

Anden musikalske kulturdialog i København

København, 6. juli, 2018 Schiller Instituttet –

Den Nye Silkevej og Verdenslandbroen handler ikke kun om samarbejde økonomisk udvikling, da kulturel udvikling også er en essentiel kilde til inspiration for at udvikle menneskehedens kreative potentiale.

Som opfølgning på sidste års vidunderlige koncert, afholdt Schiller Instituttet, Russisk-Dansk Dialog, Det Russiske Hus og Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter i København d. 28. juni, 2018, en ny koncert for fuldt hus; 130 gæster, i Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur i København, Danmark.

Koncerten begyndte med en velkomst fra direktøren for Det Russiske Center for Videnskab og Kultur og en introduktion fra Schiller Instituttetts formand, Tom Gillesberg. Gillesberg talte om, hvorledes det banebrydende topmøde mellem præsident Trump og Nordkoreas Kim Jong-un har åbnet muligheden op for at alle nationer kan træde ind i et nyt samarbejdsparadigme.

Aftenens program inkluderede musik fra mange forskellige nationer. Aftenens gæstemusikere tilhørte en traditionel folkemusikgruppe fra Heilungkiang Sang- og Danseteater som bestod af fire instrumentalister som kom hele vejen fra Kina for at optræde til koncerten, hvilket var blevet arrangeret af Det Kinesiske Kulturcenter, som dertil sørgede for velmagende kinesisk mad i pausen.

Der var musikere fra både Rusland, Polen, Danmark og Sverige. Den kulturelle dialog mellem folkemusik fra Kina og Rusland og klassisk europæisk musik var inspirerende for alle – både musikere og de entusiastiske tilskuere.

Et af de særlige aspekter ved denne koncert var at flere af musikerne, udover at optræde med musik fra eget land, dertil spillede musikstykker fra andre af de repræsenterede kulturer.

Den kinesiske gruppe spillede en dansk folkevise og opførte sammen med to russiske sangere, operasangeren Valerij Likhachev og hans datter en russisk folkesang. Udover to danske stykker af henholdsvis Carl Nielsen og Høybye spillede Hedonia-Kvartetten en gavotte af den russiske komponist Sjostakovitj samt et kinesisk stykke.

De andre musiske præsentationer var:

Syv udtryksfulde kinesiske traditionelle folkestykker spillet med forskellige

kinesiske fløjter, yangqin, pipa og erhu af den Nationale Folkemusikgruppe fra Heilungkiang Sang- og Danseteater.

To russiske sange opført af den russiske operasanger Valerij Likhachevs kraftfulde stemme.

To russiske sange spillet på charmerende vis af Balalajka børneorkestret The Moon is Shining.

Et bravur-klaverstykket af Rachmaninov, spillet af en 13-årig dansk-russisk ung mand.

Den vestlige klassiske musiks ophøjede skønhed blev præsenteret på glimrende vis af den polske pianist Dominik Wizjan, som spillede Chopins Andante spianato et grande polonaise brillante.

Den svenske sopran Leena Malkki sang Ritorna Vincitor fra Verdis Aida opera, Casta Diva fra Bellinis Norma, akkompagneret af Dominik Wizjan. (Malkki er også producenten og den ledende sopran i kommende udførelser af Norma, spillet i kammertonen 256Hz og dirigeret af Furtwängler-specialisten Jochum Heibertshausen).

Komedieopera blev repræsenteret med en "La ci darem la mano" duet fra Mozarts Don Giovanni af Likhachev, Malkki og Wizjan.

Schiller Instituttets Kor på syv personer sang en dansk sang af Niels W. Gade, inspireret af en dansk folkemelodi, som blev temaet til hans første symfoni – dette er et eksempel på den proces hvorved store komponister ophøjer elementer i folkemusik gennem den klassiske musiks kompositionsprincipper; og en koreansk folkesang, Arirang, den højtelskede sang for både Syd- og Nordkoreanere, arrangeret af Werner Hartmann fra Schiller Instituttet. Tyskland.

Koncerten blev afrundet med Schiller Instituttets Kor og Malkki som sammen med publikum sang den traditionelle kanon Dona Nobis Pacem, Giv Os Fred.

Vi vil producere en video af koncerten, for at udbrede denne dialog mellem kulturer til et bredere publikum.

Programmet:

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

Ny Rapport: OPERATION FELIX:

Yemens mirakuløse genopbygning og tilslutning til den Nye Silkevej

Af Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets koordinator for Sydvestasien.

Genopbygningen af Yemen, efter den aktuelt igangværende, destruktive, anglo-saudiske aggressionskrig er afsluttet, vil kræve et mirakel. Men det er præcis, hvad denne rapport foreslår. Miraklernes tid er over os. Mange mirakler er opnået, og mange andre er i gang. En ny æra i menneskehedens historie er gryet under BRIKS-nationernes lederskab (Brasilien, Rusland, Indien, Kina og Sydafrika), samt under den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinpings lancering i 2013 af Bælte & Vej Initiativ (BVI). Disse to udviklinger har åbnet historiens porte for en ny og retfærdig verdensorden.

Kinas mirakuløse industrialiseringsproces hen over de seneste to årtier, der har løftet 700 million af landets borgere ud af fattigdom, er en stærk indikator for denne nye proces. Den kendsgerning, at Kina har tilbudt sine teknologiske kapaciteter, sin knowhow og sine finansielle resurser til partnere i udviklingslandene, så de kan gentage dette mirakel, udgør en stærk motivering for det yemenitiske folk og lederskab for at vælge de højeste ambitionsniveauer.

Det er i denne sammenhæng, at Yemen kunne rejse sig og opnå sit eget mirakel. Ligesom det lykkedes yemenitterne at præstere det mirakel, at de har modstået de mest ondskabsfulde og magtfulde militærstyrker, således kan de – med en tilsvarende succes – præstere miraklet med at genopbygge deres land. Dette genopbygningsmirakel bliver naturligvis vanskeligere end det militære, men det bliver mere glædeligt og vil bringe alle Yemens borgere sammen – mænd og kvinder fra alle mulige dele af landet og fra alle forskellige baggrunde, som en forenet kraft til fordel for en hel nation.

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

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Der skrives nu historie i Asien! EU-topmødet må følge Singapores eksempel!

EU-samarbejde med Kinas Nye Silkevejsinitiativ for udvikling af Afrika bør gøres til det eneste punkt på dagsordenen, og Xi Jinping eller Wang Yi bør inviteres til at deltage, såvel som også nogle afrikanske statsledere, der allerede samarbejder med Kina.

