I returned to China after 25 years, in 1996, already with the idea of the Eurasian Land-Bridge, the idea of the New Silk Road, where I attended a major conference on that subject in Beijing as a speaker, the country had already been completely transformed as a result of the policies of Deng Xiaoping.

But if you now go to China, it is unbelievable. The country is prosperous; there is a large well-to-do middle class. People are optimistic about the future. They have an absolute vision, a self-confidence about China, about eliminating poverty by 2020. President Xi Jinping has a hands-on policy, going to the villages, talking to individuals; finding out what measures must be taken to eliminate poverty.

It's just such an incredibly optimistic situation—where also, culturally, China is pursuing the revival of Confucianism. Xi Jinping personally has made a big emphasis that Confucian philosophy is being taught on all levels of society.

I think that if people, especially in the Chinese-American community would amplify our efforts to show the real, true picture of China, I think the Trump supporters would absolutely understand, that it {is} in the best interest for the United States and China to cooperate. If you think about it, if the two largest economies in the world cannot cooperate, the danger of world war is very big.

Many people have talked about the Thucydides trap. This refers to the rivalry between ancient Athens and Sparta, which led to the Peloponnesian War, and the final disappearance of Classical, ancient Greece. If there would be a Thucydides trap between the United States and China; if the United States would react to the rise of China by a military confrontation, the world as a whole would not survive it.

China has (especially the Chinese ambassador in Washington, Cui Tiankai stressed that it is not the intention to replace the U.S. as the strongest power, but to have a special great power relationship, where both of them respect the sovereignty of the other, respect the different social system of the other, and then join hands and cooperate in all strategic matters.

I think there must be a very big mobilization where the image of China in the United States is being straightened out, because once people know the beauty of Chinese culture, the

optimism of the Chinese population, everything will change. It is right now that the United States has a big moral and cultural crisis. You have for the first time the life-expectancy going down. For two years in a row, you have the life-expectancy of all categories of life in the United States shrinking. If there is *any* parameter for a collapsing economy, it is the life-expectancy. And that is naturally due to the new opium epidemic, the rate of suicides because of depression, alcoholism, and the terrible culture of death, which expresses itself in the youth culture, violence of the video games, in the whole entertainment industry, which is contributing to these many school shootings.

You do have a cultural problem. And I think you have to go back to the philosophy of Benjamin Franklin, the founder and father of America, who used to be a complete Confucian philosopher. He recognized the wonderful aspects of the moral philosophy of Confucius and modeled his own moral system on the basis of Confucius. There are many parallels. You have the Confucius tradition with Benjamin Franklin, and in China, you have the American System of Alexander Hamilton in the early phase of the American republic, and now, in the Chinese model. And you have many similarities which, once you see, you can see that there are universal principles uniting these two countries, which are much more deep and much more important than the superficial conflicts.

I would say the best thing one can do to intervene in this situation is, we have proposed the project for the China investment in infrastructure. This has been picked up by a Chinese professor recently, John Gong. It has been covered by CGTN TV. There is a very famous Trump supporter in California, who just made a similar proposal. I think that has to be talked up. I think we have to talk up the idea of overcoming the danger of a trade war, by putting instead on the table Chinese investment in infrastructure, U.S. and China joining in joint ventures in third countries, and start a real cultural dialogue, so that the two people start to know each other and know the best of each other. And that way we can overcome this crisis.

SARE: Helga, I have a question which I think is related. You may want to say more. It comes from Sr. Pat C., of the Dominican Sisters of Peace who is also a member of the alto section of the Schiller Institute chorus.

She writes, "In your view, what concrete actions now will help catalyze the transition from a competition of nations to cooperation and mutual respect?"

I think you largely have addressed that, but there may be more that you want to say.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think that the knowledge about the incredible dynamic of the Belt and Road Initiative, once people know that, it changes their view. For example, take the case of Austria. Austria is a small country, but they want to take a leading role in becoming a hub for the New Silk Road. They just had a conference planning to broaden the gauge of the railway from Vienna all the way to Moscow, so that they can be better integrated in the container trains and similar things. All the Balkan countries are completely on board. The Eastern European countries, the Central European countries are all planning to be hubs and bridges.

The excitement in Africa— I mean, if people would know, there is a completely different spirit! No longer do the Africans want to be receivers of donations. They want to be treated as equal partners. They want to have investments, and the spirit of the New Silk Road has absolutely changed the self-esteem and self-confidence of all the African leaders and many of the people.

Just take this case of the Transaqua project. Transaqua is a project which was originally proposed by Bonifica, an Italian engineering firm, already more than 30 years ago. And the Schiller Institute and the LaRouche movement were campaigning for that for decades, because it is one of the key projects for the entire continent. What it would essentially mean is that you would take about 3-4% of the water from the tributaries of the Congo River, at a 500 meter height, and then by gravitation, you can bring this water through a system of canals all the way to Lake Chad, which is now dried out to less than 10% of its original volume. This affects the lives immediately of 40 million people in the Lake Chad Basin. When you bring this water back into Lake Chad, not only do you fill up this lake again, and create large volumes of water for irrigation for agriculture; you also create an inland shipping system for 12 countries in the heart of Africa; you create hydropower; you create a system of industry parks, of industrialization. So you bring in the industrialization in the middle of Africa, and that with all the

other infrastructure projects, will mean *Africa has a future*. By the year 2040, there will be 2 billion people living in Africa, and they need these jobs, they need education, they need the kinds of projects, so that people are no longer marching through the Sahara and dying of thirst, which is happening now more than people even dying in the Mediterranean—it's just not being reported. These young people would instead help in the building up of the African continent.

This is such a fantastic development, and if the Americans would know about it – I mean, I'm only talking about the tip of the iceberg – but if people would see the sheer volume of change and the magnitude of change which is already happening, they would become absolutely optimistic and change their view, and recognize that in the history of mankind, geopolitics is something that absolutely has to be overcome, if we are supposed to survive as a human species. In the age of thermonuclear weapons, if you do not overcome geopolitics, we are going to be the destruction of our own species; and nobody in their right mind can really want that because even those warmongers, who are pushing it, would be eliminated themselves, too.

I think that the moment has absolutely arrived. If we go into a mass advertising campaign, a mass education campaign, about the existence of this New Paradigm, I think it can absolutely inspire the Americans and make the change which is necessary in the short term.

Q: Hi, I am an American citizen and a Confucian, I believe in Confucianism. I'm an independent scholar of language and civilization. I was an instructor of Chinese at Harvard University, in the Department of Eastern Language and Civilization.

I have the same idea as you that America needs to join China's One Belt and One Road plan. I grew up 10 years ago, during the age of reform of China. I worked as at the FESCO, the Foreign Enterprise Service Corporation. I think more than 20 years ago, many American, European and Japanese companies invested in China, and gave us was a better economy, and I think it was very important.

Now, I think in the 21st century, China's economy is much improved. It's time to bring China's investments into America and to help America's economy. That's why in 2016, I was for Donald Trump. I want to work with American people; I want to be

the bridge to connect China and America, to bring China's investment into America, to best help America's economy.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Very good! So many you can join with the Schiller Institute to help us, to get this message out widely. Because you know, already now the states which are doing large business with China, see the advantage. When President Donald Trump was in China last November, he had with him delegations from several states – West Virginia, Alaska, and some others. And in the case of West Virginia, he brought back trade deals and investment deals worth \$83 billion! And the governor of West Virginia is completely optimistic that this will give back hope to all the people in West Virginia.

And there are many projects, for example, one very exciting idea is that Beijing, and the region of Hebei province and Tianjin, this is a region of about 130 million people, and there is a now a huge project whereby this region will be changed, where the heavy industry, which still has some environmental problems, causing smog and pollution is now being outsourced into Hebei province and modernized; a new city is being built, I think its name is Xiong'an, which is in the middle between Beijing, Tianjin and Hebei, and it's completely modernized. Beijing on the other side, will have lots of research and development, which is much cleaner for the environment, and all of this is supposed to be connected through an infra-urban modern transport system, including modern maglev. And the recent "Two Sessions" conference and the National People's Congress in China, the party discussed building a new maglev system of 600 kph speed, for the connection between the cities, and an inter-urban slow maglev system of 160 kph.

This is very good for urban transportation, because the beauty of the maglev system is that it accelerates immediately: You are in a few seconds at full speed, with the slow maglev you're only going 160 kph, which is enough for inner city transport; and they want to connect this entire region with this modern transport system, so that essentially no job will be more than 20 minutes away from the home of the working person. So you save all this commuting time.

And my idea is that this model of the Tianjin-Hebei-Beijing region could be a model for the modernization of New York, New Jersey, San Francisco, Los Angeles, the Midwest, and you actually do something like that inside the United States. And I think

President Trump is a developer; he knows about infrastructure, and I think we just have to make sure that the Trump supporters know about these plans, and that we create an environment where this is actually intersecting the present crisis and danger of a trade war.

If you move quickly enough, and get the Trump voters all inspired with this idea, I think we can do a miracle. And I definitely believe in miracles, as long as we do them ourselves.

Q: [follow-up] Thank you very much. I totally agree with you. I believe that to bring China's investment and enterprise is more important in the trade market. And secondly, I was a professional Chinese instructor: I want to educate more Americans and Chinese people to understand each other, and make a friendship to develop together.

Q: I'm José V.: I'm here from New York City. Earlier you touched upon the youth culture and the culture of death, and I was hoping you could touch more upon that, because in my experience – and I'm only 19 myself, too – but from what I see of people around me, but also my nephew who will be turning 15 this year, I see he's more interested in violent video games and yelling into the microphone to imaginary people who aren't there, and spending a lot of money on things that will never really help him out in life: for example, he brought a \$300 belt buckle, because it said somebody's name on it, I think it's Gucci. He's more interested in reading violent comic books that display gore and showing people's insides – I don't have to go into that, you know about that.

My question is, how do we overcome this violence? How do we overcome this culture of death, and how do we overcome this culture of violence? And more importantly, how do we stop getting young people wanting to escape from reality by taking drugs and whatnot? So that's my question.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think what we need for that is a mass movement for development. Because, first of all, I studied this question some years ago, when we had some guests and the children who came with the guests asked me if I knew about Pokémon, and naturally I had never heard about Pokémon. And they said: Oh, it's beautiful, it's violent, it's fighting. So I was so shocked,

I started to look into it, and I discovered Pokémon as a sort of

introduction drug to video games, and then naturally, the evolution, where these video games come from.

