

Schiller Instituttet mobiliserer danskerne på Folkemødet på Bornholm: Rejser spørgsmålet om Atomkrig og Udmeldelse af NATO!

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark mobiliserer i disse dage på Folkemødet på Bornholm for at stoppe atomkrig. ... En vigtig begivenhed, hvor vi fik mulighed for at intervenere, var ved det Danske Forsvarsakademi. Titlen på deres begivenhed var "Det danske Forsvar i det nye NATO – henimod Topmødet i juli!" Blandt talerne var det danske militærs repræsentant ved NATO, den permanente danske ambassadør til NATO og en militærforsker fra Københavns Universitet. Der var kun ét eneste hovedbudskab, nemlig, at 'Rusland må inddæmnes på grund af sine "aggressive" handlinger, og Kina er ligeledes en problemnation, der skal håndteres. Vi stillede det første spørgsmål og sagde, at NATO bør opløses; at Danmark bør forlade NATO og undgå atomkrig, og at vi i stedet bør samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, samt acceptere en multipolær verden.

18. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttet i Danmark mobiliserer i disse dage på Folkemødet på Bornholm for at stoppe atomkrig. Folkemødet er en stor politisk begivenhed, hvor alle partier, ministerier, hovedmedier, universiteter, dansk industri, militæret og mange andre institutioner er samlet til 4 dages debatter, diskussioner m.m. Omkring 30-40.000 mennesker fra hele Danmark kommer til dette Folkemøde.

Schiller Instituttet i Danmark deltager med 4 personer. Vi

bærer kropsplakater, der siger "Atomkrig? Danmark ud af NATO nu!" på den ene side og "Win-Win med BRIKS, ikke krig og økonomisk kollaps" på den anden. Vi uddeler vores danske Nyhedsorientering og vores internationale NATO-folder til folk, og vi taler med folk, vi møder på gaden eller ved interventioner!

Der var en begivenhed med den britiske og den polske ambassadør til Danmark, om betydningen af NATO. Vi uddelte vores litteratur ved begivenheden og skabte en hel del opmærksomhed om atomkrig med vores kropsskilte. Debatten var styret på forhånd, og man kunne ikke stille spørgsmål. Den britiske ambassadør gik så langt som til at sige, at Rusland udgjorde et truende imperium, der må stoppes! Vores litteratur blev godt modtaget af publikum, og vi havde mange diskussioner.

En vigtig begivenhed, hvor vi fik mulighed for at intervenere, var ved det Danske Forsvarsakademi. Titlen på deres begivenhed var "Det danske Forsvar i det nye NATO – henimod Topmødet i juli!" Blandt talerne var det danske militærs repræsentant ved NATO, den permanente danske ambassadør til NATO og en militærforsker fra Københavns Universitet. Der var kun ét eneste hovedbudskab, nemlig, at 'Rusland må inddæmnes på grund af sine "aggressive" handlinger, og Kina er ligeledes en problemnation, der skal håndteres. Vi stillede det første spørgsmål og sagde, at NATO bør opløses; at Danmark bør forlade NATO og undgå atomkrig, og at vi i stedet bør samarbejde med Rusland og Kina, samt acceptere en multipolær verden.

Mere rapportering fra Folkemødet er på vej.

Se: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1634726746777458/?fref=ts>

NATO spiller hasard med 3. Verdenskrig: Skal Europa være kanonføde? Fred er kun mulig sammen med Rusland og Kina! Af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Klokken er, i bogstavelig forstand, ét minut i midnat. Elementær overlevelse vil kræve, at vi vågner op, før vi her i Europa ofres som kanonføde i en angiveligt begrænset atomkrig på alteret for det anglo-amerikanske imperiums geopolitiske interesser, et imperium, hvis krav om at herske over en unipolær verden ikke længere kan opretholdes. Hvis der under NATO-topmødet i Warszawa i begyndelsen af juli måned finder en yderligere opbygning af det amerikanske BMD-system sted – det er bl.a. planlagt at forbinde systemet i Rumænien med krigsskibene, som er udstyret med Aegis-systemet, der kan affyre missiler – så kunne vi meget hurtigt nå det punkt, hvor der ikke er nogen vej tilbage.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Foto: Amerikanske soldater i et troppetransport fly.

**Vi er kommet til punctum
saliens – det springende
punkt;**

Vi må udøve lederskab nu!

**Hvornår kommer
nedsmeltningen?**

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 17. juni
2016.**

Video, engelsk

– Vi befinder os tydeligvis i en situation under hastig forandring, i hele verden. Vi har i løbet af de seneste dage haft uddybende diskussioner med både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche var meget kortfattet i sit råd, da han i går sagde: »Vær årvågne. Tingene kommer til at ændre sig meget hurtigt. Dette er en farlig periode.« Vi har stadig væk en trussel om global atomkrig, som er meget umiddelbar, men der er også en masse ting, der ændrer sig, som det meget tydeligt ses af de skiftende holdninger i Europa, Xi Jinpings besøg i Centraleuropa netop nu for at fremme Den Nye Silkevej, samt begivenhederne på det Internationale Økonomiske Forum i Skt. Petersborg.

Hr. LaRouche gik i dybden med nogle punkter tidligere på dagen, men jeg vil bede Jeff [Steinberg] foretage en hurtig gennemgang for at få en hurtig orientering om den globale situation, og vi vil dernæst i diskussionens forløb trække

mange af punkterne frem og følge flere af de ledetråde, som både Lyndon og Helga LaRouche fastslog i deres bemærkninger tidligere på dagen.

Engelsk udskrift. Dansk oversættelse af uddrag af webcastet følger snarest. Bliv på kanalen!

WE ARE AT A PUNCTUM SALIENS; – WE MUST EXERT LEADERSHIP NOW! How long before the blowout?

LaRouche Friday Webcast, June 17, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Afternoon! It is June 17, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you're joining us for our weekly webcast here from LaRouchePAC.com, which we hold every Friday evening. I'm joined via video by Dave Christie from our Policy Committee, who's joining us from Seattle, Washington; and Megan Beets from the LaRouche PAC Science team, who is currently joining us from Houston, Texas, where she's engaged in some activities there with Kesha Rogers. Here in the studio I'm joined by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC Science team as well; and by Jeffrey Steinberg from Executive Intelligence Review.

We're obviously in a very fast-changing situation, worldwide. We've had extensive discussions over the past few days with both Lyndon LaRouche and Helga LaRouche. Lyndon LaRouche was very concise in his advice when he said yesterday, "Stay

alert.

Things are going to change very rapidly. It's a dangerous period." We still have a very proximate threat of global thermonuclear war, but we also have a lot which is changing, as can be seen very clearly by the changing attitudes in Europe, the visit by Xi Jinping to Central Europe right now, to push the New Silk Road, and the events at the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum.

Mr. LaRouche had some points to elaborate earlier today, but I'm going to ask Jeff to go through a very quick sort of overview briefing of the global situation, and then in the course of the discussion we can draw out a lot of the points and follow a lot of the threads that both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche made in their remarks earlier today. So, Jeff.

JEFFREY STEINBERG: It's critical to bear in mind that between now and when we sit down a week from today for another LaRouche PAC discussion, that we will know the outcome of the Brexit vote in Britain. People are terrified of the implications, no matter which way that vote goes, and now we have the added dimension of the assassination of a Labour Party member of the British Parliament, Jo Cox, which may or may not have been directly related to the issues of Brexit. We'll still wait judgment on that.

Mr. LaRouche had a much more fundamental point that he wanted to make to us today, which is that regardless of these short-term factors, the entire trans-Atlantic financial system is

really about to blow. We don't know exactly when it's going to happen, but we know it's absolutely inevitable, and therefore the

critical question is: what kinds of plans will be in place; what

kinds of reasonable players here in the United States, in Europe,

are going to develop a strategy for replacing the current system?

It's hopelessly bankrupt. There is no way to manage that process.

There was a commentary earlier this week by an economist

named Simon Black, who just pointed out that major U.S. banks, led by Bank of America and Wells Fargo, have resumed the whole liar loans, just absolute fraudulent mortgages, that was one of

the root factors at least involved in the 2008 blow-out. He joins

Mr. LaRouche in saying that we're headed for a far bigger blow-out at some unknown point in the very near future.

Mr. LaRouche's point was that what's needed under these

circumstances is a return to classic economic principles, Hamiltonian economic principles, in which {physical} economic factors, and not {money} factors, are the priority, and where you

have to start, is by wiping the slate clean and wiping out all of

the existing gambling debt on the books.

You've got a clear recognition, on the part of some world

leaders, that this is the nature of the crisis-moment that we've

now reached. President Putin spoke yesterday during the opening

plenary session of the St. Petersburg International Economic

Forum. There were around 16,000 people there. Whatever Obama's plans, or British plans [were] to isolate Russia, clearly the isolation is broken. The Italian Prime Minister Renzi was there.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the President of the EU Commission, spoke there on the opening day. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ban Ki Moon, was there.

We're still awaiting the complete translation of Putin's speech, but what from what we've seen so far, he's made it very clear that the global financial situation, the system, is very unsettled. The problems of 2008 have not been resolved. He emphasized Russia's commitment to be the bridge between the Asia developments centered around Xi Jinping's One Belt, One Road policy, and the bringing of Europe into that equation as a cooperative factor.

So, there are alternative ideas out there, but there's a desperate moment from the standpoint of the British. We see it in these two incidents, almost back-to-back: of the brutal terrorist attack in Orlando, Florida, followed a few days later by the first time in {hundreds of years} that a British Member of Parliament was assassinated in cold blood on the streets of Britain.

OGDEN: Absolutely! Right in the midst of that, you have a very important initiative from Congressman Walter Jones, who has taken the next step beyond what he has already done, around the campaign to release the 28 pages, which would expose the entire

Anglo-Saudi apparatus behind what led to 9/11 and what continues

to be the threat of terrorism, world-wide today.

He had 70 co-sponsors on H-Res. 14, but this week he has

introduced a new resolution, which says, Look, we don't have to

wait for Obama at all. We're going to bypass the Obama administration, and Congress itself needs to take the initiative

to de-classify these 28 pages. It's a very important bill. The text of it should be read in full. It cites the precedent. The Supreme Court decided in favor of (former) Senator Mike Gravel,

who read the Pentagon Papers into the Congressional Record; and

also cites the fact that this is Congress's prerogative indeed.

That continues to be a very critical element in this fight

to dismantle what is in fact, as you were saying, the Anglo-Saudi

apparatus behind this entire campaign. Actually, just because we've brought that up, I wanted to read, very quickly, our "institutional question" for this evening, and then we can follow

the discussion out from there. It reads as follows:

"Mr. LaRouche: Recently a scholar at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies penned an article in the

{Asia Times} warning that the Saudi-sponsored Wah'habi terrorism

is coming to Southeast Asia, and the United States has been the

essential enabler of this spread by boosting the Saudis with protection. Dr. Christina Lin described the Saudi

'religious-industrial complex' as the source of spreading

Wah'habi ideology. Hillary Clinton recently rebuked Saudi Arabia and two other U.S. allies – Qatar and Kuwait – by name, for their support of terrorist networks and ideology. Mr. LaRouche, in your opinion, what types of religions reform must Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and Kuwait, and other Wah'habi-oriented nations, need to enact, to deal with Salafi-inspired jihadi terrorism?"

Jeff, I know that you wrote a sort of summary article earlier, in the beginning of this week, that goes through the entire Al-Yamamah case, and everything that is implied by the fact that that's still an on-going apparatus. Maybe you want to give a little bit of a background on that, in response to this question.

STEINBERG: Well, let me just start by saying that I think the idea of any kind of near-term reform of Saudi Arabia or these other countries that subscribe to Wah'habism, is a very unlikely phenomenon. We've got to take the approach that this whole apparatus has to be exposed, top down, and completely dismantled. It's going to have to come from the outside.

A very, very interesting discussion took place earlier this week [on June 14] on the John Batchelor [radio] show in New York, where Dr. Stephen F. Cohen, a Russia specialist, professor emeritus of Russian studies, history and politics at New York University, for the first time touched on the issue of Obama's removal from office. He said one of the greatest crimes that Obama has committed, has been the breaking of the cooperation with Russia, that basically the U.S. has no understanding or

no capacity for dealing with this threat of Salafist terrorism, but Russia does. Therefore Obama's demonization of Putin, refusal to cooperate with Russia, is piling up the body-count around the globe.

In a very real sense, the Obama question and the British Al-Yamamah question goes to the heart of what Dr. Lin said in that [Asia Times] article, namely, who are the enablers? Who makes it possible? Because Saudi Arabia on its own could do very little, were it not for the sponsorship by Washington, by London, and we can't leave out Paris in this equation, of the whole development of the strategy of playing the Islamic fundamentalist card for regime change. It started with the Soviet Union. It extended to Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and now this is really what's playing out in Syria.

Unless you're willing to force the severing of the British and U.S. support for this jihadist spread of terrorism, then you're really not going to address the problem. If you single out Saudi Arabia and leave out Britain, then you're leaving Al-Yamamah and everything that that implies off the hook. This was an arrangement that was made in 1985 between [then-Saudi Ambassador to the U.S.] Prince Bandar [bin Sultan] and [then British Prime Minister] Margaret Thatcher, to set up what was ostensibly an oil-for-weapons deal. But under the cover of that, they amassed hundreds of billions of dollars in offshore slush-funds, and those funds have been really what's been behind the terrorism.

The 28 pages make it clear that Prince Bandar was a source of funding to the 9/11 hijackers at a time that he was getting upwards of \$2 billion wired into that account from the Bank of England, as the result of his sponsorship of Al-Yamamah. If you talk about the Saudis without talking about the British and without talking about Bush, and now Obama, then you're never going to solve the problem.

OGDEN: You mentioned what Stephen Cohen had to say. I think this is obviously a very big step for him to make these remarks, but he said, "The major single largest cost of this unnecessary cold war with Russia, is Washington's refusal to cooperate with Russia against international terrorism, whether in Syria or in homeland security. That, I think, is an indictment of our political class, the Obama administration and Congress in particular, that we all should judge very, very harshly, because they're endangering each and every one of us and our families. Russia knows how to do counter-terrorism. We know we don't know how to do it very well."