Hvis EU-topmødet, repræsentanten for den kinesiske regering og de afrikanske repræsentanter dernæst i en fælleserklæring udtaler en forpligtelse til at gå i gang med et fælles, forceret program for et panafrikansk infrastruktur- og udviklingsprogram og lover alle unge mennesker i Afrika, at kontinentet vil overvinde fattigdom på kort tid, ville en sådan erklæring, pga. Kinas deltagelse, have den største troværdighed i Afrika og ville ændre dynamikken i alle landene mod et utvetydigt håb for fremtiden og ville således omgående bevirke en ændring i migrantkrisen. Det ville også udfri EU af dens nuværende legitimitetskrise og give de europæiske nationer en mission, der ville placere Europas enhed på et storslået, nyt niveau.

Vil Europas stats- og regeringsledere være i stand til at følge Trumps og Kim Jong-uns eksempel?

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

Jason Ross fra LaRouchePAC Videnskabsteam, USA, i København: Et nyt paradigme for verden for en

bedre fremtid for menneskeheden

Jason Ross: »Vi har virkelig en utrolig mulighed netop nu for at ændre de koncepter, der udgør grundlaget for, hvordan vi træffer beslutninger – politiske beslutninger, økonomiske beslutninger, selv kulturelle beslutninger. Der har været et angreb på det aspekt af os, der gør os menneskelige. Hvis vi ikke havde en forbindelse til udødelighed; hvis vore liv ikke var i stand til at efterlade noget, til at gøre noget, der går ud over vores egen død, ville vi faktisk, rent kulturelt, ikke være andet end dyr. Vi ville være ligesom en slags dyr; vi ville udsøge os dejlige ting, og det er da rart at have god mad, jeg kan godt lide god mad, og det er en god ting, det er dejligt at have det sjovt; men uden denne evne til at leve på en måde, så man, mens man lever sit liv, ved, at det vil have værdi for altid, så er man ikke et helt menneske. Og man kan ikke fylde det tomrum ved at forsøge at have travlt for at skubbe denne følelse af tomhed væk, eller at forsøge at købe ting for at skubbe denne følelse af tomhed væk; man må adressere det ved at gøre noget meningsfuldt. Og jeg mener, det er den største grusomhed ved det nuværende økonomiske system, som vi har i de fleste vestlige nationer; det skader økonomien; det gør folk fattigere; det koncentrerer rigdom hos mennesker, der arbejder i finansverdenen og assisterer den; det fortsætter Det britiske Imperium; og dets mest tragiske aspekt er, at det stjæler fra os, det tager fra mennesker det, der var blevet udviklet hen over århundreder som en kultur; en kultur, der gjorde det muligt for folk at gøre noget, der ville have mening efter deres død. Og det er det, vi må bringe tilbage som en del af at skabe et nyt paradigme. Det betyder, at vi har koncepter, der går længere end til det, Kina har foreslået med Bælte & Vej Initiativet. Det er et godt forslag. Der er mere at gøre. Det vil jeg komme nærmere ind på, og jeg vil, som denne rapport viser, specifikt tale lidt om Afrika som en case study, ved at sammenligne, hvordan det gamle paradigme har relateret til dette kontinent, og hvordan det nye paradigme relaterer til det.«

Video I: Jason Ross' præsentation

Video II: Diskussion

Se også den danske introduktion til rapporten:

[»Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika: en vision for en økonomisk renæssance«.](#)

Part 1:

Part 2:

Videnskab: Menneskets forhold til universet.

6. lektion i LaRouchePAC's undervisnings-serie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme«, 14. april, 2018

Det emne, vi vil tale om i dag, er stort. Vi vil fokusere vores opmærksomhed på nogle specifikke aspekter af, hvad videnskab er; hvad det fortæller os om os selv og vores plads i universet. Jeg vil gerne lægge ud med en iagttagelse, som er, at menneskets intellekt er i en vis forbindelse med universet som helhed. En af de fundamentale grundsætninger hos dem, der skabte renæssancen, såsom Nicolaus Cusanus, og hos videnskabsfolk som Johannes Kepler og Leonardo da Vinci, er, at mennesket er skabt i Guds billede.

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

Harmonien mellem konfuciansk og vestlig filosofi: Mod økumenisk enhed mellem Øst og Vest. Lektion 5 i LaRouchePAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, 31. marts, 2018

Det er generelt tilfældet, at folk i både Østen og Vesten ofte har accepteret ideen om, at der findes en eller anden fundamental forskel mellem den kinesiske tankegang og den vestlige tankegang, og at dette er et uoverstigeligt svælg. Som Rudyard Kipling, den britiske imperialist, grundlæggende set sagde, »Øst er Øst, og Vest er Vest, og aldrig skal de tvende mødes«. Som jeg altid har sagt, så er dette ikke en konstatering af fakta, men er derimod en politik – dette er den britiske imperiepolitik, der sørger for, at der eksisterer en opdeling, for det er gennem at holde verden opdelt, at de kan fortsætte med at herske imperialt over de opdelte nationer.

Men vi har altså, både her i USA og i Vesten og i Kina, at folk accepterer denne idé om, at der skulle være en eller anden fundamentalt anderledes tankegang. Der er selvfølgelig forskellige karaktertræk i vestlig kultur og i kinesisk kultur – det er der ingen tvivl om. Men folk, der fremfører dette som et argument, er tilbøjelige til at sige, at deres side er den overlegne, og de andres side er underlegen; og dette ser man for øvrigt i Kina såvel som her.

Det, jeg vil gøre i dag, er grundlæggende set at tilbagevise denne opfattelse og forsøge at vise, at det, der er fundamentalt for mennesker overalt, er kampen mellem en humanistisk opfattelse af mennesket og så den oligarkiske anskuelse af mennesket som i heldigste fald en eller anden slags avanceret dyr; og at dette er arten af hele den vestlige kulturs historie og af hele den kinesiske kulturs historie.