Well, they were developed by the military in the postwar period, because people had recognized in the Second World War, only 15% of the soldiers were ready to shoot the enemy, because human beings have a sort of natural barrier inside them, which they don't want to overcome, and when they kill somebody it goes against that. So many people have a healthy block, – or had a healthy block. So the military developed these quickly changing targets, like in target practice, not having just one target but having many, and they change and move, so that you would learn to shoot quickly – shooting, shooting, one shot after the other – in order to train people to overcome the normal adrenalin shock which happens if you shoot at another person; if you are not brainwashed, then you have an adrenalin reaction and you start shaking and so on. So they wanted to get away from this, by having these video simulations, where people would learn to shoot, to increase the killer ratio of the soldiers.

So this is the basis for these video games which then became commercial. And while, in the military, and obviously it's a terrible thing in the military also, but at least you have an officer, you have some guidance, you have military discipline; but when these video games, which have become more insane over the decades, if they are accessible to young children, and these young children have not had any kind of an inoculation through a humanist education, through the recognition of beauty in Classical culture, through moral guidelines given to them by their parents, but where you have a culture where everything is allowed, everything goes – movies become more violent, more perverse, more pornographic; even snuff movies, where killing is being filmed, or at least the illusion that people are killed is being filmed, *this is really deadly stuff!* This destroys the cognition of anybody, but especially of young people.

And when young people, then, children, pupils, students, become autistic because they are only living in their social media, and have completely lost the ability to relate to each other, this is the death of a culture. And I think this is what's happening in the United States. You would not have these unbelievable numbers of mass school shootings: Like after Columbine in 1999, there were 38 mass shootings. And after the

Parkland shooting, you had 50 alarms in the schools per day, where pupils would see another pupil having a weapon, or having crazy messages.

Now, obviously, this brings us to the question of, who is promoting this? President Trump had a meeting in the White House, where he met with the pupils of the school in Parkland, and the producers of these videos. So obviously, President Trump is aware of it, and I think we have to strengthen his resolve to move against it. And it happens to be that the Parkland incident, in particular, was also the work of the FBI, because they established a system which is run by some uneducated call center, and so, many of the hints which were clearly given before, were missed. And it now turns out that in the Orlando case, the father of the shooter was a longtime FBI informant. So there is a lot of these things to be pursued.

But I think the key thing is a mass movement for development. Because, if young people have no hope for the future, and have no perspective, because it's now the common view that the coming generations will be worse off than the present one – this is the first time *ever* this has happened; because it used to be a moral standard for families, for everybody, that you work so that your children will have a better life than yourself. And this has been abandoned for the first time. So what will young people have as a perspective? Well, they have no future. And that is a *huge* difference! And I can assure you, I have seen it in all cases: There is a gigantic difference between the optimism of the youth in China, and the pessimism of the young people and the population in general in the United States, and in countries like Germany, for example.

So the absence of a vision, where the future of a nation, of the world will be, is what is feeding this kind of culture of death, because then it doesn't matter, life doesn't matter, life is worth nothing, whether you shoot somebody or not it makes no big difference.

So I think a mass movement for the kind of economic development which we were talking about before, is an absolute ingredient, so that people have a reason to study, to develop their minds, to develop their cognitive powers, to be productive. If you have the feeling that you can be an astronaut, that you can be a scientist in the realm of a thermonuclear fusion economy; that you will travel to the Moon Village in your lifetime, you have a motivation to study! And I think without

such a motivation, it is very, very difficult.

So I would not look at it as a separate issue: I would look at it as an integral question to the whole discussion we are having here.

Q: Thank you for your work, today, and throughout all your time.

I'm Father Richard D., Franciscan Servants of God's Grace.

My question to you, is we know that the President has written a book showing that his way of dealing with a problem is to take an {extreme} view, so he has room to compromise, to come back to what he actually wants. Do you believe he's doing this with the international trade situation?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: I don't know; it may be. Because I think President Trump has said of himself many times, that he knows how to make deals, that he would get better agreements than most other people. And it may very well be that such an idea exists, that he makes big announcements of tariffs and so forth, and then in reality, he's negotiating and has his ambassador and other people, trade negotiators, making such a discussion.

I don't know. I find it a little bit risky, because I saw some Chinese articles where they said that some people may think that they can get a better result this way, but that China will not be intimidated into making compromises and basically will answer back.

I don't know. I think it is not necessary. I think this particular idea that you make a huge attack, and then you go for something less, is still, in my view, – and as you probably have realized, I'm very positive about the potential of President Trump; I've stuck my neck out a year ago, when I said that if Trump is able to put the relationship with Russia and China on a positive basis, he will go into history as one of the greatest American Presidents, and I stuck my neck out. And I'm repeating this, here. So, as you can see, I'm very optimistic and positive that it could happen.

But I also think that this particular style of negotiation is very dangerous, especially in an environment which is fraught with dangers as I touched upon in my earlier remarks. A much better way, in my view, would be to just say, "We want the United States and China to work together on a New Paradigm." There is already the Belt and Road Initiative. The United States could

have some program, they could call it the American Silk Road, or the American FDR Revival, or the American Founding Fathers Celebration, if they don't want to be part of something which already has been put out by China, it doesn't matter, as long as the content of the policy is the same on.

And I think the potential for things to grow into a higher level of reason – I mean, here we are talking about the one humanity. I mean, I think the spiritual dimension, if you want, has to be brought into this matter, because man is different from all creatures, because we are gifted by God with creative reason. And you don't have to be a Christian, you can be a Confucian philosopher, you can be a Buddhist, you can be just a good person, to understand that we have reached a point in human history, where we either recognize that we are all part of the one humanity, or we will not make it as a species.

Since Diane mentioned earlier Nicholas of Cusa, I can only say, that Nicholas developed a way of thinking which – she mentioned in the *Docta Ignorantia*, the “coincidence of opposites,” which is the idea that because we are capable of creative reason, we can think the One as having a higher quality and a higher power than the Many: The one humanity being first, and then the many nations being also important, but being not in contradiction to the progress and wellbeing of the one humanity. So I think if we understand that it is really the question of addressing that in us, which makes us human, the creative potential, then I think we can just find a way of shaping a New Paradigm where mankind is defined from a common future, how do we want to be existing as a human species, in 100 years from now, in 1,000 years from now, or even in 10,000 years from now? Because we can *think* the future! No dog, no donkey, not goose can think the future. If you tell a dog, “Let's have a walk tomorrow,” the dog will hear the word “walk,” which the dog probably knows, and jump to the door and wag its tail, and be happy. But if you say “tomorrow,” it doesn't mean anything to the dog!

But I think we need to raise the level of our communication, and just really do our duty as a human species, and prolong our existence indefinitely, by working together.

Q: My name is J. I'm the author of two books, *Evidence Not Destroyed*, and *Spread Real Love*. I want to thank Mrs. LaRouche; I want to thank this organization. You're some fine

people. As I travel around America, I see many things: I just had to buy a new car, because the one I had had over 205,000 miles on it; and the one before that had 186,000 miles on it. But I'm going around the countryside, and other countries, also, spreading, putting this literature out for so many years. And I'm impacted with this organization. It has some very fine, smart brains, that are sitting here in this auditorium today, and I just thank God for you.

And when we come to a situation like we have today, I want to know how we can go forward? How we can promote civilization? How we can carry on? But if we have learned anything from our history, we have to look back and look at our history, and look at our results. We have something that's so profound here today; we don't get this kind of information on the TV no more. I used to watch so much news, but now, they say the news is not absolutely real! They say something about "fake" – I heard that over and over again, so I turned my television off from the news. And when I can come and get this type of *real* information, in a setting like this, it makes one want to go forward.

So I'm here to help anyway I can. I'll put another 100 and some thousands miles on the car I just bought, to get this information out to the people, because if you don't get it, the news is not going to give it to you correctly, the way it should be given. So, I'm just thanking each one, and all of you that's working – just as I am; Matt Guice, I've been working with him since the '90s; Lynne Speed and Dennis Speed, I've been working with these people since the early '90s. And I'm so proud.

One thing, let me say, I think the reverend right before me, a religious man – I sit in a church now, and I'm the only deacon there! Why is this? Look where we're going? Why is that? We're reforming, we're conforming, we're complying to every situation that's not good. And I think we have some real strength here, and we can do some great things. The main thing is, keep going forward. Thank you.

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, I think people have to be courageous, because the paradigm shift which occurred in the United States, which you, Diane, referenced in the beginning, which really started with the murder of John F. Kennedy and then the murder of Martin Luther King, and the assassination of Robert Kennedy, you know, we had several years ago, a Mozart *Requiem* performance in Vienna, in the suburbs of Washington, and also in the Boston

Cathedral, commemorating the paradigm shift which has occurred in the last 50 years of America, where, the fact that the Kennedy murder, and also the murder of Martin Luther King, was really not avenged – or, not avenged, but not even investigated, and the real culprits made known and punished, which has led to people becoming depressed. I said many times, the Americans almost have become like the Germans, because if you ask a German person to do something, 99 % of the people say “Oh, you can’t do anything, anyway,” so people are really depressed, and feel that they are powerless in the face of what is happening.

And that has happened to America as a result of these unclarified murders. And since we have this event today, because of the 50th anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King, I think it’s a very good moment in history, to say, we will not allow the murderers of King to be successful in eliminating the hope which he represented. I mean, Martin Luther King was murdered at a moment when he had started to pick up many of the same issues which are now being, in reality, changed by China. Because he had started not only to take up the question of economic justice *inside* the United States, but also he had started to take on the question of jobs and overcoming poverty in developing countries. And that is what China is doing, exactly today. And in the same way as the Schiller Institute has been campaigning for, and LaRouche and his movement have been working for, for almost half a century, is now becoming a reality. So there is reason for optimism. And I think that the best thing we can do in a moment like this, thinking about the memory of Martin Luther King, is to say, we will pick up the torch, we will not allow the American people to be passive and desperate and ignorant and all of these things, but we will all turn into active members of the Schiller Institute, help to spread the message; make the Schiller Institute a Renaissance movement, a moment fighting not only for the economic buildup of the United States, but also for a cultural Renaissance. I think the two things absolutely have to go together. So I would encourage all of you to absolutely work with us, because I think the solution to all of these problems are absolutely within reach.