And then he said, "I would call this anti national security. These are impeachable offenses by our government, that they are not doing things, out of this political, ideological Cold War against Russia, that could help protect us. Whether we talk about Syria or talk about homeland security, it's a pattern, and it needs to end right away."

One thing that just developed out of this yesterday,

is
front-page coverage in the {New York Times} of a "dissent
channel," [a draft copy of an internal memo] by 50 mid-level
State Department officials, "urging the United States to carry
out military strikes against the government of President
Bashar
al-Assad to stop its persistent violations of a cease-fire in
the
country's five-year-old civil war," which is obviously a
direct
declaration of war against what Russia is doing in Syria right
now.

STEINBERG: Absolutely!

DAVE CHRISTIE: This is occurring in the middle of
where the
Syrian government has just unleashed leaflets into Rakka,
saying,
"We're coming!" The Russians have been very clear on this,
that
they're not going to sit around and play games, or allow Obama
and his gang to play games, around this idea that we need more
time to separate out the moderate terrorists, which don't
exist
anyway. This is a move to shut them down.

Coming back to this point that what has been raised on
the
nature of the terrorism, going back to the Al-Yamamah deal,
this
was effectively the geo-political enforcement wing of what was
ushered in at that time. We had some discussions earlier this
week where this was coincident at the same time that Thatcher
brought in the whole "Big Bang" program to have London be the
center of global finance and this speculative offshore
financial
system, which was sort of the consolidation of what had come

in

in 1971, as Mr. LaRouche forecast, that when they broke with the Bretton Woods system, they turned their back on the real economic progress that we saw under Kennedy and, of course, Roosevelt before then.

There was an explicit destruction of the American System

that could have swept the planet, were it not for that intervention by the British in '71. Mr. LaRouche was clear at that point, that this would result in fascism. We've now seen that come to fruition. But the point is, that's the bankrupt system that is now collapsing; and what Mr. LaRouche said today I

think is very important on the Obama question, and more importantly what Obama represents. Because he represents the British Empire, he represents this integrated financial apparatus

which is funding itself through the dope trade, enforcing it through terrorism, the whole migrant crisis; all of this is part

of the integrated policy of the British Empire. And what LaRouche said about Obama and that system is that they can't win;

Obama is going to lose, period. The question is, will others win? And what Lyn also said today I think is very important, he

says that Putin has shown this leadership; he's straight on this,

he's the best leadership we have so far. And I think that's part

of this growing recognition that the BRICS nations and specifically Russia, China, India, are now the world leadership;

the British are having to react. And I think what we're seeing

in terms of their reaction is, of course, increasingly dangerous;
because they see what the writing on the wall is in terms of the
imminent collapse of their financial system while this New Paradigm is being consolidated. Helga made the point on this question of the German bonds; their 10-year bonds are trading at
negative interest rates, so that is a huge psychological shock to
the German people. Anybody in business knows the implications of
that.

So you can really see that the political turmoil here in
terms of the potential of Europe to begin to shift towards this
new emerging leadership; similarly in Japan that we see. The fact that the situation in Korea is similarly potentially shifting; and of course, Ban Ki Moon just spoke in front of the
St. Petersburg Economic Forum. So, you just really get a sense
of what the potential is to shift this thing. And I think what
we have to do is recognize that that global leadership is now being established; but it's up to the American people to recognize that Obama will lose. People think that he's all-powerful and they look at this crazy political election, which is frankly designed around Obama. The whole circling of the wagons around Hillary wasn't so much circling the wagons around Hillary in terms of her campaign; it was really circling
it around Obama. And of course, Trump, what is this? It's nothing but a clown show to allow Obama to continue with this agenda. But as Mr. LaRouche said, he will lose. The question is, will we take up the leadership and responsibility to win?

OGDEN: And the point that Jeff made about the attempts to isolate Russia clearly have failed. I think that the St. Petersburg Economic Forum is a testament to that fact. And then you have the very strong collaboration between Putin and Xi Jinping right now, which is being acknowledged on all fronts. I think that it was very poetically at the St. Petersburg Economic Forum by one of the visiting ministers from Ecuador, who said "We view with envy the great projects that change the history of civilization." That's where we are. I think Helga LaRouche was calling it an "epical moment"; it's a change in epic, both with the emergence of this new world system, but also the fact that we're experiencing for the first time in history the negative interest rates within the European system and so forth. But this Ecuadoran minister said, these projects that change the history of civilization, with the New Silk Road that China has proposed, the creation of the AIIB, the BRICS bank, the Eurasian project which Russia has defended. I don't know if people saw the full speech that Indian Prime Minister Modi made when he came to Washington last week; but when he spoke in front of the joint session of Congress, what he concluded his remarks with was beautiful. He said, "The foundations of the future are now firmly in place." And then he quoted from a poem by Walt Whitman from {The Leaves of Grass}; a poem called "To Think of Time." And Modi said, "The orchestra have sufficiently tuned their

instruments. The baton has given the signal"; and then Modi said, "Let me add to that if I might, there is a new symphony in play." And I think that's a perfect way of describing the new world system which is now breaking onto the horizon. And it really has, despite the attempts by Obama and his allies, to isolate this and to try to beat this back. It is continuing to take hold.

ROSS: That's true; it's undeniably taking hold in the world in such a way that it's clear to everybody, too, that that's a real standard of value. You're not looking at the U.S., you're not looking at the European Central Bank; you're looking at where the growth is coming from; anyone can see that who is looking at it. And the obligation that we have to prevent the U.S. from being the stumbling block in this; because it's astonishing to read the contrast between the speech that Modi made, or the remarks of this Ecuadoran who you mentioned, with these kinds of think-tanks or institutions in the U.S.. They're talking about threats to American power; how are we going to secure American power in the coming world with all of its difficulties. It's such a bizarre outlook to even try to have. It's so outdated, so European oligarchical, it sounds like it's something from centuries ago; it hardly sounds like anything that represents what the U.S. was founded to be under the economic leadership of Hamilton, under the direction that we have taken at our best times. So, the great opportunity that we have to join in this in

the U.S., can make all the difference in the world; and it's unfortunate that it comes to us from such a negative direction.

If we don't do something, the U.S. is blocking this and Obama is going to create a war to prevent it.

STEINBERG: Putin made a point in St. Petersburg that clearly there is now a profound strategic partnership between Russia and through Russia the Eurasian Economic Union, with China. And he said, this is not a closed partnership; we welcome

European participation with open arms. And then he went after the TTIP, this U.S.-British free trade agreement that is, in fact, an exclusive arrangement that would cut off Europe from any

cooperation across Eurasia with Russia, the Eurasian Economic Union, China. And he just said, look, we're past the point where

we create alliances that are exclusionary; and he pointed out that there are now 40 countries that are seeking trade agreements

with Russia and the Eurasian Economic Union. So, I think that this idea of this openness and a common future and destiny, is something that is not only at the core of what Xi Jinping is now

in Poland, and he's on a five-day tour of eastern and central Europe; and then he's going back through central Asia. So, he's

clearly got this idea of moving forward with the extension of these policies into Europe; and in effect, there's a major split

beginning to develop in Europe. It comes down to this fundamental question of, do you focus on physical economy, or are

you stuck in the British system purely money game. It's a point

now of clash where the two systems are so irreconcilable that they can't both survive. That's also why the war danger is so pronounced at this point.

BEETS: Well, let me just add something in on this point about this newly forming world system being led by China and Russia. I was remembering that a couple of years ago, around the time of the BRICS summit in Fortaleza, Brazil, Mr. LaRouche said that this is the beginning of a world system; but it's not the final form. There has to be now a discovery process undertaken by peoples of the world to uncover and come to a point of discovery of what the human species ought to be. And I think is really the point that is missing from 99% of the discussion that goes on; most especially in the trans-Atlantic. But even – and I would put this out as a question – how self-conscious of a discussion is this in other parts of the world as well? And I think it's important, because Mr. LaRouche's emphatic point this morning was that the entire system has to be scrapped; we are at the point of blow-out. Any moves that are taken to try to save it are complete foolishness; because anything you try to save in the system is about to become completely worthless.

So, you have to re-found a new system upon a newly discovered notion of physical value. And that gets exactly to the principle that is the most fundamental; but is also the least known, and the most contradicted in the United States today.

The most fundamental principle of economics; which is that man is not an animal. And that there is a scientifically knowable principle which separates mankind as a species from all other species known to us today. And that's expressed in the fact that as a species, mankind is the only species that is not fixed. We're the only species for whom the new generation can be fundamentally different than the previous generation; as expressed in the powers wielded by the individual. The scientific powers, the powers in and over processes in the Universe, which is expressed in the productive powers of labor of the individual; which reflect knowledge of principle which is completely new to that generation. Which is both more perfect and higher than the knowledge of principles of the Universe possessed by the previous generation.

I think if we go back and look back to the United States and to our tradition, we see this expressed most recently – aside from the leadership taken by Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche in the recent decades – we see this expressed by the leadership of Krafft Ehricke and his role in establishing and fighting for the United States space program. Krafft Ehricke was completely committed to the idea, and it was a discovery in his own mind, that for human beings there are no limits to growth. There's no such thing as a fixed set of resources, for exactly the reason I cited, of man's

potential to always discover a higher principle. Krafft Ehricke fought for the idea that man must always progress; and therefore, man cannot be limited merely to the Earth. Man cannot be a species of a single globe. We have to move out into conquering space; becoming a species which is exerting power in an over the Solar System. Reorganizing, shaping, perfecting other planets in the Solar System, beginning with the Moon. Just to put it forward, that's the only legitimate basis for an economic system, is to organize the social activity of man to effect and promote that kind of activity; and to protect and promote that kind of capability which exists in potential in each and every human being. I think that we in the United States especially, have a responsibility to wake up, and to have a renaissance in the United States. Where we once again demand our space program, and demand that it represent the kind of principle expressed by Krafft Ehricke; and expressed by Mr. LaRouche's insights into the science of economics.

CHRISTIE: Just to follow up on that, I think that is probably also the place where geopolitics is – it's the symbol of the absolute end of geopolitics. And Mr. LaRouche has been discussing the idea of moving beyond nation-states. That doesn't mean a homogenized global McDonald's or something like that kind of approach to economy. What it means is, you're still going to

celebrate the cultural differences, you're going to still celebrate the fact that people have histories and shared languages and so on and so forth; but you're going to see that the core of what it is to be human. We're all human; there's only one species. And that's no better expressed than in space exploration.

I also think that what you're beginning to see is how that's operating now in terms of breaking up – or nations now collaborating and not allowing themselves to be manipulated around the British strategies of divide and conquer. For example, you just recently had Xi Jinping make a trip to the Baltic nations; to work out the Baltic nations' entry into the Silk Road program. And that is one way to defuse the tensions that the Baltic nations would have with Russia. India is working with Iran on the Chabahar port; where you get access to some of the central Asian nations, which of course, could be pitted against China. And of course, China's working with Pakistan around the Gwadar port; and defusing potential confrontations that Pakistan and India might have. You begin to see that they are all collaborating around this common mission; and seeing that all these nations' relationships and integration is important. And I think that, in terms of what has to happen in the United States, we should also recognize that what is going on in these nations, that is determining the global dynamic; and that is also what is going to determine the internal political situation.

So, all the Americans who are depressed about this crazy election process, should just flush it down the toilet where it

belongs; because it has no real bearing on what is actually occurring internationally. It is being defined by this new concept of thinking beyond nation-states; or at least beyond the manipulation that can occur under geopolitics where these nations are beginning to collaborate. That's the point of space exploration; that's also the point of Mr. LaRouche's Strategic Defense Initiative, which he raised today in discussions. This present war drive, which is why the British are trying to tear down this emerging New Paradigm, really began with the Bush crowd sabotaging the Strategic Defense Initiative of Mr. LaRouche. Had that gone through, we wouldn't be on the edge of thermonuclear warfare; we would have already begun that collaboration back then. So now is really our last opportunity to take up that initiative; but we've got to bring this New Paradigm into the United States.

STEINBERG: I was at an event in Washington when Prime Minister Modi was here, and one of the speakers was a former Indian ambassador to the United States. I thought he made some very important and pretty frank points. He said, first of all, the most important thing that came out of the meeting, other than the speech that Prime Minister Modi gave before the joint session of Congress, was the nuclear deal. The fact that Westinghouse had been contracted to build six nuclear power plants in India. So, he's viewing what remains of the actual technology base of the United States; of course, it's now a company that's working

very closely with the Japanese in order to even meet the construction requirements. But the other thing that he said was that the United States has been blocking India from playing any kind of constructive role in Middle East peace. He said India has a very important role to play; we have close relations with all of the Arab countries. But, he said, India views Iran as a crucial ally; not only economically because of the Chabahar port and the prospects of India, Iran, Afghanistan economic integration. But, he said, the threat to India and to Asia of Islamic terrorism, is coming from Wah'habism; and that they've never had any experience of terrorism coming out of the Shi'a branch of Islam. Therefore, India views Iran as a buffer against the spread of this kind of Saudi-sponsored terrorism into South Asia and the subcontinent. So, these are areas where there's an enormous amount of room for a change in policy being forced in Washington; where the kinds of problems that are right now seemingly intractable, can be solved through that kind of new approach.

On the question that Megan raised; Jason, you may want to say something about this. There was a very high-level dialogue that was going on 300 years ago between Western and Chinese scholars on this question of the nature of man. Leibniz was engaged in a tremendous exchange with China, via some of the Jesuit missionaries who were there in China for a period of more than 100 years. So, this common concept of the nature of man is

not something that is alien to leading thinkers in Asia; and I think what China and even Russia are doing now, is really reflective of at least an intuitive, if not completely self-conscious idea of this unique character of human beings as the only creative species.

ROSS: Xi Jinping – I forget the occasion of his making his speech – but in some recent remarks that he made, he had traced through the history of mankind. He was detailing all the big discoveries that made modern humanity possible; but he went all the way back. Fire, metallurgy; he talked about in the past 200 years, the incredible revolutions of steam power, of chemistry, electricity. So, there's definitely a recognition that something very special happened in a scientific way coming out of Europe from the period of the Renaissance; that's undeniable. The aspect of it that was universal, you bring up the work that Leibniz was doing about 300 years ago to try to maintain and have a dialogue with China; to have an opportunity for European science to make inroads into China, to uplift people's living standard there and to find more collaborators to work on things with. And also at the same time, his view that Chinese natural philosophy, or natural theology, or an outlook on the world and on social relations, that there was a potential for the rest of the world to learn a great deal about that from China. His view

was that if one were to ignore Christianity, which he saw as given as a revealed religion based on – in other words, it wasn't a discovery that anybody could have made. It occurred through a personality who was in the Western world. That leaving that aside, China was superior in its moral and cultural outlook.