Lyndon LaRouche:

Martin Luther Kings liv og mission

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

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

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

»Vi har, mener jeg, to problemer, som bør være grundlag for at reflektere over Martins liv i dag. 1) Vi har en national krise. Jeg vil ikke lægge fingrene imellem eller tale ud fra det politiske partiapparat (Demokraterne); men kendsgerningerne skal frem: Denne nationaløkonomi er ved at kollapse. Situationen, med hensyn til USA's grundlæggende økonomiske infrastruktur i dag, er relativt set værre end i 1933, hvor Roosevelt i marts måned kom ind i Det Hvide Hus. Det vil sige, hvis man undersøger infrastruktur, energi osv., livsbetingelserne for vort folk og i hele verden – lad være med at se på de store byer, hvor de går rundt med en facade og siger, alt går godt; men se på lokalsamfundene; Detroit, f.eks., har nu halvdelen af det indbyggertal, byen plejede at have. En industriby er forsvundet. Se på Birmingham, man ser det samme rapporteret; det var aldrig rigt, men deres oplevelse af tab, tab, tab; det er situationen i USA. Og der er en ligegyldighed over for USA's problemer. Mindst 48 af de 50 stater er bankerot, håbløst bankerot; dvs., at staterne umuligt kan øge skatteindtægterne uden at sænke økonomien yderligere, for at

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

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

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

Så vi konfronteres altså ikke med et nyt problem i dag, men med det samme

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

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

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

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

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

Mattæus-passion opføres, en ca. to timer lang forestilling. Og i disse to timer genlever publikum, menigheden, sangerne, musikerne på en kraftfuld måde Kristi korsfæstelsespassion. Dette har altid været vigtigt, at genleve dette; at indfange essensen af, hvad Kristus betyder for alle kristne, og Martin viste dette.

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

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

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

Lad os tage tilfældet Jeanne d'Arc, til sammenligning. Dette er den sande historie; hun var en så signifikant person i det 15. århundrede, historien blev grundigt dokumenteret dengang og er blevet krydstjekket osv. Hun var en person i hele kristendommen; hun er en hovedperson i Frankrigs historie. Her er hun så, en ung kvinde (17), der kom fra bondestanden, og som havde forhåbninger om, at Frankrig måtte befries fra de normanniske ridders forfærdelige besættelse; at Frankrig måtte blive en sand nation, og at det måtte løftes ud af sin tilstand og blive en nation for at tage sig af disse problemer; at Gud ønskede, dette skulle ske. Så, gennem flere hændelser, henvendte hun sig til en prins, som var den nominelle arving til Frankrigs trone, og hun sagde til denne prins – jeg har

glemt, der var diverse akkreditiver – 'Gud ønsker, at du skal blive konge'. Og han så på hende og sagde, 'Hvad ønsker du af mig?' Hun svarede, 'jeg ønsker ingenting af dig; Gud ønsker, at du skal være konge'. Og, på grund af hendes kraftfulde personlighed og hendes mission, gav kongen hende kommando over nogle soldater til en meget alvorlig kamp på det tidspunkt, idet han formodede, hun ville blive dræbt som leder af disse soldater, og det ville løse problemet. Men hun blev ikke dræbt, hun vandt slaget, som hun personligt anførte. Og Frankrig blev mobiliseret til sin uafhængighed; ideen var dets uafhængighed i det store og hele som et resultat. Så kom tidspunktet, hvor kongen blev kronet, prinsen blev kronet til konge: men så forrådte kongen hende, til Frankrigs fjender, til briterne, normannerne. Og hun blev retsforfulgt af inkquisitionen, som var en rædselsfuld ting, den værste form for uretfærdighed man kan forestille sig. Og under retssagen blev hun tilbudt lokkemad; hvis du trækker dig lidt, vil vi ikke brænde dig levende på bålet. Hun sagde nej; hun veg tilbage; måske skulle jeg gå på kompromis, hun havde præster, der forsøgte at få hende til at gå på kompromis. Hun sagde, 'jeg vil ikke gå på kompromis. Jeg kan ikke forråde min mission'. Hun havde besteget bjergets top; jeg vil ikke forråde min mission; jeg vil fastholde min kurs. Så de tog hende og bandt hende til en pæl; de stablede brændet op om pælen; de satte ild til bålet, mens hun var i live og kogte hende ihjel. Så åbnede de brændestakken for at se, om hun var i live eller ej og fandt, at hun var død, og så fortsatte de processen og genantændte bålet og brændte hende til aske (hun var da 19, -red.)

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

Betydningen af dette for os i dag, er, at pga. denne sejr, pga. det, der skete med Louis 11 af Frankrig, fik vi den første europæiske stat, i hvilken *hele* regeringen var ansvarlig for *hele* folkets almene vel. Det almene vel betyder præcis det, det betyder i 1. korintherbrev, kap. 13, hvor Paulus skriver om agápe, undertiden kaldet kærlighed eller godgørenhed. Det er denne egenskab; det er ikke loven, det er ikke lovbogen, der tæller; det er ens kærlighed til menneskeheden, der tæller; at man altid må leve for ens kærlighed til menneskeheden. Og derfor er en regering ikke legitim, undtagen som en regering, der officielt er forpligtet over for ikke alene det almene velfærd for *hele* folket, men også over for forbedringen af livsbetingelserne for deres efterkommere. Og for første gang i Frankrig, i denne stat, [fik man] princippet om forfatningsmæssig lov; at en regering ikke kan behandle nogle blandt befolkningen som menneskeligt kvæg. Det er ikke lovligt, det er ikke en nation, hvis den behandler nogle blandt sin befolkning som menneskeligt kvæg. Man skal tænke på *hele* befolkningens almene velfærd; det må være indfanget i forpligtelse

over for *hele* folket, og over for deres efterkommere. For vi er alle dødelige, og for at vække i os selv de passioner, mens vi er i live, som vil tilskynde os til at gøre det gode, må vi have en følelse af, at forbruget af vort liv, brugen af vor talent, vil betyde noget for de kommende generationer. De bedste mennesker ser efter ting, ligesom Moses, som vil finde sted, når han ikke længere selv er der til at nyde dem! Denne fornemmelse for udødelighed er det, som de bedste forældre opofrer for deres børn; det er det, som lokalsamfund opofrer for uddannelse til deres børn, for deres børns muligheder. Man gennemgår pinen ved lidelser og mangel, men man har en følelse af, at man er på vej fremad, at ens liv vil betyde noget, at man kan dø med et smil på læben; man har overvundet døden, man har brugt sin talent vist, hvorfor livet vil betyde noget bedre for de kommende generationer. Det var princippet. Det princip inspirerede den mand, der blev kong Henrik 7 af England, til at gøre det samme imod den onde kong Richard 3, og til at etablere England på det tidspunkt som den anden, moderne nationalstat. Det var på en måde, hvad Martin gjorde. Samme form for proces.