SARE: As the next person is coming up I would just tell everybody, during the break you will have the opportunity to do exactly what Mrs. LaRouche has said, which is to become a member

of the Schiller Institute at our literature table. And to purchase copies of these very important, world-changing reports: This is the one she mentioned, "The New Silk Road Becomes the World Land-Bridge," which we produced right after Xi Jinping announced it. And this report, of which Jason Ross is a coauthor on "Extending the New Silk Road to West Asia and Africa: A Vision of an Economic Renaissance."

Q: Hi, I'm Donald C. My quick question is about the liberals. How are they teaching curriculums to our kids, and they're not giving them the chance to learn the right stuff, and they're just forcing the kids what their beliefs are?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Yes, that is a big problem, because it started with John Dewey, to basically develop this liberal pragmatic idea of education. And unfortunately, you have generations of people who have gone through different phases of such elimination of Classical literature, of natural science, so it is a real problem. And I would think that the best way to proceed on that, is if you look at the kind of materials which we present in the present [What Is the New Paradigm?] class series, which you can find on the LaRouche PAC site, and you can register to be part of it, this is the kind of curriculum which was developed especially with the ideas of my husband, Mr. LaRouche, who did an incredible job, because he revived the best traditions of the 2,500 years of European civilization, the traditions in science which were the source of qualitative progress, the great Classical arts; and this is something which is not taught in American schools, for the most part. And I think we have to form, basically, educated people, who then hopefully, we can influence this present administration to change that. I think President Trump has repeatedly shown, at least for certain areas, an understanding; he talked about the American System of economy; he talked about Lincoln and Carey, he talked about Hamilton. So in the economic field there is definitely something there, which we can build on. I think there are many other people are equally concerned about the condition of the school system. But I think the best thing is that you register for these classes [<http://discover.larouchepac.com/>]. And if you haven't already done it, you can also watch some of the previous classes in the series.[6] Get yourself absolutely a firm grip on universal history, of the great advances in science and

culture, and then, you know, basically help us to organize change.

Because it will come from many places. There are many people are realizing that at this point it is the scientists, the engineers and such people, who will be much more important in the shaping of things, than many politicians who are part of a party system and partisan, and therefore, don't really regard these issues are the important ones.

But the best advice I can give you right now, is if you join with our efforts, we find ways to address all of these issues, and build a growing movement to demand such a change.

Q: Thank you very much. Your comments were very insightful. I believe in the paradigm where the United States, Russia and China, essentially a triumvirate is essentially going to lead the world, hopefully forward and out of the morass that we've been in. Especially over the prior eight years before this current President came into office.

The question, I want to ask is, what do you perceive would be the case – because I don't believe this economy in this country would have lasted another year, under the current policies. We would have had a significant economic drop which would have led to, since this country's GDP is 25 % of the world's, would have had a worldwide, negative impact. Having said that, what do you perceive would be the consequences in this country, or the for that matter the world, on the movement forward that has occurred, if President Trump did not have the position he has? He may be President, but he may have a weakened political system, in the sense of a House and the Senate: Would we be able to move forward? And what would be the consequences, and under what conditions could we move forward? Could this economy continue to grow if he can't implement his policies? What would be the international consequences of that, from your perspective?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the strongest situation is Trump's relation with his voters. That despite all of the attacks by the FBI, by the British, by the heads of the intelligence services from the Obama administration, – I mean, he had a pretty tough environment, and nevertheless, he goes back to his voters, he holds a rally, and the support for him is actually growing in the polls. So I think that that is for sure, a very strong point which we should build on, because if we keep strengthening that,

and if we keep informing the Trump voters on all the issues we are discussing here, that can actually help to outdo the Congress and the Senate.

And since there is a midterm election, there is actually a very good moment to do that. I mean, the danger is naturally that Trump could be convinced that to take an anti-China stance would help him in the midterm election. I mean, I'm not sure; I'm not close enough to the situation to make a judgment on that. But I think the strong point is, Trump is close to his voters, the voters still recognize what a change he means, and I think that we need to have a mass mobilization – I think there is no shortcut from that; because the danger is very acute. What I said in my initial remarks, when we talk to some really well-placed figure in Europe, who said that there is a discussion to pull the rug out from under Trump with a new financial crash, and if you think that this is a conspiracy theory – well, maybe before the Skripal case, you also thought that such things are conspiracies, but we have just seen a classic example of how you can manipulate a whole international community of nations to go into an attack on Russia, based on a lie! So these things do happen and they can happen.

Now, there are also many warnings. Just today, I think some representative of the firm of Guggenheim put out a warning on this corporate debt question that a financial crash can happen at any moment. And basically, you have the European banking system, the Italian banks are in terrible shape, you have a policy where the trigger point of a collapse of the financial system is many-fold. It's also like a minefield where it's not clear which mine will trigger the explosion, but once it happens, you could have a systemic blowout, much worse than that of 2008. Because the central banks have done absolutely zero, to eliminate the root causes of the crash of 2008. They have, instead, used the so-called tools and instruments – namely quantitative easing, negative interest rate, money pumping – but this has reached the point where now the Fed is forced, or think they are forced, to increase the interest rate, because a negative interest rate is very bad for the real economy, it's bad for the savings of the people, it's bad for life insurance, it's bad for real investment; and the hyperinflationary consequence of such money-pumping is already visible on the horizon in the form of the totally overvalued stock market, in the form of real estate prices, in the form of many other such phenomena. So the Fed

needs to increase the interest rate, but that is already bringing the immediate potential for a new crash.

If that happens, I think we are in {real} trouble: So our whole point, is we need the implementation of Glass-Steagall, and the Four Laws developed by Lyndon LaRouche, before the crash happens. I think this is also a subject – there are these four dialogues which have been established between President Xi Jinping and Trump; one of them concerns the dialogue on economic matters; China has put a lot of emphasis on the dangers to the international financial system, at the G20 meeting in Hangzhou [in 2016] and on other occasions. So I think that this question needs to be urgently addressed, also between the United States and China in these negotiations.

And then, if you put the whole package together, the Four Laws – Glass-Steagall, a National Bank, a credit system in the tradition of Hamilton, a crash program for the increase in the productivity of the labor force, and then joining hands in the Belt and Road Initiative – all of these measures together are a very, very practical and realistic way to overcome these dangers. But it is very urgent, because we are sitting on a powder keg, and I think it can be done, but we need a lot of people of good will to become active with us.

SARE: Helga, we're just about up on time. We have two more questions. Do you want to take both, or one, or?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, maybe both together, and then I'll answer both.

Q: Hi Mrs. LaRouche. My question to you is, is that right after the shooting at Parkland, [Broward County] Sheriff Israel was all over the news speaking about going to all members of Congress to use the Baker Act, to detain and profile people that have experienced some sort of depression. And that's of great concern to me, because there are many people who have experienced that, and I feel this country is becoming more like Germany back in World War II. So I'm kind of scared, and I'd like to know, what's your opinion on it? Thank you.

SARE: OK, next question.

Q: Hello, my name is Steve S. I would just like to ask,

how much of a role do you think that psychological warfare plays in everything that's going on? And how can we counter it? Are there people out there who specialize in psychological warfare? I hear people talk about history being erased; you know, the projection of violence through videos and commercials and that matter.

So, a lot of people are very confused, as well as myself, even when you find something that you believe in sometimes, it's presented in a way that you accept it in the beginning, and then it comes out to be a lie. And right now, clearly, lie is just pounding on the truth. I mean, you have one truth, but you have so many lies that it seems too overwhelming to survive.

SARE: Thank you.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the concerns that both of you expressed is very real. I mean, it is the fact that the West is already living in a police-state. Just take the recent example of the Facebook firm, Cambridge Analytica – they sold data on 50 million people for commercial purposes, for election manipulation and who knows for what else? If you go on the internet and you go on any website, you immediately have the advertisement for the next years of your life of whatever you looked at.

So we are already in a completely surveillance state, where the NSA and the British equivalent, the GCHQ, are monitoring everything – your phone, your smart TV, your laptop – it's omnipresent. And obviously this needs to be reversed.

In the time when I was growing up, being a young person, we had a big concern about data protection. It was a civil right to make sure that your privacy was protected. All of this has gone out of the window! And also, naturally, the big change came on September 11th. Because September 11th was the pretext for a lot of the elimination of civil rights which used to be a constitutional right up to that moment.

And therefore, I think the inquiry of what really happened on September 11th, is still one of the big tasks to be solved, because it led to police-state measures inside the United States. It led to a similar kind of change internationally. And right now, you have the ongoing trial of the families of the victims of the World Trade Center suing the government of Saudi Arabia for their role in the September 11th attacks. And the Saudi government tried to appeal against the lawsuit, and a court in

New York overruled that, so the court case can go ahead. Now, this goes very slowly, but this is a very important aspect; because eventually, we have to go back to a constitutional state. So you are quite right to be concerned, because there *is* a lot of this going on.

Again, I think there is no shortcut: We need more people taking an active role, and force the coming Congress to pass laws to protect the rights of the people again. This is absolutely possible. The whole argument, for example, that you cannot control these things, or not control the internet, is absolutely not true: You can block certain things, you can prevent things, you can make laws which prohibit the profiling; you can make laws which it a criminal act to do all of these things you are worried about. So it's not a self-evident development.

But I think it does require that more people become state citizens: A state citizen, I would define a somebody who takes responsibility not only for his life, his family, his country, but for the outcome of human history. And I think to be such a world historical individual in a moment like that, where the options are so rich, and so beautiful that there is no reason to despair, but it is really the individual decision, to be part of the solution which can and will make the difference. [applause]

SARE: Thank you. That was very beautiful and appropriate. Do you wish to say anything else to us?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, just be happy, and be productive, and feisty, and courageous, and then you can do everything you plan to do.