The attacks on it today are pretty astonishing. People saying, "Oh, look at China's economy; it's faltering. Look their growth rate is only 10 times ours; it used to be 20 times ours. They're going down." Meanwhile, it's just negative interest rates; it's obvious where the growth is coming from. Also, the way they have to play up the idea of China being a threat; it sort of seems like a psychological case of projection almost.

STEINBERG: Sure, yeah. I think it was pointed out that in the case of Russia that the U.S. defense budget, when you count in all of the defense expenditures, is over \$1 trillion a year. There's a \$1 trillion program to completely overhaul and modernize our nuclear weapons arsenal; and that's in the Department of Energy budget. That doesn't even show up in the \$600 billion Pentagon budget. That's \$1 trillion that's going into preparation for the insanity of being able to launch, fight, and win a nuclear war. Russia's entire defense budget is \$84 billion; so it's literally less than 10% of the U.S.'s. And China similarly; it's a fraction of what the U.S. is spending.

OGDEN: Yeah, as Stephen Cohen said, Russia knows how to do

counter-terrorism; we don't know how to do it very well.

ROSS: We're certainly not acting on it if we do have that knowledge.

OGDEN: And I think there is an element, as Mr. LaRouche was emphasizing, of President Putin's own unique insight as a world leader. Going back to the very beginnings of his Presidency, with what he did in Chechnya to defeat the threat of Islamic terrorism there; he said the threat here is that Russia is Balkanized. That we become the new Yugoslavia. And what would that imply for the civilization of the world? But even going back to the fact that Putin's background is as an intelligence officer, he very well knows that the source of this whole Islamic terrorism threat has its roots in the Al-Yamamah deal and the efforts that were made by Prince Bandar and Margaret Thatcher at that time to deploy the mujahideen in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union. The Al-Yamamah deal was a Cold War deal; and the fact that this has not been dismantled, means that this is still an active threat.

STEINBERG: The other thing that sort of begs that same question is, is it that we're not good at it? Or really on the other side? I think you've got to look at the case of this shooter down in Orlando – Omar Mateen; and consider the fact that he was employed for 7-8 years by a British company called G4S, which is the third-largest private corporation in the world,

behind Walmart and some Asian supermarket chain. It's a mercenary company; it's a "private security company". They're involved in mercenary activities all over the world. They were in Iraq as part of the so-called "contractors" involved in the occupation. In Israel, they man the checkpoints; they provide the technology. They are the security for the illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank. Here in the United States, they have the contracts to provide the security for 90% of the nuclear power plants in the U.S.. They're a major contractor for the Department of Homeland Security. And they had this ticking time bomb on the payroll; even when he was under investigation by the FBI for a period of a year, his job was never in jeopardy. You almost get the sense that these British companies maintain a small army of people who are severely mentally disturbed; who can be triggered at any time that there's a necessity for a pretext.

Remember that in January of 2001, Mr. LaRouche gave testimony in opposition to John Ashcroft's confirmation as Attorney General; because he said the character of the Bush administration was that they would look to create a Reichstag Fire incident to go for dictatorship. That was seven months before the 9/11 attacks that that warning was issued; and it was absolutely prescient. So, I think what Dr. Lin said in her article, that the U.S. and the British – although she focussed on the United States – have used these jihadists as tools in a policy of regime change that has destabilized the Middle East and a lot of other parts of the world. We are part of this jihadist structure; the British – pivotally so through things like

Al-Yamamah – but for the last 15 years with the Bush administration and now Obama, we've been part of that same equation. So, this is something that we've got to face the cold hard truth of if we're ever going to deal with this problem.

OGDEN: And you see this rabid opposition to even the declassification of the 28 pages and the 9/11 Report. What Brennan is doing right now to run cover for the Saudis, is disgusting.

STEINBERG: And who did Obama meet with today?

OGDEN: Prince Salman; exactly. Well, I think with the activation of this Walter Jones bill, this is definitely going one step further; and I think a lot of people have begun to recognize that you have to call out Obama for what he's done on this front. We've celebrated the courage that Senator Mike Gravel had on this when he exposed the Pentagon Papers in the 1970s; and I think that this continues to inspire people. Obviously, it has inspired Walter Jones. The depth of the resolution is, I think, beyond your average fare for Congressional "Whereas" clauses. What it says in terms of citing George Washington, in terms of citing the Supreme Court case in support of Mike Grave; and just generally making the point. And also not pulling your punches on the Saudi aspect of this; it names explicitly the Saudi government and the role that this has played. And Bob Graham has repeatedly warned – and I think this every single time there is an attack of this nature, it has to be repeated – the fact that the 28 pages were not declassified,

means that the logistical support network that was in place before 9/11, which enabled the 9/11 attackers to do what they did, was not dismantled. And for all we know, is very well still in place; and a lot of the connections. The Sarasota aspect of the cover-up by the FBI of the 80,000 pages, this speaks to the fact that this attack happened in Orlando. Then, there's the entire southern California aspect, which was documented in the investigations that went into putting together the 28 pages. I know you've said a lot about this already, Jeff, but all of these points have to continually be touched upon.

CHRISTIE: I would just add, I think that that as a flank is very crucial; because it goes right to the gut – not just of Obama and the cover-up – but more simply of the Bush crowd and their illegal wars that we've launched since under the guise of so-called terrorism after 9/11. Targetting nations that had nothing to do with it, but really had to do with the geopolitical games against Russia, China, and India. But as Mr. LaRouche mentioned on the occasion of the Orlando incident with this Mateen shooting up the club; Mr. LaRouche brought it back to Al-Yamamah. That you have to see it in a much larger context; these are not isolated cases. So, I think the flank of the 28 pages goes right to that whole structure that has been brought in since the Al-Yamamah deal, which has been connected to the various aspects of the financial system and so forth. What Mrs. LaRouche said is, if you look at everything, we are at an absolute {punctum saliens} moment; where you have – as we

discussed at the opening of the show – the question of vote on the Brexit on the 23rd, which is already having huge implications. Obviously, we don't know all the details, but it's highly likely that this assassination of the British Member of Parliament was related to this. You have the Brexit vote, you have the financial collapse; now admitted that they're going back to the crazy mortgage fraud that had threatened to bring down the system in 2007-2008. You have the German bonds trading at negative interest rates; Japan's central bank putting out negative interest rates. You just have all of this coming together. The war games and the desperation by the British. And what Mr. LaRouche said is that we have a situation that is unpredictable. And I think what that means for all of us and our fellow Americans, is to say that this really is open for what we decide to do.

In other words, there may be various players who might have all their different ideas of what to do in this moment of crisis; but we have to have the sense that we know what to do because of what Lyn and Helga have done over these decades. And this is an opportunity now to take the leadership and demand that our program and policies be implemented. But even more importantly perhaps, is a way of thinking about it; and a way of creativity being at the forefront of what we think of economics, of what we think of human relations in general. So, we just seize on

this
moment of the {punctum saliens}; that this is the time to
exert
leadership.

OGDEN: I think that's a very well-stated point to
close our
show on. Again, the {punctum saliens} – the pregnant moment;
the moment of decision. As Jeff mentioned, by the time we
meet
here next week, the Brexit vote will have occurred; a lot is
changing very rapidly. We have a lot to watch from that.

I would like to thank everybody for joining me here
today.

Thanks, Jeff and Jason both; and also Dave and Megan for
joining

us via video. And thank you all for tuning in; please stay
tuned

to larouchepac.com for critical daily updates. If you have
not

yet subscribed to the LaRouche PAC Daily email, you may do
that

through our website. And if you have not yet subscribed to
our

YouTube channel, please subscribe to our YouTube channels to
be

sure that you do not miss any of our regularly scheduled shows
here on larouchepac.com. So, thank you very much and good
night.

De neokonservative i USA stiller sig bag Hillary

16. juni, 2016 – Den neokonservative krigsmaskine i Washington satser alt, den har, på, at Hillary Clinton bliver den næste præsident. Ikke blot har den neokonservative Robert Kagan, [viceudenrigsminister for europæiske og eurasiske anliggender]Victoria Nulands mand, støttet Hillary som den næste præsident, men han har medforfattet en rapport produceret af Centret for Ny Amerikansk Sikkerhed (CNAS), "Udvidelse af amerikansk magt: Strategier for Udvidelse af Amerikansk Engagement i en Rivaliserende Verdensorden", som i en artikel d. 14. juni i Off-Guardian.com beskrives som intet mindre end en nyt 'Projekt for et Nyt Amerikansk Århundrede' (PNAC), der, i sin oprindelige udgave fra slutningen af 1990'erne, udgjorde den neokonservative perspektivplan for G.W. Bush-regeringen. Foruden Kagans navn tæller den nye perspektivplan også navnene James Rubin, en tidligere talsmand for Udenrigsministeriet under Bill Clinton-regeringen; tidligere undersekretær for Forsvarsministeriet i den anden G.W. Bush-regering Eric Edelman; tidligere stabschef for det Hvide Hus under G.W. Bush Stephen J. Hadley, og tidligere undersekretær for Forsvarsministeriet Michele Flournoy, blandt andre. Flournoy, grundlægger og direktør for CNAS og en af arkitekterne bag NATO's bombing af Libyen i 2011, skal iflg. udbredte rygter være Hillarys valg som den næste forsvarsminister.

I korthed hævder rapporten, at den amerikansk kontrollerede verdensorden udfordres af sådanne som Rusland, Kina, islamisk radikalisme og et skift i den globale økonomi – hvilket fordrer en "fornyelse" af amerikansk lederskab i Europa, Asien og Mellemøsten. Dette kræver først og fremmest et stort løft i amerikanske forsvarsudgifter.

USA, hævder rapporten, "har stadig den militære, økonomiske og

politiske magt til at spille den ledende rolle med at beskytte en stabil international orden, baseret på regler." Opgaven for den næste præsident vil blive at sikre, at USA har viljen til at lede. Hovedtruslen mod denne "vilje til at lede" er imidlertid ikke Rusland, Kina eller nogen anden ydre faktor, men snarere det amerikanske folk, der måske er ved at være trætte efter 15 års evindelige krige. "Det er nødvendigt, at ansvarlige politiske ledere forklarer en ny generation af amerikanere, hvor vigtig denne verdensorden er for deres velbefindende, og hvor vital Amerikas rolle i at opretholde den, er."

Obama, Orlando og det anglo-saudiske terrornetværk.

Kort video, engelsk

– Det masseorderiske voldsorgie i Orlando, Florida, er blot det seneste i en række forfærdelige terrorangreb, der, ligesom 11. september 2001, udspringer af den 30 år gamle Al Yamama olie-for-våben-aftale mellem de britiske og saudiske monarkier. En aftale, der skabte nutidens jihadistiske apparat som et dække for krigsoperationer, der har til formål at destabilisere rivaliserende nationer, med Rusland og Kina som hovedmål. Få hele historie her: lpac.co/orlando

Nyhedsorientering, maj/juni 2016:

Stop NATO's fremprovokation af atomkrig

Af Tom Gillesberg: Goldman Sachs fik sin kæmpebonus. Vil et britisk nej til EU lede til euroens kollaps, kaos i EU og udløse et internationalt finanskraak værre end i 2008? NATO er i gang med den største militæropbygning langs Ruslands grænse siden 2. verdenskrig. Kan vi forhindre en fortsat konfrontationspolitik, der vil føre til atomkrig? Putin åbner den asiatiske flanke, og Obamas plan for asiatisk NATO vendt imod Kina fejler. Terrorangrebet i Orlando viser, hvorfor de hemmelighedsstemplede 28- sider om terrorangrebet den 11. september 2001 må frigives. De netværk, der blev etableret og finansieret af Storbritannien og Saudi-Arabien gennem den såkaldte al-Yamama våbenhandelsaftale, og som blev beskyttet af FBI, stod ikke blot bag udåden i 2001, men står stadig bag blodige terroranslag. De er også kilden til Islamisk Stat og andre terrororganisationers store fremgang, for lande som Saudi-Arabien, Qatar og Tyrkiet har støttet dem i deres forsøg på at tage magten i Irak og Syrien. Læs mere på www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13111.

Dette er en redigeret udgave af et foredrag af Schiller Instituttets formand Tom Gillesberg den 9. juni 2016. Se foredraget og den medfølgende diskussion på www.schillerinstitut.dk/si/?p=13061.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

STOP 3. Verdenskrig: International terror. »Efter 'De 28 sider' – 11. september: Ti år senere«. Video, engelsk.

Følgende præsentation indeholder arkivoptagelser af angrebene på World Trade Center og Pentagon, den 11. september 2001.

Lyndon LaRouche, juni 2007: »Verden har levet under et system, som er 11. september-systemet – der allerede eksisterede, som jeg advarede om, i begyndelsen af 2001. FØR præsident George W. Bush blev indsat første gang, og hvor jeg sagde, 'Verdens system har nået et punkt, hvor et fremstormende kollaps af systemet nu er i gang. Og jeg sagde dengang, at faren består i, at noget lignende dette vil indtræffe, under de nuværende tendenser i USA, og det indtraf! Og det hed '9/11' – 11. september.'«

Se også: **USA: I har nøglerne til at standse terrorbølgen. Brug dem!**

Se også: **»Den anglo-saudiske baggrund for den aktuelle, internationale terrorisme: Frigiv sandheden, og lad os lukke imperiemagternes topstyrede terrorapparat ned, én gang for alle!«**

Leder: USA: I har nøglerne til at standse terrorbølgen: Brug dem!