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

Det er pointen. Problemet her er det følgende: Tror vi rent faktisk på, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyrene? Tror I på, at, i skolerne i dag, i aviserne i dag; tror I på, at amerikanere tror på, på nogen som helst signifikant måde, at mennesket er forskelligt fra dyret? Det er ikke det, vi underviser; se på vores standardpensum. Mange af jer ved noget om uddannelse. Vores uddannelsespolitik er en national forbrydelse. Man lærer ingenting; man lærer at bestå en prøve. Man spørger sig selv, om de, der udarbejder prøven, ved, hvad de taler om. Man har prøver at bestå i forskellige steder i landet, ikke for at teste, hvad man har gjort ved eleverne med hensyn til, hvad de ved; undertiden kommer eleverne og siger, 'jeg ved ingenting, i mine skoleår lærte jeg ingenting'. Sådan, som man underviser nu. Det, man tester, er elevernes lydighedstræning i dette skoledistrikt eller den del af landet, målt ud fra underlødighed. Distrikterne konkurrerer om penge! Og præstationerne, som skoleelevernes hundetræning, bliver en standard for, hvor mange penge, og hvor

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

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

Jeg startede en ungdomsbewægelse for henved 4 år siden, der fokuserer på unge mennesker, 18-25 årige, dvs. aldersgruppen for universitetsstuderende. Som I ved, når folk bliver omkring 18 til 25 år, under normale betingelser, er de gået videre end til at tænke på sig selv som unge mennesker, halvt voksne, halvt børn, og til at blive voksne mennesker. De har den voksnes selvtillid, den voksnes impulser osv. De er klar til at påtage sig ansvar i samfundet. I et velordnet samfund, ville alle have adgang til en kvalitetsuniversitetsuddannelse, for at udvikle den enkeltes talenter for at finde ud af, hvad deres mission i livet skal være, hvilken form for karriere, de skal satse på, og man giver dem muligheden for at gennemarbejde dette, finde ud af dette, finde ud af, hvem, der virkelig er som voksen, og at vælge deres fremtidige profession i livet på denne basis. Det, jeg understreger med denne træning, er, forstå forskellen mellem menneske og dyr.

Jeg bliver lidt teknisk omkring dette, for det er et vigtigt punkt. Hvad er forskellen mellem menneske og dyr? Kan man bevise, at mennesket ikke blot er et dyr? Og hvordan kan man bevise det? Hvis mennesket var en abe, f.eks., ville det menneskelige befolkningstal på denne planet aldrig have oversteget et par millioner individer. Så lad være med at gøre mennesket til en abekat (et fjols). Vi har nu over 6 mia. mennesker, vi skal sørge for, på denne planet, og tallet vokser. Pointen er, at mennesket har været i stand til at opdage, hvad intet dyr kan gøre, at opdage universelle, fysiske principper i universet, og at anvende disse opdagede principper til at frembringe forbedringer i samfundet, som øger

menneskets magt over naturen; præcis, som man kan læse i Skabelsesberetningen i 1. Mosebog: mand og kvinde skabt i Skaberens billede, efter hans lignelse; og ansvarlige for denne funktion. Det er, hvad vi er. Når vi underviser i fysisk videnskab; når vi underviser i klassisk kunst og den slags ting, når vi underviser i historie ud fra dette standpunkt, formidler vi i realiteten en fornemmelse af deres menneskelighed. De er i stand til at genopføre fortidens store principper, det være sig inden for kunst eller inden for fysisk videnskab. Når de kender dette, kender de forskellen på sig selv og dyret; de bryster sig af dette og siger, vi er menneskelige. Og de kan se på hinanden med kærlighed, en form for kærlighed, der kommer til udtryk inden for uddannelse med den rigtige form for undervisning, hvor eleverne er delagtige i processen med at kæmpe sig igennem handlingen for sig selv at opdage et princip, der præsenteres for dem som en udfordring og et paradoks. Det vil sige, en kærlig relation, en klasse med typisk 15-25 universitets- eller skoleelever, hvor eleverne gives ansvaret for, gives en udfordring med at kæmpe sig igennem det for sig selv, og den gode lærer forsøger at fremkalde denne form for respons blandt eleverne; finde to til tre i klassen, der kan starte diskussionen og få hele klassen involveret i diskussionen, så det, der kommer ud af det, ikke er udenadslære fra en lærebog, men at det, der kommer ud af det, er en proces, hvor man i en social oplevelse opdager betydningen af et princip, som om de selv havde gjort den oprindelige opdagelse. Dette gøres, ikke ved at undervise den enkelte elev, selv om det nogen gange virker, men ved at få eleverne til at interagere i diskussionsprocessen. Det er derfor, man helst skal have en klassestørrelse på mellem 15-25 elever. Ikke for mange, som kan udelukke muligheden for, at alle kan deltage. Og ikke for få, så man ikke får stimulering til at starte diskussionen. Det er denne sociale proces med en relation mellem mennesker, der elsker hinanden i en højere forstand, fordi de har været fælles om processen med at opdage et princip. Eller ... noget om historie; men de var fælles om det, og ideen om at være fælles om menneskelig viden, som menneskelig viden, er den essentielle kærlighedshandling. Man elsker menneskeheden og er tilfreds med menneskeheden, når man har arbejdet sammen for at gøre en opdagelse sammen. Og man indser, man kan regne med dem til denne form for metode – har man et problem med dem? Gå tilbage til metoden. Tal med dem på samme måde, som man gør i klasseværelset. Og man kæmper sammen igennem det, disse unge mennesker kæmper til kl.3-4 om morgenen. Når jeg holder foredrag for disse fyre, er de over mig i henved fire timer. Jeg holder en præsentation på en times tid, de er over mig konstant. Men det er smukt, det er vidunderligt. Jeg tror, at alle, der har arbejdet med undervisning, ved, hvad jeg taler om. Det er smukt; det er vidunderligt.

Så problemet er dette: Vi har en befolkning, vi har en verden, der har en mangel på mennesker, der rent faktisk fuldt ud forstår forskellen mellem menneske og