SARE: Thank you very much! [applause]

[1]

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/category/nyheder/alle-kategorier/oekonomi/larouches-fire-love-feature/>

[2] Kan læses på engelsk her:

http://www.larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2018/eirv45n06-20180209/22-28_4506.pdf

Dansk oversættelse er undervejs.

[3] Læs en dansk introduktion til rapporten af de to forfattere, Jason Ross og Husein Askary, her: <http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=23600>

[4] Abraham Lincolns Gettysburg-tale: » – *and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth*«.

[5] Martin Luther Kings berømte tale 'I have been to the mountain top' fra 3. April, 1968, kan læses her:

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkivebeentothemountaintop.htm>

[6] Se lektionerne i dansk oversættelse her:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/category/lpac-new-paradigme/>

[Lyndon LaRouche: Det britiske Imperium er stadig den civiliserede verdens fjende nr. 1](#)

Jason Ross: Ingen forstår briterne bedre end Lyndon LaRouche. Alt imens Storbritannien ikke længere hersker over havene eller verden med skibe, fly og imperiehære, så inficerer deres måde at tænke på kulturer i hele verden og former den måde, hvorpå folk analyserer og opfatter virkeligheden. Storbritannien udøver også magtfuld kontrol over verdens finanssystem gennem City of London og deres indflydelse over Wall Street. De har haft utrolig succes med at bondefange vore eliter til at være overbevist om, at amerikansk råstyrke med britisk hjerne bør kontrollere verden.

Men, hvor mange flere amerikanske liv skal ofres, og hvor mange flere ofre for unødvendige, geopolitiske krige skal dø og lide i hele verden på vegne af britiske, geopolitiske strategier, før vi udrydder dette barbariske system?

Lad os lytte til LaRouche:

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

Hvorfor geopolitik fører til krig – Og en sejr i Abuja, Afrika. Helga Zepp-LaRouche i Nyt Paradigme Webcast, 1. marts, 2018 (pdf, dansk, og video)

Er det virkelig OK med narkoepidemien, der i USA har ført til et fald i den generelle levetid; guvernør Bevin påpegede det faktum, at nogle af disse sataniske budskaber også er i teksterne i popmusikken, i filmene, i videospillene – bør vi tillade alt dette, og få vore samfund totalt ødelagt? Der er en virkning af alt dette på de kognitive evner! Hvis man ønsker Lyndon LaRouches Fire Love som den eneste løsning til at undgå systemets kollaps, jamen, især den fjerde lov kræver et forceret program for fusionskraft, for international rumforskning og rumrejser. Man kan ikke have folk med ødelagte hjerner, fordi de er afhængige af disse ting, og så få dem til at blive kreativ, produktiv arbejdskraft.

Så det er én og samme diskussion, vi har brug for – vi har brug for et Nyt Paradigme, og vi må have et uddannelsessystem, der understreger skønheden i klassisk kultur, der understreger karakterens skønhed som et udviklingsmål. Det var Wilhelm von Humboldts idé, som trods alt havde indflydelse på meget af undervisningssystemet i Europa og USA i det 19. århundrede, og det holdt sig endda til langt ind i det 20. århundrede, og han havde den idé, at formålet med uddannelse må være karakterens skønhed. Hvem taler om dette nu om stunder? Hvis man tager nogle af disse børn, der er afhængige af disse voldsvideospil, eller endnu værre, der kigger på forfærdeligt materiale på Internettet, hvor der bruges tortur og sådanne ting, og som virkelig bliver ødelagt. Deres hjerner bliver fuldstændig ødelagt!

Eftersom guvernør Bevin har krævet en national debat om dette, og præsident

Trump heldigvis også ønsker at tage dette spørgsmål op, mener jeg, vi må have en sådan debat, for det er efter min mening en integreret del af USA's tilslutning til det Nye Paradigme og den Nye Silkevej, for vi kan ikke have, at dette fortsætter.

Schiller Instituttet har i mange år bevist, at, med klassisk musik, med klassisk poesi, med Schiller, med Shakespeare, kan man transformere folk og få en æstetisk opdragelse, og det er præcis, hvad vi har brug for lige nu.

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

[Helga Zepp-LaRouche:](#) [Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?](#) [LaRouche PAC's Nyt Paradigme](#) [Undervisningsserie 2018; pdf og video](#)

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Dagens emne er det Nye Paradigme for menneskelig civilisation. Jeg har ofte fremført, at, hvis man ser på tilstanden i især den vestlige verden i dag, dvs. USA, tilstanden i Europa, den tyske regering, der er selvdestruktiv mens den forsøger at bygge en ny regering; vi har tydeligvis en situation, hvor verden er i voldsom uorden. Jeg har fremført den pointe, at vi må have et Nyt Paradigme, der er lige så forskelligt i forhold til de nuværende antagelser og aksiomer, som de moderne tider var forskellige i forhold til middelalderen. Hvor alle middelalderens antagelser med skolastik, Aristoteles, overtro og lignende rod blev erstattet af et helt andet billede af mennesket og et nyt begreb om samfundet.

Dette er nødvendigt for at sikre den menneskelige arts evne til at overleve på lang sigt. Og spørgsmålet er, om vi kan give os selv et system for at styre os selv, der garanterer, at den menneskelige art vil eksistere i kommende

århundreder eller endda årtusinder? Min mand, Lyndon LaRouche, helligede hele sit livsværk til dette spørgsmål, med andre ord, til at spore de aspekter af det nuværende system, som var forkerte, og hvordan de skulle erstattes med et bedre, mere fuldendt system. Hvis man ser på de nuværende, såkaldte liberale demokratier i Vesten, så benægter de, at man kan have et sådant nødvendigt billede af mennesket, og nødvendigt [kan ikke høres]. For det er selve liberalismens natur, at alt er tilladt, alt er gyldigt; men virkeligheden er, at dette vestlige liberale demokrati ikke er den eneste situation i verden. En del, et aspekt af dette Nye Paradigme er allerede ved at vokse frem. Det er ved at vokse frem i form af den Nye Silkevej, der for ca. 4,5 år siden blev sat på dagsordenen af Kina. Den såkaldte Ny Silkevejsånd, altså ideen om, at man kan samarbejde på win-win-basis til alles gensidige fordel; denne idé har allerede mange lande – faktisk hele kontinenter – taget til sig. Den Nye Silkevejsånd stormer allerede frem i store dele af Asien, endda visse dele af Europa, Afrika og Latinamerika.

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

BOMBE: »Memoet« opklarede et lille skridt i sammensværgelsen; Gå efter det hele, på vegne af menneskeheden

Leder fra LaRouche PAC, USA, 2. feb., 2018 – Den lærde elite og det Demokratiske Parti er gået fuldstændig amok i ugens løb over offentliggørelsen af det fire sider lange Memo, som er udarbejdet af Husets Efterretningskomite, efter at det blev afklassificeret af præsident Trump.

De fortæller os: Lad være med overhovedet at kigge på det eller tænke på det, for det kunne hjælpe Trump. John McCain gik så vidt som til at sige, at hele

Memoet var djævelens værk, fra den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin. Med hensyn til det, der plejede at hedde det »Demokratiske« parti, bliver vi nu, med overraskelse, vidne til, at de hylder og hylder vores overvågnings-politistat, vores ureglementerede forvaltning af retsvæsenet og deciderede bedrageri omkring FISA-domstolen, som om det alt sammen var lige så amerikansk som æbletærte. Se ikke på den grimme mand bag forhænet, folkens, bare lad som om, og se vores trylleforestilling.

De hyler som de stukne grise, de er.

Her er, hvad Memoet siger, inklusive vore indledningsvise kommentarer:

FBI og Justitsministeriet fik den oprindelige FISA-kendelse til at overvåge Trump-volontøren Carter Page og herefter tre fornyelser på hver 90 dage af denne bemyndigelse til at udføre overvågning. Tidligere FBI-direktør James Comey underskrev tre FISA-ansøgninger, og den nu fyrede FBI-vice direktør Andrew McCabe underskrev én. Vicesstatsanklager Sally Yates, berygtet for sammen med McCabe at have sat en fælde for Michael Flynn, og derudover for, at hele Justitsministeriet afviste at anerkende præsident Trumps immigrationsordrer; fungerende vicesstatsanklager Dana Boente og vicesstatsanklager Rod Rosenstein, underskrev hver én eller flere FISA-ansøgninger. Tidligere FBI-vice direktør Andrew McCabe sagde, at der ikke ville være blevet ansøgt om nogen overvågningskendelse af Page, uden Christopher Steele-dossieret.

De gjorde dette uden en eneste gang at fortælle FISA (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court), at dossieret, der var sammensat af den britiske efterretningsagent Steele, var en afgørende del af FISA-ansøgningen, og at Steele-dossieret, et rent produkt af britisk efterretning, var blevet betalt for af præsident Trumps politiske modstander, Hillary Clinton og hendes DNC, på trods af den kendsgerning, at FBI og Justitsministeriet vidste dette. FBI havde ligeledes aftalt at betale Steele for den samme information.

FISA-ansøgningen, som første gang blev indgivet i oktober, 2016, nævnte en *Yahoo* nyhedsartikel fra 23. september, 2016, af Michael Isikoff, som en bekræftelse af anklagerne i Steele-memoet, når sandheden i virkeligheden var den, at *Yahoo* nyhedsartiklen var et resultat af et læk fra Steele til Michael Isikoff.

I september 2016 sagde Steele til tidligere topembedsmand i Justitsministeriet, Bruce Ohr, under uautoriserede møder, at han »var desperat over, at Donald Trump ikke blev valgt og havde ekstremt stærke følelser imod, at han blev præsident«. Ohrs hustru arbejdede for Fusion GPS, det Demokratiske Partis mellemmand til britisk efterretning, som var Steeles arbejdsgiver. Dette

skete, før den første FISA-ansøgning mod Page blev indgivet. Steele blev suspenderet og dernæst afsluttet som en FBI-informant, fordi han afslørede sit forhold til FBI i en artikel i *Mother Jones* den 30. okt., 2016, forfattet af David Corn. Denne kendsgerning blev tilsyneladende aldrig bekendtgjort over for FISC (Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court).