**– Samt en kort gennemgang af det britiske og saudiske monarkis rolle i international terror gennem de seneste 30 år, inkl. video:
‘Beyond the 28 Pages – 9/11, Ten Years Later’**

13. juni 2016 (Leder) – Det masseorderiske voldsorgie i Orlando, Florida, angiveligt begået af en tilhænger af Islamisk Stat, Omar Mateen, er blot det seneste i en række af forfærdelige terrorangreb, der alle udspringer af den tredive år gamle »olieaftale« mellem det britiske og det saudiske monarki. Denne aftale har givet dem stor magt og store, skjulte ressourcer til at skabe nutidens globale jihadistiske organisation for angreb imod nationer.

Med mindre, og før, denne anglo-saudiske organisation afsløres – som vi kan gøre det med afsløringen af de dokumenter om 11. september, der er blevet hemmeligholdt i 15 år – og opløses, vil verden konstant stå over for blinde terrorangreb, over alt

og til enhver tid.

Præsident Obama blev en overlagt og villig agent for briterne og saudierne i sine evindelige krige, der har spredt kaos i hele Mellemøsten og Nordafrika, og terror i hele verden.

Hvilket »sammenræs«, at Obama skal mødes med den saudiske kronprins Salman i Washington, mens hans CIA-direktør, John Brennan, gør sit yderste for at »frikende« Saudi-Arabien for sin rolle i at arrangere angrebene den 11. september og drabene på 3.000 amerikanere. Både Obama og Prins Salman mødes med blodige hænder.

EIR's stiftende redaktør Lyndon LaRouche bemærkede i dag, at han har været klar over denne britisk-saudiske magt for ondskab i årtier; og at dette bidrog til, at han den 2. januar, 2001, fremkom med en særdeles offentlig og publiceret advarsel om, at der forelå en trussel om et større terrorangreb mod USA, der ville finde sted i efteråret 2001.

»Det er stadig det samme, det drejer sig om, selv i gårsdagens masse mord i Orlando«, sagde LaRouche.

Den unge Orlando-drabsmand var rejst til Saudi-Arabien i 2011 og 2012, mens han var ansat i det britiske, internationale sikkerhedsfirma G4S; og han kom tilbage som en tilsyneladende meget forandret person.

LaRouche understregede, at, fordi Obamas krige nu umiddelbart fører til en konfrontation med Rusland, og truer med at blive til Tredje Verdenskrig, er det af afgørende betydning at afsløre de saudisk/britiske hænder bag – begyndende med 11. september – og at tvinge Obama ud.

'Aftalen', der lancerede 1000 angreb

I 1985 indgik Prins Bandar bin-Sultan, daværende saudisk ambassadør til USA, et langvarigt partnerskab med den britiske regering under daværende premierminister Margaret Thatcher. Under dække af en olie-for-våben-aftale ved navn Al Yamamah (arabisk for »duen«), etablerede de britiske og saudiske monarkier en offshore-fond, der voksede til enorme proportioner og er blevet brugt til at føre global terrorisme imod udpegede nationer.

I løbet af de mere end 30 år, siden Al Yamamah blev lanceret, har de britiske og saudiske monarkier ophobet langt over \$100 mia. i en kæde af hemmelige offshore-fonde, til finansiering af terrorisme, politiske mord, kupplaner og andre forbrydelser som den aktuelle saudisk/britisk/amerikanske invasion og bombing af Yemen.

Under Al Yamamah sendte den britiske våbenproducent BAE Systems for anslået \$40 mia. våben til det Saudiske Forsvars- og Luftvåbenministerium, og for anslået yderligere \$20 mia. i bestikkelser til saudiske prinser og regeringsfolk inden for forsvaret. Til gengæld sendte saudierne 600.000 tønder olie pr. dag til briterne. Gennem de anglo-hollandske oliegi-ganter British Petroleum og Royal Dutch Shell blev olien solgt på de internationale spotmarkeder og skabte profitter for hundreder af milliarder af dollars. En *EIR*-undersøgelse fra 2007 anslog, at, som et minimum, blev \$100 mia. i overskud ophobet og deponeret i hemmelige offshore bankkonti, til brug for hemmelige, fælles anglo-saudiske operationer.

I en officiel biografi pralede Prins Bandar med at bruge disse hemmelige midler og med den særlige natur af Al Yamamah-aftalen, som kun kunne have været gennemført mellem to absolutte monarkier, der kunne agere over loven og udviske

skellet mellem offentlige og private handlinger.

ISIS har, med andre ord, absolut IKKE været verdens rigeste, islamistiske terroroperation.

I 2007, da de britiske medier gennemførte en begrænset afsløring af Al Yamamah-bestikkelsesskandalen, lukkede den britiske premierminister Tony Blair den britiske Afdeling for Alvorligt Bedrageris (SF0) efterforskning, med den begrundelse, at det anglo-saudiske partnerskab var af afgørende betydning for den britiske nationale sikkerhed. Ordren til at lukke efterforskningen kom få timer efter, at den schweiziske regering havde besluttet at give SF0 adgang til de hemmelige bankkonti, tilhørende Wafiq Said, en stråmand for Al Yamamah-midlerne.

Al Yamamah-aftalen var en lukrativ transaktion for Prins Bandar, som fik en kommission for sin rolle i lanceringen af programmet på mindst \$2 mia. (amerikanske efterretningskilder anslår, at Bandar fik mere end \$10 mia. for aftalen).

Spørgsmålet om 3.000 dræbte amerikanere

Bandar er direkte indblandet i angrebene den 11. september på World Trade Center og Pentagon. Penge fra den personlige bankkonto tilhørende Bandar og hans hustru, prinsesse Haifa (søster til den mangeårige direktør for saudisk efterretning, Prins Turki-al-Faisal), blev videregivet til to af de oprindelige flykaprere fra 11. september, Khalid al-Mihdhar og Nawaf al-Hazmi, via de saudiske efterretningsofficerer Omar al-Bayoumi og Osama Basnan. Penge overførtes fra Bank of Englands konti fra det Britiske Forsvarsministeriums Støttekontor til Forsvarseksport (DESO) til Bandars konto i

Riggs National Banks. Desuden modtog al-Bayoumi og Basnan penge gennem en 'skygge'-ansættelse i et saudisk forsvarsfirma, Dalah Aviation, der var eneste entrepriseindehaver for det Saudiske Forsvarsministerium.

En føderal dommer (dvs. udpeget af præsidenten) i Sarasota, Florida, gennemgår nu flere end 80.000 sider af tilbageholdte FBI-dokumenter, der drejer sig om en celle bestående af flykaprerne den 11. september, og dennes forbindelser til en prominent, rig, saudisk forretningsmand med stærke bånd til det saudiske monarki. Nogle uger før angrebene den 11. september, forlod den saudiske familie, der opholdt sig i et indhegnet bosted i Sarasota, meget pludseligt landet. De efterlod sig ejendele, der indikerede, at de brød op med meget kort varsel. FBI gennemførte en uddybende undersøgelse af familien, fordi de husede tre af flykaprerne fra 11. september, inkl. ringlederen Mohammed Atta i mange tilfælde, iflg. sikkerhedslogs og videooptagelser, der viser Atta og de andre gå ind og ud af ejendommen.

FBI hemmeligholdt dokumenterne og det faktum, at de foretog en undersøgelse, for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse og 11. september-kommissionen. Tidligere senator Bob Graham, der var med-formand i den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, hævder nu, at eksistensen af forbindelsen mellem de saudiske royale og Sarasota-cellen, når dette ses i sammenhæng med beviset for den saudiske regerings støtte til San Diego-cellen, nu rejser yderligere spørgsmål om angrebene 11. september. Hvad med Herndon, staten Virginia, og Paterson, staten New Jersey, har senator Graham offentligt spurgt?

Et 47 sider langt dokument, skrevet af de to stabsmedlemmer af 11. september-kommissionen, der tidligere havde arbejdet for den Fælles Kongresundersøgelse, og som havde skrevet det 28 sider lange, undertrykte kapitel, identificerede i alt 20 saudiske regeringsfolk med beviselige bånd til de 19 flykaprere forud for angrebene 11. september.

Disse forbindelser gik fra det sydlige Californien til den Saudiske Ambassade i Washington og til den Saudiske Ambassade i Berlin, Tyskland. Tidligere flådeminister John Lehman, medlem af 11. sept.-kommissionen, sagde til '60 Minutes', at kommissionen ikke førte en uddybende undersøgelse af de ledetråde, der burde have været forfulgt, og som relaterede til det saudiske monarki og det saudiske regimes støtte til flykaprerne. Lehman, blandt andre kommissionsmedlemmer, har krævet en tilbundsgående, fra øverst til nederst, ny undersøgelse af 11. sept. – en undersøgelse, hvor alle de undertrykte ledetråde og åbne spor til de saudiske royale fuldt ud forfølges.

I løbet af denne trediveårige periode med Al Yamamah-programmet er der flydt penge fra disse hemmelige offshore-konti, så vel som også gennem saudiske velgørenhedsorganisationer, til finansiering af et globalt netværk af moskeer og madrasser (skoler), der har rekrutteret flere generationer til det ekstreme wahhabi/salafist-apparat, som udgør rekrutteringspuljen til sunni jihadistisk terror over hele verden.

Hvad der skal gøres

De beviser, der indeholdes i det stadig hemmeligstemplede, 28 sider lange kapitel af den oprindelige Fælles Kongresundersøgelse af 11. sept., åbner døren til en optrevling af hele det anglo-saudiske terrorapparat. Uden en forståelse af den rolle, som det britiske monarki og de britiske efterretningstjenester har spillet i det jihadistiske apparat, er det umuligt at lukke dets evne til at operere ned.

CIA-direktøren fremførte i et interview søndag, at amerikanere »ikke burde tro på« dette 28-siders kapitel, som han nu frygter, vil blive tvunget til at blive frigivet, med en

ophævelse af hemmeligstemplingen. Men et republikansk medlem af Kongressen rapporterede i et tweet, »CIA-direktøren må referere til nogle andre 28 sider end dem, jeg har læst. Frigiv dem, og lad det amerikanske folk træffe afgørelsen.« I har i jeres hænder midlerne til at gå til modangreb mod denne britisk/saudiske operation. Brug dem. Fremtving en offentliggørelse af de saudiske beviser. Fremtving Obamas afgang. »Dette må gøres hurtigt«, sagde LaRouche i dag, »for at forhindre yderligere international ødelæggelse.«

Video: *'Beyond the 28-pages – 9/11: Ten Years Later'* – Otte måneder før angrebene 11. september, 2001, forudsagde Lyndon LaRouche, at USA havde en høj risiko for en begivenhed à la 'Rigsdagsbranden', en begivenhed, der ville gøre det muligt for dem, der var ved magten, gennem diktatoriske midler at styre en økonomisk og samfundsmæssig krise, som de i modsat fald ikke var kompetente til at håndtere. Vi lever nu i det ubrudte kølvand af dette stykke historie.

Titelbillede: Obama og Kong Salman bin Abdulaziz under et af præsidentens mange besøg i Saudi-Arabien samtidig med, at han opretholdt mørklægningen af 11. september. [flickr/whitehouse]

]

Barske ord; Hvem kan høre dem?

(Lyndon LaRouche) – Hovedtale ved konferencen i San Francisco (v/Helga Zepp-LaRouche)

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det

9. juni 2016 (Leder) – I går lykkedes det næsten indgriben fra FBI at forhindre Lyndon LaRouches deltagelse via internet i en stor konference i Nordcalifornien, arrangeret af hans medarbejdere. Hvis ikke lederskabet dér havde grebet ind i tide, ville LaRouche ikke have kunnet deltage.

Da LaRouche endelig kunne tale, var hans udgangspunkt den aktuelle, akutte trussel mod den menneskelige eksistens.

»Det væsentligste spørgsmål, jeg bekymrer mig om, er truslerne mod den menneskelige arts eksistens, i det totale område, lige nu. For, lige nu, på dette tidspunkt, står hele den menneskelige arts eksistens på den yderste rand, og vi må derfor være lydhøre over for at forstå, hvad det er for problemer, der er involveret i det her, og hvad det er for midler, der kan sikre en udvej for menneskeheden generelt.

Netop nu befinder den generelle menneskehed sig under en alvorlig trussel om undergang, på global skala. Det betyder ikke, at det nødvendigvis vil finde sted. Det betyder, at, hvis vi gør de rigtige ting, kan vi undfly disse trusler. Det er, hvor vi står generelt, lige nu. Og hvis du vil gøre noget ved det, så lad os tale om det.«

Men fra dette øjeblik og fremefter – lad os sige det ligeud – rev hovedindholdet i LaRouches bemærkninger slemme i nerverne på mange lyttere. Han blev ved med at komme tilbage til spørgsmålet om personlig identitet, men især spørgsmålet om hans egen personlige identitet. På et spørgsmål om, hvordan det individuelle sind overvinder forhindringer for at vinde en kamp for menneskeheden, svarede han:

»Lad mig sige, at jeg har temmelig gode levnedsegenskaber. Jeg er en aktiv person i samfundet, og jeg er en ældre person, og en erfaren, ældre person, en af de mest erfarne af alle personer i denne kategori. Så jeg tror ikke, nogen ville have nogen vanskeligheder med at forstå, hvem jeg er, hvad jeg er, hvor jeg kom fra og hvad jeg gør.

Andre personer holder måske fast ved en idé om en anden identitet hos en anden person, som jeg ikke kender, men sådan synes det at være.«

LaRouche drejede næsten hvert spørgsmål rundt på denne måde. Dette her irriterer dig måske, men det første spørgsmål, du skal stille dig selv, er: er det sandt? Er det sådan, at »tingene bare sker«, eller er det sådan, at »tingene bringes til at ske« af mænd og kvinder, der, som LaRouche sagde, er »kvalificeret til at skabe historie?« Da MacArthur blev tvunget ud af Filippinerne den 12. marts 1942, var det da rigtigt af ham at sige, »Jeg vender tilbage«, eller burde han have ændret det til »vi vender tilbage? Ville mennesket have klaret at komme til Månen i 1969 – eller nogensinde – hvis det ikke havde været for den enlige skikkelse, den første og største tyske rumpioner, Hermann Oberth (1894-1989). Oberth var fattig det meste af sit liv. Efter at have kæmpet for rumrejser i årtier, havde han næppe mødt en eneste person, der både var enig i, og forstod, disses betydning. Men det er takket være denne »næppe en eneste person«, såsom Werner von Braun, at vi fik den revolution, som var rumprogrammet.