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

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

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

Og det er vores situation i dag, og grunden til, at jeg er så glad for denne lejlighed til at være sammen med jer, for I typificerer dem, der kæmper med vanskeligheder, i dette land og uden for dette land, for den såkaldte 'glemte mand'; som Franklin Roosevelt, der i 1933 blev indkaldt til at være præsident. 80 % af befolkningen i USA i særdeleshed, og mange i hele verden, er den glemte mand og kvinde. Der er ikke rigtig nogen, der kerer sig om dem. Tag eksemplet med historien om sundhedssektoren; tag eksemplet med alle mulige ting. Den eneste måde, hvorpå man kan forny en nation, som Martin ydede et stort bidrag til en fornyelse af USA, er, at man må gå til den glemte mand og kvinde; især til de ubemidlede, og hvis man kan udtrykke en kærlig holdning over for problemet med de ubemidlede, dem, der befinder sig på den laveste side i livet, så er man i stand til at repræsentere det princip, på hvilket moderne regeringsførelse bør baseres; det samme princip, som Jeanne d'Arc på sin vis muliggjorde gennem sit bidrag til Frankrig som den første, moderne nationalstat, der var helliget det almene velfærd. Hvis man vil være en ægte politiker, må man være forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Man må være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, og for at være forpligtet over for menneskeheden, må man se på

det menneske, der befinder sig i de værste omstændigheder, generelt, og løfte dem op. Så har man virkelig bevist, at man kerer sig om det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke går til disse mennesker, er man ikke *med* det almene velfærd. Hvis man ikke har sine rødder i kampen for det almene velfærd, er man ikke i stand til at lede vores nation, som er en nation, der forfatningsmæssigt er forpligtet over for det almene velfærd. Martin havde dette. Alle de store ledere i historien er som regel kommet fra denne form for baggrund; de fødtes ikke til at være ledere, de blev ikke valgt som ledere; nogle blev valgt i løbet af livet, men de startede ikke med at etablere deres lederskab ved at blive valgt. De etablerede deres lederskab ved at finde deres rødder i kampen for menneskehedens velfærd. De blev repræsentanter for en eller anden gruppe, der kæmpede for deres rettigheder, eller de blev fortalere for denne gruppe, der kæmpede for sine rettigheder. Og de kom frem til en lederposition, fordi de havde en indbygget, moralsk karakter, i billedet af Kristi passion og korsfæstelse. Og jo mere, de kommer ind i det, og jo farligere, det bliver, i takt med, at de vinder mere indflydelse – livet *bliver* farligere i takt med, at man vinder mere indflydelse – så indser de, at de sætter deres liv på spil, og de må spørge sig selv: hvad er det, jeg vil risikere mit liv for; hvad er det for en sag, jeg ikke vil forråde, selv, hvis prisen er, at det koster mig mit liv? Og han kastes direkte tilbage til Kristi korsfæstelse og passion. Og dér er vi i dag. Martin havde dette; og problemet med USA og bevægelsen i dag, er, at bevægelsen er blevet, skal vi sige, for 'civiliseret' med hensyn til at bøje af for at komme ud af det med det politiske *establishment*, og hvor den tenderer mod at tro på, at vejen til succes er at bøje af for at komme ud af det med dem. Man fortaber passionen, som bør motivere den sande, politiske leder. Og passionen er denne helligelse; man har en talent, man har en fornemmelse af, hvad ens liv betyder, man har en fornemmelse af forpligtelse, af en mission i livet, for at opløfte nationen ved at løfte en bestemt del af befolkningen, eller hele befolkningen. Og man vil *ikke gøre noget som helst* for at forråde dette. Det giver én kraft. Det giver én kraft til at være et menneske, der er skabt i den levende Skabers billede. Man tapper ind i det. Martin tappede ind i det. Han var en Guds mand, ikke kun af Gud, men en Guds mand. Han var en mand, som, i løbet af livet, af skæbnen fik givet missionen at være en Guds mand. Og han havde styrken til at gøre det. Han havde styrken til at gå i Kristi fodspor; til at gennemleve Gethsemane; til at gennemgå korsfæstelsen. Han havde denne styrke. Som Jeanne havde på sin måde.

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

truer os.

Mange tak.«

[1] Hør hele Martin Luther Kings sidste tale, 'I have been to the mountain top', her <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ixfwGLxRJU8>

»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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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 find, 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-LAROUCHE: 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-LAROUCHE: 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:

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 \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Kreativitetens musik.

LaRouchePAC's Undervisningsserie 2018

»Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?« Lektion

4,

17. marts, 2018: pdf, dansk/engelsk;

video

I dag vil jeg guide jer til den fremtidige renæssance af klassisk kultur, som jeg er overbevist om, ikke ville have været mulig uden Lyndon LaRouches opdagelser om kreativitetens forrang, ikke blot i menneskelige relationer, men også i universet som helhed. Jeg træder i baggrunden til fordel for Lyndon LaRouche selv; og til fordel for forskellige uddrag af hans mange skrifter, og ligeledes klip fra video og audio, håber jeg at kunne komme ind på de hovedtemaer, som har optaget ham hele hans liv, som begyndte i 1922. Dette vil også være meget nyttigt, for det vil gøre det muligt for os at fortsætte, hvor Dennis Small slap i den foregående lektion, hvor han talte om den særdeles uheldige David Hume. Jeg vil diskutere den ondartede indflydelse fra den måske ondeste filosof til alle tider, en person, der er baseret på Hume, men som gjorde noget endnu værre; nemlig Immanuel Kant.

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

Hvad er geopolitik? Anden del: Er du

human,
eller Hume-an? Filosofien bag
geopolitik.
LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie
2018,
»Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«
Lektion 3, 3. marts, 2018; pdf,
dansk, og video

Så for Leibniz er mennesket ikke Gud, men det er i stand til skabende fornuft af den form, som Gud har begavet det med i universets udvikling. Så for Leibniz er mennesket skabende, som det også er for Cusanus. Denne kreativitet, og kun denne kreativitet, er det, som skænker mennesket fri vilje. Med andre ord, så er mennesket i stand til at gøre noget, eller ikke gøre noget; eller at gøre A eller B; der er fri vilje. Og det er det samme som kreativitet, mener jeg, det er rimelig indlysende. Men det er også kilden til moral. Så kreativitet, fri vilje og moral er i realiteten det samme, videnskabelige begreb. Af den grund, siger Leibniz, så er det, der er formålet med vores liv, eftersom vi har fået denne kreative evne, at få det, han faktisk kalder lykke (happiness), at udvikle stræben efter lykke. Han siger ikke 'liv, frihed og stræben efter nydelse'; han siger ikke 'liv, frihed og stræben efter at undgå smerte'; han siger, 'liv, frihed og stræben efter lykke', som han undertiden også kalder 'felicity' (det betyder også lykke).

Dette er altså det stik modsatte af Benthams idé om nydelse; det er lige så modsatrettet som Satan er til Gud.

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

Billede: 'Lysternes have'. Maleri af Hieronymus Bosch, 1403-15.

Hvad er geopolitik? Første del: Historie. LaRouche PAC's Undervisningsserie 2018, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?«, Lektion 2, 17. feb. 2018

Der var de fortsatte provokationer i Mellemøsten, provokationer i Asien, Koreakrigen, Vietnamkrigen – dette var geopolitik med det formål at bevare Det britiske Imperium. Og desværre, med mordet på Kennedy, blev USA en partner i det, man kunne kalde et »anglo-amerikansk geopolitisk imperium«.