Efter Steeles afslutning, vurderede FBI selv, at hans påstande kun minimalt kunne bekræftes, og FBI-direktør Comey aflagde efterfølgende vidneforklaring om, at Steeles påstande var »slibrige og ubekræftede«. Alt dette blev heller aldrig fortalt til FISC. På trods heraf briefede Obamas efterretningschefer Trump om Steele-dossieret den 17. januar, 2017. Denne hændelse, der kun kort beskrives i memoet, er det, James Comey senere i sin forklaring for Senatet kaldte sit »J. Edgar Hoover-øjeblik«. Det blev arrangeret, at hele det slibrige og afskyelige, britiske efterretnings-bras senere, efter dette møde, blev lækket til de nationale nyhedsmedier og hilste Donald Trumps præsidentskab velkomment med den påstand, at han var en Putins 'manchurisk kandidat', der væltede sig i russiske prostituerede på den selvsamme seng, som Obama-parret havde sovet i.

Ifølge MEMOET, løj Steele over for FBI om sine mediekontakter på vegne af Clinton-kampagnen og DNC. Dette er efter al sandsynlighed grunden til, at senatorerne Chuck Grassley og Lindsay Graham henviste Christopher Steele til FBI til efterforskning for kriminelle handlinger.

Vi har altså et klart misbrug af FISA, et bedrageri over for denne domstol. Håndgribelige fakta om overvågning af en amerikansk, politisk kampagne og en amerikansk borger, og som blev sat i værk af denne kampagnes politiske modstander og deres allierede i Obama-administrationen, blev holdt skjult for domstolen af FBI og Justitsministeriet.

Men, der er meget, meget mere her. Steeles beskidte værk blev brugt af Clinton-kampagnen og Obama-administrationen, i aftalt spil med medierne, i et forsøg på at besejre Donald Trumps forsøg på at vinde præsidentskabet. De efterfølgende Russiagate- og Mueller-efterforskninger er blevet brugt til at forsøge at ødelægge Trumps præsidentskab. Hele Russiagate-myten, forkyndt af Obama og briterne, har ødelagt de amerikansk-russiske relationer og anbragt hele verden i fare.

Vi udgav hele historien, og hele baggrunden for, at dette skete, for flere måneder siden. Læs dossieret, [»Robert Mueller er en umoralsk, juridisk lejemorder: Han vil gøre sit job, hvis I giver ham lov«](#).

Det hele, det hele må efterforskes og retsforfølges. Vi vil have mere at

fortælle i løbet af de kommende 72 timer.

(Hør også: [LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast, 2. feb., 2018](#), med en særdeles grundig gennemgang af det nu afklassificerede Memo.)

[Breaking: Hemmeligt Nunes-Memo offentliggjort! Sandheden om Russiagate.](#)

[LaRouche PAC Internationale Webcast, 2. feb., 2018.](#)

Vært Matthew Ogden: Jeg vil starte med at annoncere de seneste nyheder: Nunes-memoet, det fire sider lange memo, der blev udarbejdet af formand for Husets Efterretningskomite David Nunes, er nu officielt blevet afklassificeret af præsident Trump og er blevet frigivet til den amerikanske offentlighed. På trods af det Demokratiske lederskabs, efterretningssamfundets, selve FBI's og endda britisk efterretnings trusler, bagvaskelser og intimidering, har præsident Trump og det Republikanske lederskab på Capitol Hill besluttet at afklassificere dette memorandum, og *det er en bombe!*

Det afslører præcis det, som LaRouche PAC har dokumenteret lige fra begyndelsen af dette: Det såkaldte slibrige og ubekræftede, britiske efterretningsprodukt, kendt som Steele-dossieret, blev brugt som såkaldt »bevis« for at indhente en FISA-kendelse til at udspionere ledende medlemmer af Trumps kampagne. Det, som dette memo fortæller, er, at det nu er officielt, at Christopher Steele selv sagde til seniorembedsmand i Justitsministeriet, Bruce Ohr, at han var »desperat for, at Donald Trump ikke blev valgt og havde meget stærke følelser imod, at han blev præsident«. Det er Christopher Steeles egne ord, og dette sagde han til Bruce Ohr, *før* den første FISA-ansøgning overhovedet blev indgivet.

Og selv om det var kendt, at dette såkaldte dossier var et helt klart partisk stykke researcharbejde for oppositionen, som blev finansieret af Hillary

Clintons præsidentkampagne, imod hendes behørigt nominerede modstander i valget, Donald Trump, så blev denne anmodning om overvågning godkendt af FBI-direktør James Comey, og ligeledes af Andrew McCabe [daværende FBI-vice-direktør].

Dette memo vil helt bestemt markere et vendepunkt i hele denne operation og hele dette kupforsøg mod vores præsident og vil højst sandsynligt gå over i historien som et af de mest skamfulde kapitler i vores republiks historie. Hele Russiagate-operationen er et skamfuldt eksempel på det mest grove magtmisbrug fra FBI's side, der fuldt ud lever op til den berygtede arv efter J. Edgar Hoover, i et forsøg på at bruge dette lands efterretningstjenester, i aftalt spil med britisk efterretning, til at underminere og vælte en ledende, politisk person og efterfølgende, USA's behørigt valgte præsident.

Som indledning til denne udsendelse vil jeg gerne dele med jer, den fulde tekst af dette memo, der netop er blevet afklassificeret. Som I ser i toppen, »Afklassificeret«, og det blev afklassificeret af præsidenten, efter ordrer, den 2. feb., 2018. Vi læser teksten [LPAC's redaktørs bemærkninger: Følgende tekst er taget fra Husets Permanente Efterretnings-Udvalgskomites pdf-dokument. I pdf-dokumentet vises den originale understregning (her med enkeltkrøllede parenteser) og fed skrift (dobbeltkrøllede parenteser); kursivering (ligeledes her vist med enkeltkrøllede parenteser) bruges udelukkende til publikationer.

https://intelligence.house.gov/uploadedfiles/memo_and_white_house_letter.pdf

(Her følger engelsk udskrift af resten af webcastet):

{{Purpose}}

This memorandum provides Members an update on significant facts relating to the Committee's ongoing investigation into the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and their use of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) during the 2016 presidential election cycle. Our findings, which are detailed below, 1) raise concerns with the legitimacy and legality of certain DOJ and FBI interactions with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), and 2) represent a troubling breakdown of legal processes established to protect the American people from abuses related to the FISA process.

{{Investigation Update}}

On October 21, 2016, DOJ and FBI sought and received a FISA probable cause order (not under Title VII) authorizing electronic surveillance on Carter Page from the FISC. Page is a U.S. citizen who served as a volunteer advisor to the Trump

presidential campaign. Consistent with requirements under FISA, the application had to be first certified by the Director or Deputy Director of the FBI. It then required the approval of the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General (DAG), or the Senate-confirmed Assistant Attorney General for the National Security Division.

The FBI and DOJ obtained one initial FISA warrant targeting Carter Page and three FISA renewals from the FISC. As required by statute (50 U.S.C. §1805(d)(1)), a FISA order on an American citizen must be renewed by the FISC every 90 days and each renewal requires a separate finding of probable cause.

Then-Director James Comey signed three FISA applications in question on behalf of the FBI, and Deputy Director Andrew McCabe signed one. Then-DAG Sally Yates, then-Acting DAG Dana Boente, and DAG Rod Rosenstein each signed one or more FISA applications on behalf of DOJ.

Due to the sensitive nature of foreign intelligence activity, FISA submissions (including renewals) before the FISC are classified. As such, the public's confidence in the integrity of the FISA process depends on the court's ability to hold the government to the highest standard— particularly as it relates to surveillance of American citizens. However, the FISC's rigor in protecting the rights of Americans, which is reinforced by 90-day renewals of surveillance orders, is necessarily dependent on the government's production to the court of all material and relevant facts. This should include information potentially favorable to the target of the FISA application that is known by the government. In the case of Carter Page, the government had at least four independent opportunities before the FISC to accurately provide an accounting of the relevant facts. However, our findings indicate that, as described below, material and relevant information was omitted.

1) The "dossier" compiled by Christopher Steele (Steele dossier) on behalf of the Democratic National Committee (DNC) and the Hillary Clinton campaign formed an essential part of the Carter Page FISA application. Steele was a longtime FBI source who was paid over \$160,000 by the DNC and Clinton campaign, via the law firm Perkins Coie and research firm Fusion GPS, to obtain derogatory information on Donald Trump's ties to Russia.

a) Neither the initial application in October 2016, nor any of the renewals, disclose or reference the role of the DNC,

Clinton campaign, or any party/campaign in funding Steele's efforts, even though the political origins of the Steele dossier were then known to senior DOJ and FBI officials.

b) The initial FISA application notes Steele was working for a named U.S. person, but does not name Fusion GPS and principal Glenn Simpson, who was paid by a U.S. law firm (Perkins Coie) representing the DNC (even though it was known by DOJ at the time that political actors were involved with the Steele dossier). The application does not mention Steele was ultimately working on behalf of—and paid by—the DNC and Clinton campaign, or that the FBI had separately authorized payment to Steele for the same information.

2) The Carter Page FISA application also cited extensively a September 23, 2016, {Yahoo News} article by Michael Isikoff, which focuses on Page's July 2016 trip to Moscow. {This article does not corroborate the Steele dossier because it is derived from information leaked by Steele himself to Yahoo News.} The Page FISA application incorrectly assesses that Steele did not directly provide information to {Yahoo News}. Steele has admitted in British court filings that he met with {Yahoo News}—and several other outlets—in September 2016 at the direction of Fusion GPS. Perkins Coie was aware of Steele's initial media contacts because they hosted at least one meeting in Washington D.C. in 2016 with Steele and Fusion GPS where this matter was discussed.

a) Steele was suspended and then terminated as an FBI source for what the FBI defines as the most serious of violations—an unauthorized disclosure to the media of his relationship with the FBI in an October 30, 2016, {Mother Jones} article by David Corn. Steele should have been terminated for his previous undisclosed contacts with

Yahoo and other outlets {{in September}}—before the Page application was submitted to the FISC in October—but Steele improperly concealed from and lied to the FBI about those contacts.

b) Steele's numerous encounters with the media violated the cardinal rule of source handling—maintaining confidentiality—and demonstrated that Steele had become a less than reliable source for the FBI.