På et spørgsmål om, hvordan vi kan afgøre, hvorvidt vore

forestillinger er fantasteri eller er sandfærdige, svarede LaRouche:

»Hvorfor siger vi simpelthen ikke, lad os identificere et sandfærdigt eksempel, en sandfærdig identitet. Jeg er. Og enhver, der vil benægte dette, ville tage fejl, ville være tåbelig.

Jeg er kendt som, identificeret som en historisk skikkelse igennem det meste af det 20. århundrede, og de fleste mennesker fra det 20. århundrede bør vide, hvem jeg er, og de bør vide, hvad jeg gør. De kender måske ikke alle detaljer omkring, hvad jeg gør, men sådan er det: Jeg er en prominent, en særdeles prominent, skikkelse på denne planet, blandt de mest prominente.«

Den senere del af det 20. århundrede ville have været uigenkendelig, hvis det ikke havde været for LaRouches sejr over det britiske, økonomiske system i en debat i 1971 på Queens College, New York, som dernæst, ad indirekte veje, førte til hans sejr med det **Strategiske Forsvarsinitiativ i Reaganregeringen i 1983.**

Dette banede igen vejen for hans og hans hustru Helgas initiativ, som nu er blevet til den Eurasiske Landbro og den Nye Silkevej, og som er det 21. århundredes hovedudvikling frem til i dag.

Hvorfor er det så irriterende at lytte til det indlysende: at LaRouche er en hovedskikkelse i det 20. og 21. århundrede? Fordi vi i skolen lærte om demokratiets dyder? Er det den virkelige årsag, eller skyldes det snarere, at vi lukker ørerne, fordi vi finder det mere beroligende for os personligt at benægte, at nogen mand eller kvinde rent faktisk kan være ansvarlig for menneskets tilstand og menneskehedens skæbne?

Læs her Helga Zepp-LaRouches hovedindlæg på konferencen i San Francisco, Californien, den 8. juni:

“Vi må atter blive sande amerikanere”.

**LaRouchePAC Internationale
Fredags-webcast, 10. juni
2016**

Jeg vil indlede vores diskussion med at påpege, hvad hr. LaRouche i de seneste dage meget klart har sagt: Vi befinder os i en ekstraordinært farlig periode i verdenshistorien. Det kan ikke ses tydeligere end af disse militærmanøvrer, der finder sted på de østeuropæiske grænser (Ruslands vestlige grænser). Disse kombinerede NATO-øvelser, der finder sted hele vejen op og ned langs Ruslands grænse, fra De baltiske Stater, ind i Polen og derfra mod syd. Dette er en kombination af fire forskellige, angiveligt uafhængige krigsspil, men det involverer live troppemanøvrer, af hvilke den største hedder "Anaconda 2016". Denne manøvre involverer 30.000 tropper fra 24 forskellige lande, inkl. 14.000 amerikanere, 12.000 polakker, 1000 faldskærmstropper og den virkelige krydsning af

nøglefloden dér, Vistuta-floden; samt træning af natlige angreb, tungt militærisenkram, 35 helikoptere, 3.000 militærkøretøjer, flådemanoøvrer osv.

Engelsk udskrift.

WE MUST BECOME TRUE AMERICANS AGAIN!

LaRouche PAC Friday Webcast; June 10, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good Evening! It's June 10th, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden, and you joining us for our weekly Friday evening webcast here from larouchepac.com. As you'll notice, we're taking a little bit of a different format than customary today. We have a roundtable format, joined in the studio by Megan Beets and Ben Deniston, from the LaRouche PAC basement science team; and also Kesha Rogers and Mike Steger are both joining us from the LaRouche PAC Policy Committee via video. So, we're going to have a little bit of a freer kind of roundtable discussion here.

I'd like to begin our discussion by just pointing out, what I think has been said very, very clearly in the recent days by Mr. LaRouche, that we're in an extraordinarily dangerous period of world history. This couldn't be made more clear than seeing these military maneuvers which are happening on the eastern border of Europe (the western border of Russia). These combined NATO maneuvers which are happening all the way up and down the border of Russia, from the Baltic States, into Poland, and then south from there. This is a combination of four different, supposedly independent, war games, but it involves live troop

maneuvers, the largest of which is called "Anaconda 2016." That one involves 30,000 troops from 24 different countries, including 14,000 Americans, 12,000 Polish soldiers, 1,000 paratroopers, the actual crossing of the key river there, the Vistula River; and the exercise of nighttime assaults, military hardware, 35 helicopters, 3,000 military vehicles, naval maneuvers, and so forth.

If you take that, together with the three other maneuvers that are happening right now, you have approximately 60,000 troops that are engaged in military maneuvers all along the border of Russia. As Helga LaRouche pointed out, this the greatest troop and military hardware maneuver that you've had on Russia's border since World War II – the mobilization by Hitler of the Nazi forces prior to the invasion of what was then the Soviet Union. Obviously, this many troops engaged in live military maneuvers, not only creates a very strong possibility for some accident occurring, which could trigger a rapid escalation towards a very hot war, which could escalate very quickly; but also it's very clearly a provocation, which is being taken by NATO with Obama in the leadership, directly towards Russia. And it's being seen as such in the context of other things, by the Russian President and other leading members of the Russian military. It's also being recognized as such by various forces within Europe. {Der Spiegel}, one of the leading news magazines in Germany, put out a story on Wednesday, saying these war maneuvers along the Russian borders, are "going too far", and

"are playing at real war". Clearly, any war that were to break out between NATO and Russia would very quickly lead to not a limited, not a tactical, but an all-out strategic, thermonuclear war.

If you combine this with Obama's upcoming trip to attend the NATO Heads of State Summit in Warsaw, Poland, while these war games are actively taking place, along with his refusal to sit down with President Putin to discuss the deployment of these AEGIS anti-missile systems along the Russian border, which have been characterized as a "Cuban Missile Crisis in Reverse," along with the trillion dollar allocation that Obama has recently signed off on, to modernize the U.S. military arsenal, including these B61-12 nuclear warheads, and the long-range LRSO [Long Range Standoff] cruise missiles; all of these, taken together, along with the simultaneous provocations that are happening by U.S. forces against China in the South China Sea.

Any sane person should be asking themselves, "Why are we driving the world towards the point of a war of extinction, when we could be taking up Chinese President Xi Jinping's offer to engage in a new strategic and economic architecture for the planet, based on win-win cooperation?" This danger, and also the very real possibility of a paradigm shift, were both put on the table at a very significant seminar sponsored by the Schiller Institute that occurred on Wednesday in San Francisco, California. Both Kesha and Mike were participants. It was titled, "Will the U.S. Join the New Silk Road? Global Scientific

Development, or Nuclear War?" Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave an extensive and very thorough overview of this war danger in her keynote address; and Mr. LaRouche, in his remarks, said very clearly – this is the very beginning of what Mr. LaRouche said,

"The key thing I'm concerned about, is the threats to the existence of the human species in the total area right now; because right now, at this time, the existence of the entire human species continues to be on the edge of jeopardy. And therefore we have to attune ourselves to understanding what the

problems are that are involved in this, and what are the remedies

for which we can get an escape for humanity in general. Humanity

in general right now is under serious threat of jeopardy on a global scale." So, that's very clearly said by Mr. LaRouche.

Also, I consider very significantly, in response to a question which was posed from former United States Senator Mike

Gravel, who was also a participant, a speaker in this seminar. He

posed a question to one of the other participants, Sergey Petrov,

the Consul-General of the Russian Consulate in San Francisco, to

which Mr. Petrov said that there is no such thing as a limited nuclear war, as some as some people would be delusional enough to

believe. What the Consul-General of Russia said at the Schiller

Institute gathering in San Francisco, is the following: "I share

the understanding that we are very close to a major conflict. And

I add that there is no possibility of a 'limited nuclear war.' If

that starts, it will be the end of the world."

I think the starkness of this statement, combined with what

Mr. LaRouche and Mrs. LaRouche both had to say, really underscores the sobriety with which we have to approach the discussion which we will have here today. Since both Kesha and Mike were participants in that seminar, I'm going to leave a little bit of the further discussion of the proceedings of that

event until a little bit later in the show. The seminar also involved Mr. Howard Chang, an internationally renowned expert on water projects.

But before we open up the discussion, I would like to play a

short – approximately 10 minute – excerpt from the keynote speech that Mrs. Helga LaRouche gave. This is the concluding excerpt of her remarks. She asked two questions: (1) How did we

get here?; and (2) What is the solution to the crisis we now face? I just want to underscore, what you'll hear Mrs. LaRouche

say in this excerpt, is what Mr. LaRouche reiterated, and I think

is the subject that we have to pay attention to here today: that

both the LaRouche movement in general, and Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche

as individuals, {have played the crucial, central, historical role} in not only creating the possibility for a solution to this

crisis, going all the way back to their proposal for the Eurasian

Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, in the aftermath of the collapse

of the Soviet Union; but also continued to play the crucial role

in providing the possibility for humanity to escape this crisis.

This seminar in San Francisco was a crucial element of that, but it's part of an ongoing series of interventions internationally, which include a very prominent conference in Europe that the Schiller Institute is sponsoring, coming up within the next two weeks. So, we'll have more discussion on all of that after we hear this short except from Mrs. Helga LaRouche's keynote speech.

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Okay, now, let me introduce the third [subject I want to talk about]. The solution to all of this would be a piece of cake. It is already there! A New Silk Road is integrated. We called it at that time, first, the Productive Triangle; in 1991 we called it the Eurasian Land-Bridge: the New Silk Road, which was the idea that when the Iron Curtain had fallen, [to integrate] the populations in the industrial centers of Europe with those of Asia, through development corridors. This New Silk Road program would have changed the world in the direction of a peace order already in '91, but, unfortunately, you had Bush, Sr., you had Margaret Thatcher, you had François Mitterrand, who all had completely different ideas. They [wanted to reduce Russia] from a superpower into a Third World, raw-material-producing country, and they imposed the "shock therapy" in the Yeltsin period. They dismantled the Russian potential in three years, and they had no intention to allow Germany to have any kind of economic relation with Russia. So it did not happen.

You had the '90s, which were genocide against Russia. You had all of the consequences of the Bush period. You had the eight

years of Clinton, which was a certain interruption; but then with

Bush, Jr. and Obama, you went back to the old project of an American Century doctrine and the idea of a unilateral world.

Fortunately, in 2013, President Xi Jinping announced a New

Silk Road to be {the} strategic objective of China. In the almost

three years which have passed since, this idea to end geopolitics, to establish in the tradition of the ancient Silk Road, a win-win cooperation among all nations on the planet, is

progressing extremely quickly. Remember, the ancient Silk Road was a fantastic cooperation in terms of exchange of culture, goods, paper, technology, porcelain, silk, silk-producing, and many other cultural manifestations. It led to a tremendous benefit for all the countries which participated, from Asia to Europe.

The New Silk Road, obviously, is doing exactly that. The

amount of projects which have been concluded between China and ASEAN countries, China and Latin American countries, China and Europe, China and African countries, China and East European countries, and now, in a very clear fashion, the economic integration between the Eurasian Economic Union, headed by Russia, and the New Silk Road, [is progressing very well. An alliance] has been formed between Russia and China, with India being the third factor in the situation. Many, many other countries have been joining.

Contrary to what you read and hear in the mass media, China

is not doing badly. They are shifting their economic orientation

from an export orientation, because the export markets in the trans-Atlantic sector are shrinking. They are now going more in

infrastructure investment in many countries in the world, and

to
develop the inner region of China. [To raise the] consumer [to
a]
higher standard of their own population, since they have
lifted
600 million people out of poverty, [into a] decent living
standard in China. This is indeed the absolute correct policy,
to
say we will uplift the remaining people who are still poor,
and
also make them participate in the Chinese economic miracle.

Xi Jinping has [offered] to President Obama that the
United
States [should] not only by helping to ,
which I think is the moral obligation of the United States,
given
the fact that they were the key reason why these countries are
now in such disarray; by participating in the building of
Africa,
which I think the West has an absolute moral obligation. The
reason why you have millions of people as refugees, not only
risking their lives, drowning in the Mediterranean, dying in
the
Sahara, which has even more victims than even the
Mediterranean.
Fifty years of IMF policy has denied economic development to
Africa! The reason why people are taking a risk of a 50%
chance
that they will die, to cross the Mediterranean, is because
they
are running from war, from hunger, from epidemics, and this is
the result of Western policy denying this continent economic
development! We have a moral obligation to join hands to
develop
southwest Asia, to develop Africa.

The United States also needs a Silk Road. If you look
at the

figures of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, productivity has collapsed over seven years in a row. All the indexes are going down. The United States population is in a terrible condition, or at least in the poorer parts; while the rich become more rich and Wall Street is having a heyday with cocaine parties and plotting destruction for the rest of the world.

The United States needs an infrastructure project. The roads are bad, the traffic is ridiculous. People spend hours and hours every day in commuting, risking to disappear with their cars into a pothole. They have no rail system. China has built 20,000 km fast train system up to the end of last year; they plan to have 50,000 km by the year 2020, uniting every major city in China through a fast train system, which are fantastic – they're smooth, they're fast, they're quiet. How many kilometers of fast train systems has the United States built? Zero!

So, for the United States to build its own Silk Road, to connect with the global development perspective is a question of its own best self-interest. We have to get the United States off this confrontation course, and simply say, we have to shift this policy and all this trillion-dollar investment in modernization of nuclear arsenals and the largest military budget in the world, trying to maintain an empire which is collapsing anyway.

Rather,
shift, get rid of Wall Street, impose Glass-Steagall, get back
to
a policy of Alexander Hamilton, a credit policy; invest in
infrastructure and go in the direction of a win-win
cooperation
with the other nations of the world – with Russia, China,
European nations, India; build up Latin America, build up
Africa
and Southwest Asia.

This is really the choice before the United States. I
know
this is very difficult for you to think how this should be
done,
but you know, think about Kennedy; think about the kind of
optimistic country the United States used to be. Think about
the
idea that America was built to be "a beacon of hope and a
temple
of liberty," where people from the whole world would go and
try
to be free. The U.S. singing the National Anthem, "the land of
the free." Is the United States the land of the free today? I
don't think anybody who is in their right mind would say that
today.