Og hvad gik politikerne ud på? Frihandel, neoliberal økonomi, nedskæringspolitik. Svækkelse af regeringer, svækkelse af ideen om national suverænitet og etablering af institutioner som den Europæiske Union, der ønsker ikkevalgte bureaukrater til at bestemme politikker for det, der plejede at være nationalstater.

Det så ud, som om alt dette kunne ændre sig i 1989, med den kommunistiske verdens fald, med det østtyske regimes kollaps og Berlinmurens fald. På dette tidspunkt intervererede LaRouche-organisationen meget direkte, for et alternativ til geopolitik. Lyndon LaRouche var blevet fængslet af George Bush, med assistance fra den daværende vicestatsanklager i Boston, Robert Mueller. Men Helga Zepp-LaRouche anførte kampen for det, vi dengang kaldte den Produktive Trekant Paris-Berlin-Wien, og dernæst, så tidligt som i slutningen af 1990, det, der blev kaldt den »Nye Silkevej« eller den Eurasiske Landbro, som et middel til at bringe nationer sammen og overvinde disse kunstige opdelinger, skabt af Det britiske Imperium.

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 \(PDF, Unknown\)](#)

Afslutningen af geopolitik: Hvad er det nye, globale paradigme? Ny video-undervisningsserie fra LaRouche PAC, 10. feb. 2018

Lørdag, den 10. februar kl. 18 dansk tid vil Helga Zepp-LaRouche indlede den nye video-undervisningsserie med ovenstående titel. Serien fortsætter frem til 28. april.

Registrer for at deltage i denne online-undervisningsserie, inkl. diskussionsklasser, der kræver særskilt indtegning.

Det amerikanske folk konfronteres med et historisk valg: Gå med i Kinas revolutionerende Nye Silkevejsprogram og sikr et nyt paradigme med global win-win-udvikling, eller fortsæt Obamas og Bush' selvmorderiske, geopolitiske politikker, der vil garantere konfrontation med Rusland og Kina og truer med verdenskrig. Alt imens præsident Trump hælder mod at gå i retning af samarbejde med Kina og Rusland, trues han af et paladskup af dem, der desperat klamrer sig til det gamle, geopolitiske standpunkt med uantastet, angloamerikansk, global dominans.

Du kan spille en rolle på dette afgørende tidspunkt i historien. Vær med til at sikre det Nye Paradigme.

LaRouche PAC lancerer en ny undervisningsserie, »Hvad er det Nye Paradigme?« for at forberede dig til at lede befolkningen på dette afgørende tidspunkt. Året 2018 må være det år, hvor vi afslutter geopolitik.

Program:

2/10/18 – Introduction: What is the New Paradigm?
2/17/18 – What is Geopolitics, Part I–History
2/24/18 – *Follow up discussion, registered participants only*
3/3/18 – What is Geopolitics, Part II–Philosophy
3/10/18 – *Follow up discussion, registered participants only*
3/17/18 – Culture–Beauty & Freedom vs. the CCF
3/24/18 – *Follow up discussion, registered participants only*
3/31/18 – Confucian and Western Philosophy
4/7/18 – *Follow up discussion, registered participants only*
4/14/18 – Science: Man’s Relation to the Universe
4/21/18 – *Follow up discussion, registered participants only*
4/28/18 – Wrap-up and Mobilization–End Geopolitics

Du skal indtegne dig for at modtage pensum, hjemmeopgaver, forberedende læsestof, samt særskilt indtegnning, hvis du ønsker at deltage i livediskussionerne, kun for tilmeldte deltagere.

Tilmelding kan ske på LaRouchePAC’s hjemmeside, her:

http://discover.larouchepac.com/2018_new_paradigm_signup

Du kan sende spørgsmål til lektionerne via e-mail her: classes@larouchepac.com

**[Schiller Instituttets Specialrapport:
Introduktion: Forlæng den Nye](#)**

Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika; en vision for en økonomisk renæssance

Vi introducerer her Schiller Instituttets nye, danske specialrapport, "Forlæng den Nye Silkevej til Vestasien og Afrika; en vision for en økonomisk renæssance", som er en grundig indføring i den 246 sider lange, engelske rapport, af rapportens forfattere, Hussein Askary og Jason Ross.

Glød dig til en optimistisk og konstruktiv løsning på det forfærdelige fattigdoms- og underudviklingsproblem, som denne verdensdel er så hårdt ramt af, og, som Helga Zepp-LaRouche så ofte har nævnt, den eneste humane og retfærdige løsning på det umenneskelige flygtningeproblem, der nu også har ramt Europa.

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

Regn ikke med Wall Street! Hvad præsident Trump har brug for at forstå om økonomi. pdf og video

Den fremgangsmåde, der er nødvendig, er at opgive denne idé om økonomi; at sige, glem 'tilføjede værdi', glem 'penge'. Ægte rigdom kommer af at forøge vores magt over naturen, af at forbedre vores levestandard og at opdage mere om universet og om os selv, gennem udvikling af videnskab og udvikling af en skøn kultur. Vi kan få en sådan økonomisk genrejsning; vi kan gå med i dette nye paradigme for økonomisk tankegang, som, baseret på årtiers organisering af LaRouche-parret, nu i vid udstrækning er Kinas politik gennem dets Bælte & Vej Initiativ. Vi kan gå med i dette. Vi kan få en økonomisk genrejsning; men vi bliver nødt til at fortælle præsident Trump: Se ikke hen til Wall Street for en økonomisk genrejsning. Forvent ikke, at \$200 mia. i statslig finansiering vil blive

imødekommet af en entusiastisk strøm af \$1 bio., der strømmer ud fra Wall Street for at genopbygge vandsystemet i Flint, Michigan, blandt andet, eller til oversvømmelseskontrol efter orkaner i Texas; det vil ikke ske. Den eneste måde, vi kan gøre det på, er som en national prioritet, og det er ikke muligt at opnå nogen af disse LaRouches fire politikker uafhængigt af hinanden. De følges ad: Glass-Steagall; statslig bankpraksis; teknologiske snarere end monetære målemetoder til at udfordre økonomisk vækst; og forcerede programmer for at skabe dette næste niveau, som er det sande nettoresultat, den sande, økonomiske aktivitet. Vi har brug for det som et samlet hele, som et nyt koncept for, hvordan økonomi fungerer; i modsat fald vil vi ikke få en økonomisk genrejsning i USA.