3) Before and after Steele was terminated as a source, he

maintained contact with DOJ via then-Associate Deputy Attorney General Bruce Ohr, a senior DOJ official who worked closely with Deputy Attorneys General Yates and later Rosenstein. Shortly after the election, the FBI began interviewing Ohr, documenting his communications with Steele. For example, in September 2016, Steele admitted to Ohr his feelings against then-candidate Trump when Steele said he {"was desperate that Donald Trump not get elected and was passionate about him not being president."} This clear evidence of Steele's bias was recorded by Ohr at the time and subsequently in official FBI files—but not reflected in any of the Page FISA applications.

a) During this same time period, Ohr's wife was employed by Fusion GPS to assist in the cultivation of opposition research on Trump. Ohr later provided the FBI with all of his wife's opposition research, paid for by the DNC and Clinton campaign via Fusion GPS. The Ohrs' relationship with Steele and Fusion GPS was inexplicably concealed from the FISC.

4) According to the head of the FBI's counterintelligence division, Assistant Director Bill Priestap, corroboration of the Steele dossier was in its "infancy" at the time of the initial Page FISA application. After Steele was terminated, a source validation report conducted by an independent unit within FBI assessed Steele's reporting as only minimally corroborated. Yet, in early January 2017, Director Comey briefed President-elect Trump on a summary of the Steele dossier, even though it was—according to his June 2017 testimony—"salacious and unverified." While the FISA application relied on Steele's past record of credible reporting on other unrelated matters, it ignored or concealed his anti-Trump financial and ideological motivations. Furthermore, Deputy Director McCabe testified before the Committee in December 2017 that no surveillance warrant would have been sought from the FISC without the Steele dossier information.

5) The Page FISA application also mentions information regarding fellow Trump campaign advisor George Papadopoulos, but there is no evidence of any cooperation or conspiracy between Page and Papadopoulos. The Papadopoulos information triggered the opening of an FBI counterintelligence investigation in late July 2016 by FBI agent Pete Strzok. Strzok was reassigned by the Special Counsel's Office to FBI Human Resources for improper text

messages with his mistress, FBI Attorney Lisa Page (no known relation to Carter Page), where they both demonstrated a clear bias against Trump and in favor of Clinton, whom Strzok had also investigated. The Strzok/Lisa Page texts also reflect extensive discussions about the investigation, orchestrating leaks to the media, and include a meeting with Deputy Director McCabe to discuss an "insurance" policy against President Trump's election. [end memo]

So this is a bombshell. And what it absolutely makes clear is that these Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act warrants against leading members of the President Trump campaign {never} would have been requested or obtained without the so-called evidence presented in the Steele dossier. And this Steele dossier is completely discredited, and as it made clear, in Steele's own words, he was "desperate that Donald Trump not get elected and was passionate about him not being president." Now, exactly as Congressman Matt Gaetz two weeks ago, when he first read this memo, when it was still classified, he said, "the facts contained in this memo are jaw dropping.... There is no higher priority than the release of this information to preserve our democracy.... I think that this will not end just with firings. I believe there are people who will go to jail.... The entire Mueller investigation is a lie built on a foundation of corruption.... This will vindicate claims by many of us: It is a real attempt to undermine the President, from the scariest of places."

President Trump was speaking to the media earlier today, and right before the official release of this memo, the decision to release this memo by the Republican leadership in the House, President Trump had the following to say. This is what President Trump's own words were, in anticipation of the probable release of this memo. He said the following: "I think it's terrible. You want to know the truth? I think it's a disgrace. What's going on in this country, I think it's a {disgrace}. The memo was sent to Congress, it was declassified. Congress will do whatever they're going to do. But I think it's a disgrace what's happening in our country. And when you look at that, and you see that, and some of the other things what's going on, a lot of people should be ashamed of themselves, and much worse than that. So, I sent it over to Congress, and they will do what they're going to do. Whatever they do is fine. It was declassified, and

let's see what happens. But, a lot of people should be ashamed." So those were President Trump's words.

Now, LaRouche PAC has issued a statement, which is now posted on the LaRouche PAC website. This statement contains a short summary of what is contained in the Nunes memo, and then it has a short analysis and some commentary, and it promises to be swiftly followed up by more marching orders in the coming 72 hours.

But this is what LaRouche PAC has to say: "...We have a clear abuse of FISA, a fraud on that court. Material facts about surveillance of an American political campaign, and an American citizen, set into motion by the campaign's political opponent and their allies in the Obama administration were concealed from the court by the FBI and the Department of Justice.

"But there is much, much more here. Steele's dirty work was used by the Clinton campaign and the Obama Administration, in collusion with the media, in an attempt to defeat Donald Trump's bid for the Presidency. The subsequent Russiagate and Mueller investigations have been used in an attempt to destroy the Trump Presidency. The entire Russiagate myth, promulgated by Obama and the British, have destroyed U.S. Russian relations and endangered the entire world.

"We published the full story and the reasons why this is occurring months back. It is not what you think. Read the dossier, sign the petition, all of it, {all of it}, needs to be investigated and prosecuted."

Now, this is the dossier [LPAC.co/ytdos] which LaRouche PAC released months ago. This is the full documentation on not only Robert Mueller's background in prosecuting Lyndon LaRouche, in covering up the crimes of 9/11, and now, in being a central player in this attempted coup against the President of the United States; but it was also ahead of the curve in absolutely documenting exactly what this Nunes memo is discussing.

Let me give you one short example: This is a quote from inside the Mueller dossier. It says the following: "Hillary Clinton used the Steele Dossier to paint Trump as a Russian dupe throughout her general election campaign against him. James Comey used it to justify his FBI counterintelligence probe of the Trump campaign which began in July of 2016, and has continued.

"Thus, we have the British government ... {intervening in an election in the United States to sway the result.} Most certainly this raises questions about the applicability of

election laws which bar foreign funding for exactly the reason that the United States elections should be decided by United States citizens. Most certainly, once this sequence of events is fully investigated, it will become clear that all government participants intended to sway the election unlawfully, using the powers of a state to vanquish the will of the voters.”

And that gets directly at the core of the matter. And we didn't need the Nunes memo to know that that what this was all about all along.

Now, what this dossier also documented – this is now, I'm talking about the LaRouche PAC dossier on the Mueller operation – what this documented is that motivation is not what you think it is. The motivation has got to be contextualized within an understanding of what is this moment in history in which we find ourselves? And this entire Russiagate coup from the very beginning was intended to prevent the kind of collaborative relationship that President Trump was clearly inclined towards in his Presidential election campaign, to say we have to end this World War III, thermonuclear game of chicken that the Bush administration and the Obama administration have been playing with the Russians, which has brought us to the very threshold of the kind of nuclear war that the citizens of Hawai'i were frightened about during that so-called false alarm a few weeks ago. This is a very, {very} real danger!

And the American people knew that to be true, and they associated Hillary Clinton with nothing less, than the further escalation of Obama's World War III policy against Russia. This is the consequence of British Imperial geopolitics: Divide and conquer.

President Trump made clear that he was willing to reach out a hand of collaboration and cooperation with Russia, and also, as has subsequently been clear, with China, and to say, “we're going to turn the geopolitical chessboard over, and we are going to establish a new great-powers relationship with these leading powers, in order to address the common problems that mankind must resolve.” And that was President Trump's clear, clear inclination.

So why was the Russiagate thing cooked up from the very beginning? Well, it was to block President Trump from establishing that kind of collaborative relationship with Russia and with China, and instead, to ensure the continuation of the Obama/Hillary Clinton policy of confrontation and potential

thermonuclear war.

{So that's what's at stake here.} And the reason that the timing is so critical, is because a New Paradigm of economics and strategic partnerships is emerging on this planet as we speak. It's rapidly escalating and it's a tide that very well could not be turned back short of that kind of thermonuclear war. What form that New Paradigm is taking is the Belt and Road Initiative, China's initiative to create a new win-win economic, political, and strategic partnership among the nations of the world for peace through massive economic development. The Belt and Road has already come to Central Asia, the Belt and Road has already come to Africa, the Belt and Road has already come to Eastern Europe. And the Belt and Road, as we speak, is in the process of coming to the Western Hemisphere with Latin America and Caribbean fully on board. The question is, will the United States join? That was the question which provoked this Russia-gate coup attempt against President Trump from the very beginning. That, and because we must defend the very fundamental facets of our Constitutional republic, of our Constitutional democracy; that is why we must defeat this coup. Whether you consider yourself a Republican, whether you consider yourself a Democrat, an independent, whether you even personally support President Trump or like him; you must defeat this clear and blatant coup against the Constitution and the Presidency of the United States. Now, what I'd like to do for you is to point out the irony that the Democratic Party which, going back to the dirty trick operations against the Kennedys, against Martin Luther King, by J. Edgar Hoover, the Democratic Party led the charge on investigating this FBI operation. The Democratic Party has now sold themselves out completely to be the party of Russia-gate – the new McCarthyism. There's a very ironic statement by attorney Alan Dershowitz; he went on TV just yesterday, pointing out exactly this irony. And I'd like to just read you some of what Dershowitz had to say, pointing out that the Democratic Party has now become the cheering section for the FBI. He says: "I'm just old enough to remember when liberals and major media organizations believed America's national security apparatus had to be closely monitored to protect our civil liberties.

"The liberals and journalists brought to light the horrific abuses of power that J. Edgar Hoover's FBI and the National Security Agency undertook in the 1960s against Martin Luther King

and others....

“But all of that was forgotten this week, as Washington liberals rushed to the microphones to demand that the Nunes memo from Representative Devin Nunes, Republican from California, be kept from the American people. Their sympathetic friends in the media were quick to give their complaints blanket and largely unskeptical coverage.

“The four-page Nunes document is a House Intelligence Committee summary of Justice Department and FBI files that points to serious abuses of power involving the surveillance of US citizens in the run-up to the 2016 election.... But to leading Democrats, the possible discussion of intelligence agency abuses is akin to Armageddon.

“Representative Adam Schiff, Democrat from California, the ranking Democrat on Nunes’ Intelligence Committee, has read the Nunes memo, but curiously dismisses it by saying ... the memo is ‘meant only to give Republican House members a distorted view of the FBI.’ Far from resembling the crusading liberals of the 1960s and ’70s, who probed the FBI; Schiff has taken on the role of the Bureau’s lapdog.