Go back to the values of the American Republic, as it
was
founded by people like Benjamin Franklin, or George
Washington;
go back to the policies of Alexander Hamilton, Franklin D.
Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King. I think if the
United States could mobilize itself to bring back that nation,
the whole world would love to be friends of the United
States again. Right now, I can tell you, the rest of the world
has almost given up on the United States, and when they look
at
the election process, the choice between a very, very

irrational

Donald Trump and unfortunately a very, very predictable Hillary

Clinton, given her statements about confrontation against Russia

and China. I think you have to really mobilize now. And I think

the 28 pages, Glass-Steagall – these are flanks which can derail

the situation long before this election is going to take place.

We have to have a completely new world. Remember, mankind is

not a beast, and mankind is not bound to do what seems to be inevitable. Mankind is the only species capable of reason, capable of free will, of defining and designing a beautiful future, and then going to implement that. The last time was with

Kennedy, the Apollo Project. I think we can absolutely do it again! I think you have a great possibility in front of you. I would encourage you – be American! Be true Americans again, and

the whole world will be the most happy and embrace you!

OGDEN: So, that was a short excerpt from Helga LaRouche's opening remarks at the San Francisco seminar; and the full proceedings of that seminar will be made available as they are processed. The first panel is available on YouTube now. And as

I said, both Kesha and Michael Steger were participants in that

event; so maybe I can just throw the discussion open to one of the two of you guys right now, to follow up on what we just heard

from Helga.

MICHAEL STEGER: Sure, thanks Matt. One of the most

interesting, one of the key aspects of this whole process and what our organization does, was demonstrated at the discussion process in San Francisco on Wednesday. You have key people in their areas: Obviously, Senator Mike Gravel represents what is a

true American political tradition; to recognize that you fight for what's true, you go against popular opinion and peer pressure. And he was very clear on that question; you don't go

along to get along. As Lyndon LaRouche often says, "You can't fight politically and go along with the popular opinion."

Dr. Howard Chang is a leading civil engineer; obviously the

Consul-General of Russia was someone who spoke on behalf of his

country. But the key question is that the standards our organization represents in this existential crisis is something

unique; it gives these individuals an opportunity to wage a political fight at the level necessary that inspires them towards

what mankind can accomplish, and also addresses the real crisis

in the world today. It's far too often that people who want to

address the economic crisis, people who want to address the increasing and escalating war danger, fall far short of the necessary to want to work with us. And two, to recognize the quality of method which is necessary to address these problems.

These problems are of great scope and magnitude; it's not fixing

a pothole, although we have many potholes to fix as Helga points

out. And apparently, the Chinese won't even be allowed to build

– they wanted to build a small segment of high-speed rail

between Los Angeles and Las Vegas; very easy. Actually, east of
of
Los Angeles in the desert. And I guess apparently they won't
even be allowed to build that in the United States. So, we
can't
build any high-speed rail; it's just been outlawed basically.
This just came out.

But the size and scope of these problems cannot be –
steps
cannot be taken that simply alleviate one's guilt; or the
tension
on one's own identity regarding the dangers of nuclear war, or
the increasing crisis that the economic collapse presents to
many
Americans. Too many people want to look for a quick solution;
an
easy mechanism that "Maybe I can vote for this person, or that
person." At this point, I think most people realize they
can't
vote for either of these people; yet you'll still find them
consumed to discuss "Well, who do you vote for, though?"
They're
not willing to recognize that there's a higher method which is
required to act to address this kind of crisis. And I think
if
you look at Lyndon LaRouche's comments at the discussion, he
makes this somewhat clear in his remarks. Because there is
something unique towards mankind's ability to advance.
Mankind
does not advance – unlike any other animal species on the
planet
– simply because it doesn't like the problems it sees. It's
able to advance and evolve because of a unique creative
capacity;
essentially to become more beautiful, to become more creative.
To
make the discoveries about the Universe that have not been

discovered before. And that commitment, that approach is oftentimes what's lacking; and as Helga said, we need real leadership in the United States, we need leadership in Europe today. The problem can be solved so easily.

The New Silk Road, the Eurasian development projects are so extensive, they're ongoing; there are collaborations between China, India, and Russia. And then the nations of central Asia, of Southeast Asia; the strategic intervention in the war domain in Southwest Asia; all of these are now being addressed in a fundamentally different way than they were by the United States and NATO for the last 15 years since the 9/11 attacks. Which has just been ongoing war and destruction.

So, there's a comprehensive picture that the United States and Europe could participate in. So, why aren't we? Why don't we take those steps? Simply raising red flags that we're near nuclear war, or simply complaining and trying to figure out which of the lesser evils you vote for, are just obviously insufficient. So, why does that remain the discussion? The discussion has to take on a higher standard; and I think that's what Lyn has already recognized over these 50 years. Because if you think of it, 50 years ago, there was a quality of leadership of this nature. John Kennedy recognized that the way you uplift and strengthen a country is to set out on a mission that's never been accomplished before; but it wasn't just the Moon. It was

the largest water projects, and the development of Africa.
John
Kennedy's view of the world and of the Universe had a great
scope
and magnitude to it, to help uplift the population; it wasn't
a
practical campaign. Someone like Martin Luther King had a
similar outlook; and you saw that inspire people like Bobby
Kennedy and Malcolm X, but there was a resonance. You saw the
same thing from the great scientists like Krafft Ehrlicke; the
visionaries in the space program didn't look at it as kind of
fun
engineering projects. They saw it as something of a cultural
advancement of the human species. And there was a resonance
with
this quality of leadership politically, that unfortunately, I
think what was made clear by the seminar, is that many people
are
attracted, they gravitate towards this quality of leadership
if
they have a sense of honesty; but that the ability to
demonstrate
this method, to act upon that quality of the human mind and
human
creativity is a challenge for much of the population in the
United States and Europe today. And the standard that they
have
to come up to, is not just acknowledging the dangers, but a
standard of operating to embolden and strengthen the
population
to solve these problems and to move our civilization upwards.

And I think that really was the culminating nature of
the
discussion on Wednesday at the seminar; and it really is to
bring
more people into this quality of an organization. Of what we
are

as a political organization, but that we must become what the nation is. And that requires our population must become better; they must become more courageous, more intelligent, and more beautiful if we're actually going to address these problems. Because they're not going to be addressed from any simple mechanisms; and I think that really was the fight we waged here for the seminar, and I think the only way to deal with the current crisis you presented at the beginning.

KESHA ROGERS: I want to continue with that theme, and add that I think what we have to look at is the unique role of Mr. LaRouche over these years to identify a science of physical economy; which characterizes him in a way that was the understanding of both Krafft Ehricke and other leaders from the standpoint of the rejection – shall we say people that Michael brought up, such as John F Kennedy, such as Lincoln, Martin Luther King. A rejection of a limits to growth policy. And this is what Mr. LaRouche has organized as the founding principle of his economic policy in terms of what is the essential role of the advancement of mankind.

During the presentation, I had an opportunity to actually work with Michael and others there for the conference that was just held in San Francisco. And I presented on the unique role of Krafft Ehricke, the German space pioneer; and what he represented from the standpoint of putting forth the epistemology

and the philosophy on human nature's identity in terms of creating an open world system. Which was this idea that you reject the Club of Rome meadows and foresters limits to growth population reduction; the Malthusian policy that human beings are nothing more than small lily pads, mindless beings. That they have no conception of advancing human creativity. And this is what was the unique role defining Krafft Ehrlicke from the standpoint that he knew that is was not just a matter of promoting technological advancements; but what do these technological advances do to improve upon the conditions of human life and the progress of mankind overall.

And this has been something that Mr. LaRouche understood is crucial in his science of physical economy, from the standpoint that you're not just looking at technological advancement from speaking of just one leap. But you're talking about a succession of leaps in economic progress in society. And during the relationship that Mr. and Mrs. LaRouche developed with the identity and role of Krafft Ehrlicke as a scientist and genius of his time, is really exemplified in what Mr. LaRouche continued to develop around his policy for a Moon-Mars colonization program. I think that people who have not actually studied the significance of Mr. LaRouche and why he became a threat to this zero-growth policy, because he continued to push the limits, push mankind beyond the so-called limitations that have been put on mankind; just as Krafft Ehrlicke understood that our extraterrestrial imperative was to actually remove all limitations and barriers from the progress of mankind. And the best way to do this was

through the advancement of man into the colonization of space.

And I think it's important to note, that some people start

to put themselves into this smallness of thinking, in this mindless thinking. "Well, how are we going to travel into space

if we can't actually solve the problems here on Earth?" And Mr.

LaRouche made it a priority to actually organize an understanding

of what real technological advancement is; this was exactly the

thinking of John F Kennedy in the progress of the commitment of

the Moon landing, of sending a man to the Moon and bringing him

safely back to Earth. That this was going to lead to technological advancements that would pay themselves off several

times over; but what was going to be essential for it, is that you had to have breakthroughs as Mr. LaRouche called for, in several categories of technology that was actually going to be essential for bringing about an increase in the productivity of

society. You take the example; you look at this massive undertaking of what Krafft Ehricke did in the design and development of what took men to the Moon, in terms of the Saturn

V rocket. It wasn't something that was just thrown together on

the cheap; you couldn't have just Wall Street and Elon Musk going

in there and saying, "OK, let us just throw a spacecraft up."

This took some real engineering; it was a total transformation in

terms of the economic conditions of society. Thousands, millions

of people were put to work; the spin-off technologies that went into it. Mr. LaRouche called for the advancement of four categories of technology, in thermonuclear fusion and related plasma technologies; or development of electromagnetic radiation of high energy density. Basically promoting new synthetic materials or the production of the colonization of Mars; that you were going to actually have to have flotillas in developing low-Earth orbit. And putting materials on the Moon to actually lead to the colonization of Mars. How are we going to get there?

We had to have engineers, we had to have astrophysicists.

The technical considerations are all laid out very prominently, but I think what it really represents is a transformation of the human species; and that's what Mr. LaRouche

was very crucial in, saying that you had to actually have a different identity of who we are as human beings. That we are actually distinct from the animal species; and that no limitations can be put on mankind to keep them in a state of bestiality. And the question of technological advancement is, are these advancements being made in a so-called barbaric society

that wants to keep human beings down and keep them enslaved; and

promote a policy of limitations on growth and population reduction so these policies would not be advanced. Or, are we talking about a cultural Renaissance, where these advancements are made as Krafft Ehrlicke understood, from the standpoint of a

new conception of mankind. This is what has really brought together the minds, and why Mr. LaRouche sees Krafft Ehrlicke as

extremely fundamental to how we overcome the threats facing us

today in society.

OGDEN: Well, I think that's something that certainly you elaborated very clearly in your speech at the conference, and I think as we had a discussion with Mr. LaRouche yesterday; everybody who is on this show was engaged in that discussion. Mr. LaRouche put a very emphatic emphasis on the personality of Krafft Ehricke and his courage in fighting for a vision which was not a popular vision even among the people in the space community. And Mr. LaRouche asked that more research be done on this; and I know that both you, Ben, and Megan have been immersed in this a little bit in the recent few days and weeks. So, maybe you want to give people a broader idea of some of this.

MEGAN BEETS: Well, I can say something briefly. I was just looking back at comments that were made by both Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche at the memorial conference that was held in honor of Krafft Ehricke in 1985, following his death in 1984. And both Lyndon and Helga LaRouche reflect something which I think really does go to the essence of the importance of the personality of Krafft Ehricke in what we were able to achieve in the space program. And what they both reflected was the fact that his life made a contribution to moving the species as a whole forward; but why? It's exactly because he was not motivated by the kinds of practical considerations that were impinging on most of the population at the time; and both Lyn and

Helga reflected the fact that Krafft Ehrlicke was motivated by a total cultural optimism. That not only was it necessary, but it was also possible to move mankind forward into the Age of Reason; to move man into a paradigm where we completely left the cultural vestiges of the beast behind us. And if you look at Krafft Ehrlicke's work, which ranges from extremely technical papers on the use of liquid hydrogen fuel to fictional stories which are envisioning the first manned mission to Mars; but all of them I think are motivated by this passion and vision for a better mankind as a whole. And he came to the conclusion himself as a young man, that the way to realize that had to be space travel; had to be space colonization.

Just to add one more thing, Mrs. LaRouche was reflecting on a speaking tour that Krafft Ehrlicke did with the Schiller Institute in the 1980s in Germany. And what she reported was, that at that time, the resistance from the Greenie movements was so intense at some of these meetings, the police had to be called in. What Krafft Ehrlicke reflected on at the time was that these Greenie movements were very reminiscent of the fascist movements of the 1930s; and that's why the only way to move forward had to be by addressing exactly what you just raised, Kesha. The essence of the cultural morality of mankind; is mankind a culture

of beasts, or is mankind actually representing a culture of what Schiller would call beautiful souls?

BENJAMIN DENISTON: I think highlighting the fight for that; he fought for that. He went against the opposition even within the scientific community for that kind of idea; and I think that also goes back to something that Michael was saying about what's needed today. It's people like that; it's people who are going to fight for what's true. Not because they think it's what their neighbors will like, or because they think it's what will make them popular; it's because they have an internal drive that they know that's what's needed. You pulled up this quote – it's just one thing among many – I just thought it was indicative; this quote of Krafft testifying in Congress in, I believe it was in 1960, the early '60s. And really emphatically pushing the need for nuclear power for space; he said, the Universe runs on nuclear power. The stars are run by nuclear power; this nuclear power is an inherent part of the Universe and mankind is going to be obsolete in his attempt to be part of the Universe more broadly – go beyond Earth, fulfill this extraterrestrial imperative – if we reject nuclear power. That's one thing. Already in the early '60s, he said, if we don't do this by the end of the decade, we're going to be obsolete in terms of our space efforts. Nuclear power is one issue; one critical issue,

obviously, for mankind as a whole, for space development. But you see this visionary quality of fighting against the opposition

to these breakthroughs; and being the force that says, "No, this

is what's needed," against massive opposition. The tragedy is that the opposition has taken over.