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

[LaRouches fysisk-økonomiske målemetode,](#) [Del II: Hvordan værdi defineres.](#) [LaRouche PAC Videnskabsteams undervisningsserie 2017 i økonomi:](#) [Lektion 6. pdf og video.](#)

Denne case study er også meget nyttig for at se på den omvendte proces og komme med et par meget vigtige konklusioner i dagens diskussion – og dette er noget, jeg aldrig har hørt hr. LaRouche ikke sige – og det er, at nulvækst, eller såkaldt bæredygtighed, iboende vil slå samfundet ihjel. Det er en fundamental naturlov; og i dette kapitel fastslår han denne pointe ...

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

**Bernhard Riemann og formen på
økonomisk rum
LaRouche PAC Videnskabsteams
Undervisningsserie i økonomi 2017.
Lektion 5. pdf**

En forståelse af, hvad LaRouche tænker, af, hvad hans indsigter i økonomi og hans fremgangsmåde er, og en hel del mere undersøgelse og udarbejdelse af en fuld, økonomisk teori på denne basis, burde være et af de mest presserende behov blandt økonomiske tænkere i verden i dag. Alle mennesker har brug for at vide, hvordan Lyndon LaRouche kommer til sine konklusioner; hvad hans økonomiske synsmåde, som nu i stigende grad er i færd med at forme en stor del af politikken i verden, er.

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

Kvalitativ forandring: Hvad tal ikke kan måle

LaRouche PAC Videnskabsteams

Undervisningsserie i økonomi 2017.

Lektion 4.

LaRouche: »Det sker på et tidspunkt, hvor det nuværende, monetære finanssystem faktisk befinder sig, nu, i en disintegrationsproces. Der er intet mystisk ved det, jeg har talt om det i nogen tid, det har været fremadskridende, det er ikke i aftagende. Det, der er optegnet som aktieværdier og markedsværdier på de internationale finansmarkeder er 'sorteper' (buck). Det er rent fiktive trosobjekter, der er intet sandt i det. Falskneriet er enormt. Der er ingen mulighed for et ikke-kollaps af det nuværende finanssystem. Ingen! Det er færdigt nu! Det nuværende finanssystem kan ikke fortsætte med at eksistere under nogen som helst omstændigheder, under noget som helst præsidentskab, under noget som helst lederskab, eller noget lederskab i nogen nation. Udelukkende kun en fundamental og pludselig forandring i det globale, monetære finanssystem vil afværge et generelt, omgående, kædereaktionslignende kollaps; i hvilket tempo ved vi ikke, men det vil fortsætte, og det vil være ustoppeligt.«

Det var altså LaRouche i 2007. Tydeligvis et andet synspunkt end økonomernes nationale undersøgelser viser, at de mente på det tidspunkt.

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

Se alle taler på Schiller

Instituttets konference,

»At opfylde menneskehedens drøm«

Se alle taler på Schiller Instituttets konference, »At opfylde menneskehedens drøm«, i Bad Soden, Tyskland, 25.- 26. nov., 2017, [her](#).

RESOLUTION:

»Europa må ende fattigdom for sine 120

millioner fattige frem til år 2020«
og

RESOLUTION:

»For en afslutning af krigen og den humanitære krise i Yemen«.

Vedtaget på Schiller Institutets internationale konference, 25.-26. nov., 2017

I den Europæiske Union lever omkring 120 millioner mennesker under fattigdomsgrænsen, ifølge vore egne kriterier, der karakteriserer leveomkostningerne. I betragtning af, at Europa stadig er et økonomisk kraftcenter, er der ingen acceptabel grund til, at Europa ikke også skulle kunne løfte disse 120 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom frem til år 2020. Den bedste måde, hvorpå dette kan opnås, er ved, at EU og alle europæiske nationer tager imod Kinas tilbud om samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet på en »win-win«-basis.

RESOLUTION: »Europa må ende fattigdom for sine 120 millioner fattige frem til år 2020«

Resolution vedtaget på Schiller Institutets internationale konference i Bad Soden, 26. nov. 2017.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Hvis der ikke er flere spørgsmål, vil jeg gerne oplæse mit forslag til denne resolution, som jeg gerne vil have, I vedtager – eller én af

dem.

På denne konference, der havde titlen, »At opfylde menneskehedens drøm«, drøftede vi den utrolige transformation i verden, der er blevet katalyseret af det kinesiske initiativ for den Nye Silkevej; Bælte & Vej Initiativet, der skaber optimisme i Asien, Afrika, Latinamerika, flere og flere stater i Europa og, efter præsident Trumps statsbesøg til Kina, i flere stater i USA.

Bælte & Vej Initiativet har det konkrete perspektiv for, hvordan fattigdom og underudvikling kan overvindes gennem investering i infrastruktur, industri og landbrug, baseret på videnskabelig og teknologisk fremskridt. Den kinesiske regering, der i løbet af de seneste 30 år har løftet 700 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom, har nu bekendtgjort målet om at løfte de tilbageværende 42 millioner mennesker, der lever i fattigdom, ud af denne tilstand og skabe en anstændig levestandard for hele den kinesiske befolkning frem til år 2020.

I den Europæiske Union lever omkring 120 millioner mennesker under fattigdomsgrænsen, ifølge vore egne kriterier, der karakteriserer leveomkostningerne. I betragtning af, at Europa stadig er et økonomisk kraftcenter, er der ingen acceptabel grund til, at Europa ikke også skulle kunne løfte disse 120 millioner mennesker ud af fattigdom frem til år 2020. Den bedste måde, hvorpå dette kan opnås, er ved, at EU og alle europæiske nationer tager imod Kinas tilbud om samarbejde med Kina om Bælte & Vej Initiativet på en »win-win«-basis.