“... All of this presents a rich stew of questions that you might expect Washington to be curious about. Instead, you have a frenzy of denunciation of people who want transparency in government and a lack of curiosity about the activities of our most powerful intelligence agencies – entities that have been guilty in the past of clear abuses of power.

“If Americans are to have faith in their government, it must have people who watch the watchers in our intelligence agencies. So far this week, we are seeing an awful lot of people blindly defend the bureaucracy rather than fulfill their duty to question authority.”

Again, that was Alan Dershowitz.

So, the Democratic Party has completely bankrupted itself.

This is moment in which the entire LaRouche PAC program – the Four Laws, the economic recovery program that we have documented and we have put out, our campaign to win the future, and the campaign to bring the United States into the New Paradigm of development in the form of the New Silk Road – this has got to replace this morally and intellectually bankrupt behavior by the Democratic Party; and this must become the policy for all American citizens who are interested in saving this country. Now, Helga Zepp-LaRouche delivered a very significant

webcast yesterday – the founder and President of the Schiller Institute. During that webcast, she was asked by the moderator what we should expect from the release of the Nunes memo. Of course, this was before it was clear that the memo would be released; although we were all highly anticipating the release of this classified document. But, I would like to play for you a short excerpt of what Helga LaRouche had to say. I think she very clearly situates this within the broader context which must be understood.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Oh, I think this is reaching very interesting dimensions. As a matter of fact, on the way out of Congress, Trump was asked if he would release this Nunes memo, and he said “100%.” And then also the White House Chief of Staff John Kelly was interviewed, and he said the White House would release this memo “pretty quick,” because the American people should make up their minds on their own, what their judgment is. And that is very good.

So there, again, you have a complete freak-out, for example, the German media, which were absolutely not reporting about this whole controversy, or {if} they would only report about it from the standpoint of Russia-gate and soon Trump will be gotten out of office. Now they have to sort of cover their behind, in reporting about it, but they’re still on the line of the FBI-leaning version, but they do have to report it.

What happened this week was naturally dramatic: You have the decision of the House Select Committee on Intelligence to release the memo. Then you had the firing of [FBI Deputy Director Andrew] McCabe; that is very good. Then you have the ongoing operation by Senator Grassley and Senator Lindsey Graham, who, on the one side are insisting on a criminal investigation against Christopher Steele; but they also sent letters to all the leading Democrats, Podesta, the DNC, the various other Democratic officials, asking them detailed questions: What did they know about the Steele dossier? When did they know about Hillary? Many, many questions.

Then, McCabe is also under a new investigation, because it seems that he delayed the whole Hillary investigation concerning her emails by three weeks, trying to push it behind the November

election.

So I think there is a lot of fury: You have people warning that the outcome of this will decide the fate of the United States – for example, Paul Craig Roberts, who after all was in the Reagan administration, he had a very stern warning saying the stakes are extreme; if the coup plotters would get away with their actions, then the United States would turn into a full police-state, where the intelligence services would create a dictatorship and there would be no more accountability of the government. So this is clearly one side.

And on the other side, naturally, there is expected hope that if this memo, which is due to come out, at the latest tomorrow, because the rules are such that it has to be five days after the vote in Congress, and that can really be an earthquake. Because if what seems to be in this memo becomes public, I think it will change not only the situation in the United States, but also it will have an earthquake effect internationally. [end video]

OGDEN: So, we can expect that earthquake to occur internationally. This is a huge development. The point is, that this must be situated within this fight, this ongoing battle for the soul of the US Presidency. We can see even at this moment that there are still opposite tendencies at work at the highest levels of this administration; people who are working against the inclination that this President has for the kind of great powers relationship and a new paradigm of international partnerships. We saw a very inflammatory speech by Rex Tillerson just yesterday. We've seen the release of the National Security Strategy, which accuses China and Russia of being authoritarian dictatorships which are attempting to reorder the entire international order. And so forth and so on. But we also see that President Trump continues to reach out to Russia. He did not impose these sanctions against the Russian officials, even though it was sent to him by Congress, and he continues to reach out to President Xi Jinping. And he continues to emphasize that a good relationship between the United States and these two countries is a very good thing, and not a bad thing. That's the point, though; that he is being backed into a corner. He continues to have the highest levels of his own administration working against him, and this political earthquake which we can expect coming out of the declassification of this

memo which makes undeniably clear that this was a political operation through the use of the intelligence agencies of this country in pure J. Edgar Hoover style through and through. It was nothing more than that, and continues to be nothing more than that.

President Trump, obviously as we know, delivered the State of the Union address this Tuesday, just a few days ago. Whereas the LaRouche Political Action Committee has been in an intense campaign to put on the table LaRouche's Four Economic Laws and the necessity for the United States to join the Silk Road, that campaign has not lessened one bit in the aftermath of the State of the Union; but has, in fact, intensified. The persisting questions will continue to be on the table. If President Trump wants \$1.5 trillion in infrastructure investment, where is that going to come from? How are you going to do that? Should you use a Hamiltonian national banking approach, as opposed to this other concoction which has been put together by Steve Mnuchin and others? Also, as the trans-Atlantic financial system continues to be perched on the verge of a meltdown, how will President Trump respond to that impending threat? God forbid, if the entire came down as it did in 2008, if not worse. We must preempt that threat with a Glass-Steagall reorganization of this entire financial system, as has been called for by LaRouche for years. The threats are very clear; we're in a Catch-22. We're on the verge of either a hyperinflationary blow-out, or a total bottom dropping out of the entire trans-Atlantic system. So, in response to President Trump's State of the Union speech, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in that same webcast yesterday, had a little bit of analysis. I'd like to share that with you.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE

: Obviously, he did not say what he should have said, namely to go with the Four Laws of Lyndon LaRouche, Glass-Steagall, and a new credit system in the tradition of Alexander Hamilton. Now, we don't give up hope that that may still come, because, after all, if you remember, when my husband in 1983 had campaigned for what became the Strategic Defense Initiative, this was not mentioned by President Reagan in the State of the Union address; but then, on the 23rd of March, Reagan publicly announced the Strategic Defense Initiative. So

therefore, we can absolutely hope that President Trump eventually, when he has to come to the question of financing the infrastructure he announced, he will come back to his promise from the election campaign to implement Glass-Steagall. Otherwise, the speech was not bad. I think it's quite significant that, according to CBS, in a poll, 75% of the people who saw the speech were in great support for Trump. So I think that domestically, he definitely touched on a sense of optimism, even so there are still many problems, obviously, with the financial system which he did not address. But I think it's on a good course.

I think the strongest indicator that he is doing something good is the freak-out by the Democrats, and while he appealed to a bipartisan cooperation on the immigrant issue, on infrastructure, the Democrats who basically were sitting there, demonstrating not-applauding, and in a certain sense being quite the war-party. I think that has become crystal clear, because in the context of the State of the Union, actually one day before, was the deadline for the implementation of the sanctions which the Congress had voted on half a year earlier; and nothing happened. The Trump administration did not implement sanctions against Russia and there was a complete freak-out by such media as the {New York Times} or think tanks like the Atlantic Council which basically accused Trump of completely going against what the Congress had mandated. But the simple answer of the Trump administration on the sanctions against Russia was that it was not necessary.

Now, that's very good. I think that in spite of the fact that Trump in terms of the foreign policy aspect of his State of the Union address where he called Russia and China "rivals," rather than partners or something more positive, to which the Chinese reacted quite strongly. They said that this was alarming and provocative. But then, the Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said that the United States and China should work together instead, for a happier future of all of mankind. So that response was on the one side, expressing displeasure, but on the other side, keep reaching out for the kind of cooperation which already was demonstrated between Xi Jinping and Trump.

The Russians even responded less harsh, because they, in a commentary said the speech by Trump was much milder those of all of his predecessors, referring obviously to Obama and Bush. So I think this is not the end of the world. It's not what

it should be, but I think in the context of what is happening in the United States, one can also not expect, given the neo-con mobilization, given the really ridiculous behavior of the Democrats, I think he did pretty well. [end video]

OGDEN: So, that's Helga LaRouche's analysis of President Trump's State of the Union. Clearly, what this demands of us is an escalation on the front of the campaign that we've been waging. This is contained in the Campaign to Win the Future statement which is now being circulated across the country for endorsement; and in fact, has already received an endorsement from some members of state legislatures, including a Democrat member of the state legislature from Michigan. This is really on the verge of totally breaking through. This really goes to the core of what President Trump, I think, stands for in the eyes of those who elected him; especially those electoral victories which were decisive in the so-called "Rust Belt" states – in Pennsylvania, in Michigan, in Wisconsin. He flipped those three states in an unprecedented Election Night turnaround. That's what secured him the victory.

During his campaign when he went to the Midwest, when he went back after his victory, continually President Trump has continued to stand by this idea that we are a nation of builders, and we must revive and live up to that great legacy with great projects for our own generation. That was one thing that he mentioned in the State of the Union speech, but he elaborated it last night in a speech at the Greenbrier in West Virginia for the Republican Party retreat. This is the very conclusion of that speech by Donald Trump:

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP

: We're proud of our history, we're confident in our values, and we're grateful to our heroes, and we are determined to create a brighter future for all of our people. We are restoring the bonds of love and loyalty that unite us all, as friends, as neighbors, as citizens, as Americans. Because when Americans are united, nothing – nothing at all – nothing can stop us. We win. (Applause.) As I said the other night, we are a nation that built the Empire State Building in one year. Actually, to be exact, it was

– we built it in less than a year. Would you believe it?

Working 24 hours around the clock.

We built the Hoover Dam in record time. We built the Golden Gate Bridge. We linked our nation together with railroads and highways. We dug out the Panama Canal. We're the nation that won two World Wars, defeated fascism and communism, and put satellites into space and planted our great American flag on the face of the moon. We've healed the sick, cured disease, and cared for the poor like no other nation. We've lifted millions into prosperity, and delivered millions into freedom.

This is our legacy. This is our birthright. And this is the foundation on which we build our very glorious future.

Because together, we are, indeed, making America great again.

Thank you, and God bless you all. Thank you very much.