We had, under the leadership of Krafft Ehricke and people

working with him, we had a nuclear rocket pretty much built by the early '70s; it was basically a few steps away from being ready to go, and it was just cancelled. It was not found to be

too difficult; it was not found to be some failure; it was not found to be too expensive; it was just cancelled. And we've had

this zero-growth policy take over at that crucial pivot point —

the late '60s, early '70s — when Lyn really came on the scene and started to continue this fight. Obviously, Krafft resonated

with that, and came to work with the LaRouches directly based on

that; but you see the failure of departing from this visionary quality and this fight to move into the future. But I think he

exemplifies what's needed from the US population right now; you're not going to find solutions from the existing cultural, social framework. It's failed; that's expressing the failure of society.

We heard at the beginning, one of the things that strikes me

in discussing this whole war danger and the fact that we're taking steps towards nuclear war, which I think it's important,

it was stated clearly. There's no limited nuclear war;

there's
no small nuclear war, you don't take small steps. If it happens,
everything's over; it's gone. But what's potentially even more
striking than that actually being a reality on the table?
Who's
talking about it? We have a Presidential election; are these
candidates raising this as an issue? Is there any discussion
about this? I think it just underscores the importance of
that
quality of leadership needed; and exemplified by what was done
in
San Francisco. We're going to be having, coming out of the
Schiller Institute conference in Germany coming up; and what
really this movement represents in the United States.

And I think this should also be an appeal to our
viewers.
Really, this is a time when we need escalation; we need
increase;
we need more support; we need more people to be these type of
creative leaders like Krafft Ehricke, like Lyndon LaRouche.
That's the only thing that's going to save the country at this
point.

OGDEN: Yeah, Michael made a point which I thought was very
significant. That, at a time like this, when it's very clear
how
huge the dangers are, you cannot allow yourself to be any less
than the magnitude of the crisis challenges one to be. And the
magnitude and scope of thinking which is necessary to solve a
crisis of this sort, of a civilizational scale, must be huge
in
those terms. And I think one thing out of this discussion
about
Krafft Ehricke, that occurred to me is, when you're thinking

about where the entire idea of the geopolitics of the last 70 years has been rooted; it is rooted in the zero-growth technology, no development kind of paradigm. The idea that there are limited resources that a growing population is fighting over, and these territories and so forth; that is the fundamental tenet of the geopolitics that has dominated this paradigm which has now failed. When you talk about a New Paradigm, when you talk about "win-win" as Xi Jinping says it, instead of winner take all, all are winners. That fundamentally requires, it begs a new attitude towards our concept of growth; that there is no idea of limits to growth, of fixed natural resources. But that you have an ever-expanding possibility of ever-increasing potentials of growth. I think as very demonstrated, China, in a certain way, does understand that in the way that Krafft Ehricke understood it; is a central element of their current policy, is not only the One Belt, One Road policy, but it is also this exploration of the Moon. Now just going to the Moon, as a sort of space race or setting your foot on a foreign body or something like that; but saying we're going to discover fundamentally new about the Universe. And as Mr. LaRouche has been emphasizing, this Chang'e mission to explore the far side of the Moon and everything that is there to be discovered. We don't even know; we don't know the

extent to which we will discover brand new things about the structure of the Universe when we explore this new territory. That, I think, speaks to this idea that the idea of a New Paradigm, a new "win-win" system, is rooted in overturning the last 70 years of this Malthusian concept of zero-growth, zero technological development, and fixed resources.

And it's only natural that Krafft Ehrlicke understood it in those terms.

DENISTON: Anything else just goes to the longer legacy of the Zeus vs. Prometheus fight. You talk about this zero-growth paradigm; where did this come from? The British; the British royal family. People like Prince Philip; people like Prince Bernhard. This oligarchical mindset. These guys are so explicit, their view of mankind is just disgusting cattle to be managed. Zeus would just pal up with these guys; they wouldn't even need to introduce themselves. They would just get together like they've know each other for ages. That mentality of this imperial conception of the management of mankind as a bestial species; that's where this zero-growth paradigm came from in this recent period, but it stretches back through history. You look at the writings of Aeschylus on the Prometheus vs. Zeus fight; the attack on Prometheus. And you see that as a reflection of a true negative principle of society at the time, which is carried through to today. This hatred of human progress; this hatred of creative development; this desire to keep mankind suppressed

to
this lower level. What angered Zeus wasn't just that he had something stolen from him; it's that he had a whole class of people he was managing, that Prometheus then gave an ability to uplift and realize their own humanity. And for that, Zeus punished him.

It's the same fight today; but today, Zeus has thermonuclear arsenals at his fingertips. We're at a clear, and I think this was very well expressed even in the discussions back in the '80s that we're talking about, with the need to move to the Age of Reason. We're at the point where mankind has developed technologically to the point where if we allow that type of process to continue, you're talking about mankind annihilating himself; and that's what we're talking about right now, with these NATO deployments. It's complete insanity. But again, as we're saying, it's not going to be solved in the negative, by just saying, "Stop that. Don't do that." It's going to have to be resolved in the higher realization and actualization of the true nature of mankind as a Promethean force; as Krafft Ehricke represented. Today, as much as then, this need for an Age of Reason is the imperative; and space is emblematic of the Age of Reason, the age of mankind, really.

OGDEN: Well, I think it's important in the context of everything that we've discussed, also to note that we really are on the edge of a meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system. It was noted this week that now major European banks are beginning to

cease their investment into the ECB, because of the ECB's negative interest policy. They said, why should we be putting money into the ECB if they're just going to be charging us for putting our money there? So, Helga LaRouche said, there's a lot of European bankers who are sleeping with billions of dollars underneath their pillows in the current days. But this is, even without the instability of what could happen in the build up to the Brexit vote at the end of this month. I know our institutional question for this week, which we haven't addressed; was on the subject of the Brexit. And Mrs. LaRouche said, if this means that Ireland and Scotland are going to leave the UK, and the UK will break up; then sure, I welcome this. But in seriousness, we are on the verge of the meltdown of the trans-Atlantic financial system; the productivity of the United States is through the floor; unemployment in this country is unbelievable, especially youth unemployment. It's at levels that are unprecedented in the modern history of this country. And at the same time, you have the possibility of an entirely economic paradigm presenting itself in the form of the New Silk Road; everything that's coming out of the BRICS. We have the visit by Narendra Modi to the United States this week; he spoke to a joint session of Congress. There's a lot that could just happen; as Helga LaRouche said, it would be very easy. It would be a piece of cake for the United States to join this New Paradigm; and I think that's the ongoing of the LaRouche Movement

internationally, is making that possibility very, very real. It requires a policy revolution in the United States to bring that about; but as was clear from the seminar in San Francisco this week – and I think will continue to be clear in our interventions in New York City around the Manhattan Project that Mr. LaRouche has initiated; and then this upcoming conference that's being sponsored by the Schiller Institute in Europe in the coming weeks. The activities of the LaRouche Movement internationally are crucial; and it's very significant that we're at the breaking point in terms of several aspects of this.

Mrs. LaRouche also put a big emphasis on the continued fight around the declassification of the 28 pages, because of what this would imply in terms of the potential to bring down the entire Anglo-Saudi empire. And also everything that was contingent on the lies that were told in the aftermath of 9/11; and what that has led to in terms of the perpetual war policies, the refugees who are coming into Europe from North Africa and the Middle East.

So, all of these things taken together, represent a situation which is dynamic, it's changing very rapidly, and it is fertile ground for the types of interventions that the LaRouche Movement is making internationally right now.

So, let me invite Kesha or Mike, if you want to say anything more, in terms of reflections at the conclusion of this

discussion, you're welcome to.

STEGER: I'd say, let's get rid of Obama and join the New Paradigm.

ROGERS: Yeah. I think it's true; we are at the end of an era of representation of barbarism, war, and these limits to growth consequences that Krafft Ehrlicke was very well aware of. We're seeing the emergence of a new system of cooperation, a new collaboration and dialogue among civilizations that's being led by Russia and China. And I think the continued question being presented by our activity is, will people actually join with LaRouche and join with the nations who are representing this new direction for mankind? And that means doing what Krafft Ehrlicke did, and breaking with all practicality, and as you said Ben, popularity; and actually going out and doing that which is seemingly impossible. I think China gives us the light and the inspiration as to human beings; that is our mission, that is what we do. We do those things which seem almost impossible. And we do those things that actually help to bring about the solutions that are going to lead to a greater condition for mankind. So, I think that's what we're representing right now, and we're on the brink of a total breakthrough; unlike anything that's been seen.

But also, as Mrs. LaRouche said in her opening remarks, this breakthrough is going to come with rejecting the absence of any discussion on the threat of this thermonuclear war and what mankind really faces. Because the question is, what kind of society are we going to actually demand be brought into existence? What kind of future are we going to actually bring about for those generations not yet born? And Mr. LaRouche is committed to that, and many more people as we've stated, need to do the same.

OGDEN: OK. Well, thank you very much, Kesha. With that, I'm going to bring a conclusion to this webcast here this evening. I'd like to thank both Kesha and Michael for joining us; and also thank you to Megan and to Ben. So, please stay tuned to larouchepac.com; and as I think you can tell, we have a very busy few weeks ahead of us, and a lot of responsibility. So, thank you very much; good night.

**Rapport fra Schiller
Institut-seminar i San
Francisco, USA:
Vil USA gå med i Den Nye**

Silkevej?

Schiller Instituttets Strategiske Seminar i San Francisco den 8. juni tiltrak 70 gæster og eksperter for at diskutere det presserende nødvendige spørgsmål: »Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller atomkrig«. Denne plan går ud på at tilslutte sig en plan for infrastruktur i hele verden, med navnet Ét bælte, én vej, og som Kina har fremlagt, eller også blive sammen med de kollapsende, vestlige økonomier, hvis bankerot leverer ved til det bål, som er en global atomkrig. **Listen to the entire seminar on SoundCloud**

De højtplacerede talere inkluderede Lyndon LaRouche, berømt strategisk og økonomisk tænk; Helga Zepp-LaRouche, også kendt som »Silkevejsladyen« pga. sin verdensomspændende kampagne for at skabe den »Silkevejspolitik«, som Kina nu har fremlagt, og for at få denne politik vedtaget på verdensplan som alternativet til krig; den amerikanske senator Mike Gravel (senator 1969-1981), der indlæste de hemmeligstemplede »Pentagon Papers« ind i Kongresprotokollen i 1971; honorære konsul Sergei Petrov, generalkonsul for det Russiske Konsulat i San Francisco; dr. Howard Chang, internationalt kendt ekspert i vandsedimentering, samt Kesha Rogers, to gange demokratisk kandidat i Houstons 22. C.D. (kongresdistrikt) – hjemsted for NASA. De stedlige russiske, kinesiske, japanske og filippinske lokalsamfund var repræsenteret blandt publikum.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche præsenterede tilhørerne for det faktum, at NATO's deployering på Ruslands grænser, med AEGIS-systemet i Rumænien, og krigsskibet USS Ross i Sortehavet, efterlader russerne i en position, hvor NATO-missiler kunne nå Moskva på fem minutter – hvilket nødvendiggør en politik med »Affyr ved varsel«. Ulig i 1980'erne, hvor tusinder af mennesker demonstrerede imod atommissilerne i Europa og Rusland, der var sat til »affyring ved varsel«, så har de neokonservative i Obamaregeringen genskabt denne fare, uden nogen protester i

Vesten. Faren for en konfrontation med Kina i Det sydkinesiske Hav er også til stede.

I dette klima traf Kinas præsident Xi Jinping i 2013 beslutningen om at gøre en ende på geopolitik og at genetablere den Nye Silkevej, og at bygge infrastruktur for vand, elektricitet og transport i hele verden. Zepp-LaRouche påpegede Kinas 20.000 km højhastigheds-jernbanelinjer, som er bygget i løbet af 2015, hvorimod der ikke findes *nogen* hurtigtog i USA. Hun konkluderede: »Gå sammen med Kina i jeres egen interesse, eller stå over for atomkrig.«

Fr. LaRouche adresserede problemet med, at Obama fortsat er præsident, ved at påpege den presserende nødvendige frigivelse af de klassificerede »28 sider« af Den Fælles Kongresundersøgelsesrapport om 11. september, 2001, og Obamas afvisning af at frigive disse sider, der vides at indeholde bevis for saudernes finansiering og sponsorering af terrorangrebet 11. september, hvilket kunne sprænge hul i amerikansk politik og gøre det muligt at vælge en kvalificeret kandidat, af samme støbning som Franklin D. Roosevelt eller præsident Kennedy. Herefter fulgte spørgsmål fra tilhørerne.

Efter Helga Zepp-LaRouche kom et indlæg fra den russiske konsul i San Francisco, Sergei Petrov: »For et stort land som USA, er det gavnligt at se på verden.« På et spørgsmål fra senator Mike Gravel om, hvorvidt han (Petrov) var enig i Helga LaRouches vurdering, svarede han: »Jeg er enig i den forståelse, at vi er meget tæt på en storkonflikt. Og jeg tilføjer, at der ikke er nogen som helst mulighed for en 'begrænset atomkrig'. Hvis den begynder, bliver det verdens ende.«

Hr. Petrov beskrev USSR's opløsning i Statssamfundet af Uafhængige Stater, med alvorlige, økonomiske problemer, og trinnene i den lange proces med at opbygge den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union. EAEU søger nu at indgå aftaler med Mercosur, SCO og EU om økonomisk og humanitært samarbejde. Næste skridt

bliver at indgå forbindelse til Nordamerika. På denne dag, sagde hr. Petrov, »vil jeg føle, jeg har været en god diplomat«.

Show Helga Zepp-LaRouche Keynote and Q&A

Show Lyndon LaRouche Q&A

**»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye
Silkevej? Global,
videnskabelig
udvikling, eller atomkrig«;
Helga Zepp-LaRouches
åbningstale ved Schiller
Institut-
seminar i San Francisco, USA.
Video, engelsk.**

Jeg tror, at, hvis man ser på verdenssituationen, især på den amerikanske offentlighed, der næsten intet ved om situationen; folk i Europa ved lidt mere, men, hvis man sammenligner den umiddelbart forestående fare for en eskalering af konfrontationen mellem NATO, USA og Storbritannien og så Rusland og Kina på den anden side, så er viden om det så svag, at dette for mig står som det mest skræmmende aspekt; for,

fraværet af en offentlig debat om den mulige udslettelse af hele civilisationen, om det så skyldes mange folks ligegyldighed, fordi de simpelt hen er ligeglade, eller det skyldes, at de er for bange til at tænke tanken til ende, men manglen på en offentlig debat er det, vi må ændre.