Vi, deltagerne på Schiller Instituttets konference, opfordrer alle folkevalgte personer til at tilslutte sig denne appel til de europæiske regeringer. Skulle vi i Europa ikke være stolte nok til at sige, at, hvis kineserne kan gøre dette, så kan vi også? [applaus]

RESOLUTION: »For en afslutning af krigen og den humanitære krise i Yemen«

26. nov., 2017 – Deltagerne på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Bad Soden, Tyskland, vedtog enstemmigt følgende resolution om krigen i Yemen:

»I betragtning af den dokumenterede kendsgerning, at krigen mod Yemen, der er blevet ført af den saudiskledede koalition siden marts 2015, har været årsag til en humanitær krise uden sidestykke i dette land som resultat af bombardement af landets infrastruktur og den totale blokade til lands, til vands og i luften,

der er gennemført, kræver deltagerne på Schiller Instituttets internationale konference i Bad Soden, Tyskland, den 25.-26. nov., 2017:

1. En øjeblikkelig våbenstilstand mellem alle parterne;
2. Ophævelse af blokaderne mod landet, især mod havnen i Hodeida og den internationale lufthavn i Sana'a, og som muliggør omgående humanitærhjælp til landet;
3. En tilbagevenden til den nationale forsoningsproces og dialog, som var i gang, men som blev afbrudt af krigen. (Denne forhandlingsproces må føres under FN-regi og udelukkende mellem nationale, yemenitiske grupperinger uden indblanding fra regionale eller globale magter, men sponsoreret af Rusland, Kina og USA som garanter for gennemførelse af det sluttelige resultat af dialogen.) Formålet med sådanne forhandlinger er at finde en politisk løsning på krisen i Yemen.
4. At hjælpe Yemen med en hurtig og storstilet genopbygningsproces, der fokuserer på infrastrukturprojekter for at genvinde nationens levebrød og Yemens integration i Bælte & Vej Initiativet.«

[Arven efter Friedrich Schiller og Schiller Instituttet i Xis Nye Silkevejs konfutsianske koncept i dag. Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale til Schiller Instituttets Venners Valgmøde i København, 10. nov., 2017](#)

Så der er mange punkter, hvor vi kan sige, »Lad os gå tilbage til vore bedste traditioner, og så vil vi finde ud af, at Europas klassiske perioder, og Kinas konfutsianske tradition og andre landes klassiske perioder virkelig skaber grundlaget for en ny renæssance.

Jeg mener, vi befinder os ved et utroligt, historisk øjeblik, og vi bør erindre os Friedrich Schillers ord, »Et stort øjeblik bør ikke finde et lille folk«. Så lad os forsøge at løfte vort folk op til at tænke stort, tænke smukt, blive skønne sjæle, skabe grundlaget for, at alle børn kan få mulighed for at blive

genier. Og at det ligger inden for vores viljes mulighed at gøre det, og derfor er Toms kampagne og de andre medlemmer af Schiller Instituttet så absolut vigtig, og at vi bør være glade for, at Schiller Instituttet eksisterer i Danmark og skaber en mulighed for alle danskere til at gå med i dette utrolige, historiske øjeblik og skabe en bedre verden for os alle.

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

Trump, Xi og den Nye Silkevejsånd. Schiller Institut Nyt Paradigme Webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche, 9. nov., 2017. Dansk udskrift.

Så jeg mener, at det, der tydeligvis er ved at vokse frem, er et mere og mere integreret, nyt økonomisk system, hvor det grundlæggende set er meget klart, så længe, europæerne, eller i det mindste EU og den tyske regering, fortsat har en kold og uvenlig holdning, så er det, som en erhvervsmand for nylig sagde, »hvis de ikke springer på toget, vil de se lysene fra den bageste vogn forlade stationen, og de bliver stående tilbage«.

Centrum for strategisk betydning bevæger sig tydeligvis over mod Asien i øjeblikket. Og denne amerikansk-kinesiske relation vil forhåbentlig fortsat udvikle sig, og så er jeg meget optimistisk mht., at mødet mellem Trump og Putin også vil blive succesfuldt. Jeg har faktisk grund til at tro, at dette også vil blive et stort gennembrud, og så vil disse journalister fra denne sensationspresse simpelt hen rive sig selv midt over, ligesom Rumleskaft. Og det er, hvad de burde gøre.

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

Kreativitet sluppet løs: Xis tid

Forestil jer engang den kombinerede virkning af den Europæiske Renæssance, den Industrielle Revolution, Marshallplanen og Apollo-programmet. Gang dette med en faktor på tusind, og I vil begynde at få en idé om størrelsesordenen af den globale forandring, som Kinas præsident, Xi Jinping, har initieret. De politiske, økonomiske, videnskabelige og kulturelle transformationer, der er under udvikling, overgår allerede alt, hvad mennesket hidtil har oplevet.

China: Time of Xi, en dokumentar, der udkom 14.-16. oktober i tre afsnit, giver blot en antydning af de forbløffende udviklinger, der nu finder sted i Kina. ...

Der er en lang historie med amerikanske, og amerikanskallierede, grupper, der står bag forholdsregler, som er taget for at promovere udviklingen af stærke, uafhængige nationer på de amerikanske kontinenter, i Asien og Afrika, og som kunne blive allierede imod det prædatoriske, politiske og økonomiske, britiske imperiesystems hærgen.

Imperialisme er nu ved at blive overtaget af det, John Quincy Adams^[1] kaldte et fællesskab af suveræne republikker. Xi refererer til »fællesskabet for en fælles skæbne«.

BRI er på mange måder uden fortilfælde. Kina er aldrig tidligere trådt frem på verdensscenen og har taget en ledende rolle i globale anliggender. Men Kina er nu stærkt nok rent fysisk, og har tilstrækkelig tillid til sine demonstrerede, økonomiske metoder, til, at det tilbyder at dele sine beviste, succesfulde metoder med hele verden.

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

Fysisk kemi: Stadier i menneskets udvikling.

LaRouche PAC Videnskabsteams

Undervisningsserie 2017 i økonomi.

3. lektion

Jason Ross: En af de ting, jeg tænkte på, var, hvor utroligt meget, folk tager fejl, hvor meget, folk undervurderer, hvor meget politikerne tager fejl, hvor meget, økonomer tager fejl, hvor meget, folk i almindelighed tager fejl i grundlæggende spørgsmål om ikke alene økonomi og politik, men endda om menneskeheden: Hvad er det, der gør et individ til et menneske? Hvis man interviewer den såkaldte 'manden på gaden' og blot spørger folk, hvad er det, der gør os forskellige fra dyrene? Den kendsgerning, at Renæssancens gennembrud besvarede disse spørgsmål på en måde, der førte til skabelsen af utroligt, videnskabeligt fremskridt, det største fremskridt i menneskelig civilisation, i menneskelig velfærd, i levestandard, som verden endnu havde set; den kendsgerning, at denne grundlæggende viden, der gjorde dette gennembrud muligt, er næsten totalt fraværende i dag, er virkelig forbløffende.

I sit økonomiske arbejde husker jeg, at hr. LaRouche engang sagde, at noget af det, der gav ham en fordel, var, på en måde i sammenligning med andre, at de fleste økonomer rådgiver dig om økonomi ligesom en person, der fortæller dig, at du skal tage dine bukser over dit hoved, som det første skridt til at få dem på dine ben. Man begynder i den forkerte retning lige fra begyndelsen.

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