(Applause.) Thank you. [end video]

OGDEN: Now, that's exactly the spirit which I think has energized the American people, and which we must continue to inform with the specific policies to honor that birthright as a nation of builders, as a nation which has accomplished unprecedented things, and which we must continue to do. The great projects are there for the taking, and if we look at what China is now doing, China has become a nation of builders as well; not only domestically, but abroad. The building of the One Belt, One Road Initiative, this New Silk Road – both the land Silk Road and the new Maritime Silk Road which is spanning the globe – this is what the United States must decisively join. It has come to the Western Hemisphere to the southern nations; and now it is time for the United States to join that collaboration and to reach out a hand of partnership between the United States and China, and to renew our partnership between the United States and Russia.

One thing that you just heard President Trump say is that we were the nation that won two world wars and defeated fascism. Well, today happens to be the 75th anniversary of the victory at the legendary battle of Stalingrad. This was a horrific, six-month siege. The casualties are absolutely staggering; over 1 million casualties reported on the Russian side alone. Half a million Russians died during the battle of Stalingrad; but this was a great victory, led by the legendary Marshal Zhukov. It was a decisive defeat of the Nazi army, which led to the following two years of the war, which finally, in collaboration between –

there you see on the screen – President Roosevelt and Stalin of the Soviet Union. Fascism, Nazism was defeated.

To conclude our show, this is a quote from President Roosevelt's letter of congratulations to Josef Stalin on the victory at Stalingrad, 75 years ago today. I would encourage us to take this as the paradigm of what we must revive in terms of that kind of great powers relationship. If we come together as great nations on this Earth against mankind's common enemies and for the common aims of mankind, we can accomplish great things. So, here's what President Roosevelt had to say; this is addressed to Josef Stalin.

"As commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the United States of America, I congratulate you on the brilliant victory at Stalingrad of the armies under your supreme command. The 162 days of epic battle for the city which has forever honored your name and the decisive result which all Americans are celebrating today will remain one of the proudest chapters in this war of the peoples united against Nazism and its emulators.

"The commanders and fighters of your armies at the front and the men and women who have supported them in factory and field have combined not only to cover with glory their country's arms, but to inspire by their example fresh determination among all the United Nations to bend every energy to bring about the final defeat and unconditional surrender of the common enemy."

"[signed] Franklin D Roosevelt"

And as we know, it was Franklin Roosevelt's vision, as documented in the book {As He Saw It} by his son, Elliott Roosevelt, that in the aftermath of World War II, in the aftermath of the defeat of fascism, we would work together with those allies that we had during the war, including Russia and China and India, to bring about a new era of development for the planet. To bring what Franklin Roosevelt demonstrated in the form of the New Deal with the TVA and the great projects that were built here in the United States, lifting hundreds of thousands of Americans out of poverty at that time, to bring those New Deal policies to the globe in collaboration with the allies who won the war against fascism, to continue the war after the defeat of Adolf Hitler and to fight a war against the colonial and imperialist policies of the British Empire. And to fight a war against the poverty and backwardness that had been imposed on the world from centuries of British rule. That was

Franklin Roosevelt's vision for after the war. That was unfortunately and tragically abandoned with Franklin Roosevelt's death. We experienced decades of a Cold War with the nuclear sword of Damocles hanging over our heads. We are now at the point at which finally we must make the decision – will we allow that Cold War mentality of geopolitics to bring us to the point now of World War III and the potential extinction of the human race through thermonuclear war? Or, will we embrace the revival of that legacy which is now being accomplished by the Chinese and the Belt and Road Initiative and all the nations that have joined together for that New Paradigm of peace through great projects and development? Will we say now is the moment when we can pick up where Franklin Roosevelt left off and reach out a hand of partnership and collaboration to Russia, to China, and to all the other nations of good will on this planet, to bring development – finally – to every corner of the globe.

Obviously today, we've seen a major turning point in the history of the United States. This is a huge development, and as we promised, there will be more updates from LaRouche PAC in the coming hours, the coming 24, 48, and 72 hours to come. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com and mobilize, mobilize, mobilize. Thank you for joining us; stay tuned.

[LaRouche-bevægelsens kandidater til USA's Midtvejsvalg 2018: Kesha Rogers, Texas](#)

Kesha Rogers annoncerer, at hun stiller op som uafhængig kandidat til Texas' 9. Kongresdistrikt.

Den 7. december annoncerede Kesha Rogers, medlem af LaRouche Political Action Committee, LPAC, sit kandidatur som uafhængig for Texas' 9. kongresdistrikt, der i øjeblikket holdes af kongresmedlem Al Green. I en videoerklæring, hvor hun annoncerer sin kampagne, udfordrer Rogers kongresmedlem Greens nylige resolution

for Trumps impeachment som spil for galleriet, der intet gør for at adressere de sande behov eller interesser hos befolkningen i det 9. distrikt. I et interview i dag skitserede Rogers hovedelementerne i sin kampagne, som følger:

»Der har ikke været nogen økonomisk opgang i mange af indbyggerne i det 9. distrikts liv, siden finanskrakket i 2008, og mange i distriktet er fortsat fanget i brutal fattigdom, bandevold og narko. På det nationale plan har Wall Street fortsat de samme politikker, der førte til kollapset i 2008, og i hele verden hvisker de informerede bag lukkede døre, at et nyt kollaps er umiddelbart forestående. Vi lider fortsat under, at man forsømmer den nødvendige infrastruktur, der skabte den tragedie, der kendes som Orkanen Harvey. Der er ingen overbevisende vision for fremtiden og de nødvendige videnskabelige og andre former for uddannelse, der må ledsage dette, for vores ungdom.

På den anden side af verden i Kina bliver et helt andet perspektiv for fremtiden virkeliggjort af det store Ét Bælte, én Vej-projekt, det største infrastrukturprojekt, mennesket nogensinde har bygget. Hele nye byer bliver udtænkt og bygget. Højhastighedstog bringer borgerne over store afstande på minimal tid. Vareproduktion finder sted på en moderne platform. Rumforskning er blevet en national prioritet. Og hvad der er vigtigst, så er befolkningen optimistisk med hensyn til fremtiden; nye ideer er genstand for passioneret debat og diskussion. Lyndon og Helga LaRouche har længe forudset dette projekt og ført kampagne for det. Præsident Trump, som kongresmedlem Greene ønsker at afsætte ved en rigsret, udforsker, hvordan USA kan opnå fordel af dette storslåede projekt. For eksempel har Vest Virginia netop fået en investeringspakke på \$83,7 mia. som resultat af præsident Trumps forhandlinger med sin ven, præsident Xi Jinping. Houstons borgmester har for nylig også været i Kina for at søge lignende former for investering.

Jeg annoncerer mit kandidatur for Texas' 9. kongresdistrikt for at bringe lederskab og adressere nødvendige løsninger til de problemer, som ikke alene dette distrikts borgere, men nationen som helhed, står overfor. Mange af jer ved, at dette har været begrundelsen for mine tidligere kampagner og grunden til, at jeg opnåede et betydeligt stemmetal og vandt to primærvalg til Kongressen og fremtvang en 2. valgrunde i en kampagne til USA's Senat. Jeg stod for det rumprogram, som Obama opgav. Jeg stod for fundamental investering i at bygge fremtidens byer og infrastruktur. Jeg stod for at genintroducere videnskab, klassiske former for musik og kultur og at gøre opdagelser, i vore unge menneskers uddannelse. Jeg stod for at regne ud, hvordan vi skaber en ny, menneskelig renæssance og for at sikre, at alle borgere havde produktive jobs. Der er aktuelt ingen i Washington, der udtaler noget, der tilnærmelsesvis er de løsninger, vi har brug for eller, hvad værre er, de fortsætter med de samme,

fejlslagne politikker med endeløse krige, økonomiske bailouts og partiske hårdknuder. Ingen i USA's Kongres fra nogen af partierne udtaler en positiv vision for USA i verden.

Tiden er kommet til, at nogen træder frem og erklærer, at USA må tilslutte sig det internationale Bælte & Vej Initiativ, der anføres af Kina, og lancere en dristig, ny æra for hurtigt videnskabeligt og kulturelt fremskridt, der atter sætter vort folk i arbejde og opbygger en fremtid, vi kan være stolte af, lige her. Som kongresmedlem vil jeg være placeret til på enestående vis at tage denne kamp til Washington, D.C., og til at sikre, at mine vælgere atter kan være optimistiske og skabe en bedre fremtid. Det er grunden til, at jeg annoncerer mit kandidatur som uafhængig for 9. kongresdistrikt – for at være en fornuftens og optimismens stemme for fremtiden, over de politiske partipamperes skrig og hyl i deres svigt af det amerikanske folk, som der ikke findes noget forsvar for.«

Følg Kesha Rogers her: <https://larouchepac.com/kesha-rogers>

[»Tiden er inde til at lukke britiske imperieoperationer ned«](#) [Helga Zepp-LaRouche i ugentlig international webcast. pdf og video](#)

Så vil jeg gerne sige noget om de subjektive grunde til, at jeg, på trods af alle disse farer, er fundamentalt meget optimistisk: Og der er ikke er nogen pointe i at være bekymret. Man må have en vision for, hvor man med sit liv vil bidrage til forbedringen af den menneskelige race. Jeg har en vision, der ikke er helt identisk med Xi Jinpings, men min vision er også meget lig min mands, med hvem jeg i 40 år har arbejdet på dette, at vi har en verden, hvor hvert enkelt menneske på denne planet kan få et anstændigt liv, kan opnå at opfylde hele det potentiale, som det enkelte menneske har, og at menneskeheden kan blive voksen! Vi kan gå tilbage til de værdier, der er karakteristiske for den Amerikanske Revolution, for den Tyske Klassik, for den Italienske Renæssance og andre af kulturens højdepunkter. Jeg er forhåbningsfuld mht., at vi kan få en kulturel renæssance for klassisk musik, klassisk poesi, og eftersom Kina allerede er på denne kurs ved at genoplive den konfutsianske tradition og lægger

stor vægt på klassisk kultur og videnskabelige gennembrud, mener jeg, at Vesten virkelig bør gentænke, hvad vore bidrag til universalhistoriens fremme var, og dernæst genoplive dem og få en dialog mellem kulturer med alle landes bedste traditioner.

Jeg mener, at dette er menneskets natur.

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