POLITISK ORIENTERING den 9. juni 2016:

Fører NATO's provokerende øvelser til krig?

Se også anden del (11 min.).

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Video: 2. del:

Lyd:

**Menneskeheden står ved en skillevej,
af Helga Zepp-LaRouche.**

Åbningstale (dansk) ved konference i New York, i anledning af Mindedagen for faldne soldater

Vi står på kanten af atomkrig.

Alt dette finder sted over for flere akutte, strategiske kriser: én på den russiske grænse i Østeuropa; en anden i Sydvestasien; endnu én omkring Korea; og atter igen en anden omkring Det sydkinesiske Hav. Hver af disse konflikter kunne blive udløsermekanismen for en global atomkrig. Og folk flipper virkelig ud, for det forestående NATO-topmøde, der vil finde sted i begyndelsen af juli i Warszawa, er planlagt til at manifestere alle mulige former for forandringer, som at flytte fire store bataljoner med 1000 tropeenheder i hver ind i de baltiske lande; som, på dagen, hvor dette julitopmøde finder sted, da at forbinde den nyligt installerede BMD-komponent (ballistisk missilforsvar) i Rumænien med krigsskibene af Aegis-klassen, som allerede er deployeret i det baltiske område og i Sortehavet og andetsteds. Og dette er nu i færd med meget hurtigt at nå til et punkt, hvor Rusland har sagt, at de ikke kan tolerere en fortsat opsætning af dette ballistiske missilsystem, fordi det tydeligvis er rettet mod Rusland, og det tilsigter tydeligvis at ødelægge Ruslands gengældelsesevne, og det har aldrig, hvad der ellers altid har været påskuddet, det har aldrig været rettet mod den angivelige missiltrussel fra Iran.

Allerede for to eller tre år siden har det russiske militær fremstillet videoanimationer, der viser, at de systemer, der nu er installeret i Polen, i Rumænien, i Bulgarien, i Spanien

og på disse krigsskibe, i virkeligheden er tiltænkt at skulle ramme Rusland. Men især efter, at man har indgået en aftale mellem P5+1, med Iran, og som hæmmer faren for missiler, der kommer fra Iran, findes et sådant påskud ikke længere. Det er nu blevet bemærket af sådanne personer som professor Stephen Cohen fra New Yorks universitet, at dette meget klart har til hensigt at lancere en krig. En anden, meget betydningsfuld taler fra Rusland, general Leonid Ivashov, sagde, at det, vi nu ser, er klare skridt som forberedelse til krig.

Download (PDF, Unknown)

Stop 3. Verdenskrig: NATO's katastrofale atomare bluff imod Rusland: Du kan være med til at stoppe det nu

8. juni 2016 (Leder) – Fra Tysklands *Der Spiegel* her til eftermiddag kom en advarsel i sidste minut: NATO's »Anakonda« kombineret med krigsøvelser langs de russiske grænser i Polen og de baltiske stater »går for vidt« og »leger rigtig krig«, atomkrig. *EIR* har allerede advaret om, at disse massive

»krigsspil« kan udløse en meget virkelig Tredje Verdenskrig, og i dag har vi netop lært, at øvelserne er større endnu og involverer henved 50.000 NATO-tropper. Samtidig har Obamaregeringen afbrudt al diskussion med Rusland om de ballistiske missilforsvarssystemer, som NATO er i færd med at bygge rundt om Rusland i øst og vest; og piloter og fly fra det russiske luftvåben er nu i øjeblikket selv ved at træne angreb, der skal tilintetgøre de selv samme BMD-systemer rundt om Sortehavet.

På Schiller Instituttets seminar i dag i San Francisco, USA, responderede Ruslands generalkonsul i samme by på et spørgsmål fra den amerikanske senator, Mike Gravel:

Jeg er enig i den forståelse, at vi er meget tæt på en storkonflikt. Og lad mig tilføje, at der ikke findes nogen mulighed for en 'begrænset atomkrig'. Hvis den begynder, bliver det verdens ende.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche fremlagde ligefremt den eskalerende trussel om verdenskrig – hvis hensigt er at skræmme både Rusland og Kina til at underkaste sig Obamas regler og diktater – for seminaret i dag. Hun stillede også spørgsmålet, og svarede på det: »Hvordan er alt dette blevet til?« og »Hvordan overvinder vi det?«

Obamaregeringen og NATO bluffer virkelig – et bluff, der i sig bærer truslen om menneskets udslettelse, men et bluff ikke desto mindre. De transatlantiske økonomier er bankerot og har mistet ethvert produktionspotentiale, og er ved at opbygge det næste kollaps. Obamas amerikanske økonomi har nået vejs ende, hvis der ikke kommer en total genopbygning. Og de asiatiske magters »Nye Silkevej« og lignede aktiviteter, med ny infrastruktur og udforskning af rummet, udgør den eneste potentielle kilde til denne totale genopbygning.

NATO er i kun færd med at deployere »arrogance, og skinnets af magt«. Økonomisk bankerot får Obama til at se eurasisk

udvikling som en trussel, der retfærdiggør krig – og som gør hans trussel om global krig til et bluff.

Denne tragiske situation kan fuldstændigt ændres, sagde Zepp-LaRouche til dagens seminar, gennem nonlineære handlinger. Mobiliseringen for at fremtvinge sandheden om saudernes og briternes rolle i angrebene på Amerika den 11. september [2001] er nu oppe i højeste gear; hvis det lykkes i nærmeste fremtid, kunne det blive årsag til en ægte »katarsis«, sagde hun, og til en afvisning af hele politikken med evindelig krig, der udsprang – gennem løgne – af 11. september. Og jo flere amerikanske borgere og i landet boende personer, der bliver aktive i at gennemtvinge denne sejr, desto bedre er chancen for at genskabe den ægte, amerikanske republik.

Appellen »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig – Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«, udbredes ligeledes i hastigt tempo og cirkulerer i dag i nok et land, Ungarn.

Vær ikke bange for, at Ruslands lederskab ville starte en verdenskrig, men det vil afslutte den. Det er vores mission totalt at forandre Obamas og NATO's fremstød mod krig med et nyt paradigme, og det kan gøres.

Foto: Vil det amerikanske folk komme til fornuft, før en atomkrig udløses? [flickr/usnavy]

Stop 3. Verdenskrig:

NATO's Krigsspil i Baltikum kunne udløse en meget virkelig 3. Verdenskrig – Underskriv og cirkuler appellen: »Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig – Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«

7. juni 2016 (Leder) – Hvis Obama får sin vilje, kan menneskeheden meget vel blive drevet ud over klippekanten i form af en fremprovokation af atomkrig fra USA's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, advarede Lyndon LaRouche i dag. NATO-manøvrerne i stor skala, der begyndte i går i Polen og De baltiske Stater, og som involverer 31.000 tropper fra 24 lande i en 10 dage lang øvelse, der simulerer en angivelig russisk invasion af området, udgør i sig selv en umiddelbar, potentiel udløser af krig. Ruslands ambassadør til NATO, Alexander Grushko, forklarede i går faren ligefremt, i bemærkninger, som hr. LaRouche vurderede i høj grad gik lige til sagens kerne:

»Det, vi i dag ser i De baltiske Stater, er rent faktisk ikke andet end forsøg på en magtudvikling, med den fjendtlige politik, som NATO har forfulgt i den seneste tid. Jeg ville ikke sige, at dette udgør en direkte trussel mod Rusland, men det skaber selvfølgelig alvorlige risici i takt med, at vi ser en absolut ny, militær virkelighed danne sig langs vore grænser.«

Grushko uddybede, at NATO-advarsler om non-eksisterende russiske trusler kan materialisere sig til handlinger.

»(NATO's) politik lever i en surrealistisk virkelighed, og det farligste er, at det nu begynder at tage form af militær planlægning og militære forberedelser, der finder sted på territorier langs vore grænser.«

LaRouche understregede, at Rusland under præsident Putin vil træffe sine egne beslutninger på sin egen måde, som respons til disse forsøg. Hvis briterne, Obama og NATO ønsker krig, får de det, og det vil blive forfærdeligt: en atomar 3. Verdenskrig – det er, hvad vi taler om.

Der findes en strategi, som LaRouche længe har identificeret, til at overvinde denne »surrealistiske« politik for folkemord, som udgår fra Det britiske Imperium. Den nødvendiggør den omgående fjernelse af Obama fra Det Hvide Hus, både for at få hans finger væk fra atomknappen, så vel som også for fuldstændigt at vælte det skakbræt, som er det vanvittige præsidentvalg i USA, der i øjeblikket tilbyder amerikanere valget mellem cyanid og stryknin. Og det kræves også, at USA og Europa går med i det Ny win-win-paradigme, med økonomisk udvikling med videnskab som drivkraft, og som forfægtes af den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og af den russiske præsident Vladimir Putin, og som fortsætter med at gå aggressivt frem i hele Eurasien.

Det spørgsmål, der ligger for os, indfanges af titlen på en stor Schiller Institut-konference, som LaRouche-bevægelsen vil afholde i San Francisco den 8. juni:

»Vil USA gå med i Den Nye Silkevej? Et valg imellem global, videnskabelig udvikling, eller en atomar verdenskrig«.

Underskriv og cirkuler appellen:

**»Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig
– Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!«**

Foto: Enhver af disse konflikter ville kunne udløse en global atomkrig.

Dump Obama nu – Verden er parat til at gå med i det Nye Paradigme

7. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Lederskabet af verden er, med rette, blevet overtaget af det voksende samarbejde mellem Rusland, Kina og Indien, og med andre eurasiske nationer, der entusiastisk går med i de nye udviklingsplaner, der er legemliggjort i programmet med 'Ét bælte, én vej'. London, Wall Street og Obama er alle desperate over dette ægte, igangværende paradigmeskifte.

I sin kommentar til dette skifte advarede Lyndon LaRouche om, at Obama er ved at blive afsløret som intet andet end en svindler og et falsum. Faren er, at et sådant falsum kan detonere på en farlig måde. Udfordringen består i fuldt ud at konsolidere skiftet over til udviklingsparadigmet, der ledes af Rusland/Kina/Indien, uden at fremkalde, at Obama og kompagni flipper voldeligt ud. Det betyder, understregede LaRouche, at »Obama og kompagni må forkrøbles«, så de ikke er i stand til at leve deres desperation ud i handling.

Dette står mere og mere klart: Verden har ikke brug for Obamas, eller briterne, eller Wall Streets klovneshow. Det, der behøves, er en virkningsfuld, økonomisk organisering, der erstatter disse desperate svindlere og dræbere. Vi befinder os ved et punkt, hvor hele det britiske system er i færd med at gå ned, netop nu. Det er oprindelsen til krigsfaren, og intet andet. »Dump disse elendige karle«, erklærede LaRouche. »Giv disse ledende, eurasiske nationer, sammen med de sydlige nationer, lederskabet, og støt dem i deres udviklingsplaner.«

Frem for alt andet, som Lyndon LaRouche gentagne gange har understreget i løbet af den seneste uge, så byg Kra-kanalen! Det ville markere en revolutionerende forandring for verden, der i enorm grad ville forøge handel og udvikling over hele Eurasien og ind i Afrika og videre endnu. Kra-kanalen ville skabe et fuldstændigt nyt billede af verden som helhed.

Flere og flere nationer er parate til at deltage i denne fremtid. Japan er nu i færd med at genoplive koordineringen med de andre hovednationer – Rusland, Indien, Kina – for eurasisk udvikling, at genoplive programmer, der tidligere blev legemliggjort i Mitsubishi Global Infrastructure Fund (GIF), der arbejdede for Kra-kanalen tilbage i 1980'erne. Kina er hen over de næste seks år parat til at investere \$3,5 billion i store infrastrukturprojekter, der rækker langt ud over det umiddelbare asiatiske Stillehavsområde, iflg. en nylig undersøgelse fra Asia Society. Japan har annonceret sin egen, \$110 milliard store investeringsplan for det asiatiske Stillehavsområde.

Den russiske præsident Putin kommer til Kina senere i denne måned for at indgå de sluttelige aftaler om 52 rapporterede fællesprojekter; og russisk-kinesiske forhandlinger skrider nu frem om den planlagte bygning af en 7000 km lang højhastighedsjernbaneforbindelse mellem Moskva og Beijing. Indien er i færd med at udvide sine planer for handelskorridorer, der strækker sig fra Iran gennem Afghanistan, og med nyligt annoncerede planer om også at bygge

en dybvandshavn i Bangladesh, tillige med Chabahar-havnen i Iran ved Oman-golfen. Indien og Kina støtter alle disse investeringer, der vil udvide hele det asiatiske Stillehavsområdes produktive evner, hvor Kina og Indien alene udgør en tredjedel af verdens befolkning.

Den tyske kansler Angela Merkel skal besøge Kina i næste uge. Den netop færdiggjorte Gotthard Tunnel gennem de Schweiziske Alper, verdens længste jernbanetunnel, åbnede officielt den 1. juni, og projektet, som det tog 17 år at færdiggøre, har udløst entusiasme over hele Europa. Denne entusiasme for store projekter må videreføres til, at ledende, europæiske nationer går med i fremtiden med 'Ét bælte, én vej'-programmet, på en langt mere seriøs måde. Det betyder at bryde med de britiske royale og med Obama.

Projekterne, der fremmes af Kina og Indien, vil samlet set accelerere udviklingen og legemliggøre ideen om det »win-win«-samarbejde, der er et varemærke for skiftet væk fra geopolitikkens imperiekrige og til ægte, menneskelig udvikling. Vi har ikke brug for krig. Faktisk ville endnu en storkrig betyde udslettelse. Det ved og forstår Putin, lige såvel som også Kina.

Titelfoto: Premierminister Narendra Modi med den kinesiske præsident Xi Jinping og førstedame Peng Liyuan, der fejrer deres nationers voksende samarbejde og løsning af tidligere konflikter. [flickr/narendramodiofficial]

I denne tid med særdeles alvorlig fare, opfylder kun en dialog mellem civilisationer de nødvendige krav

6. juni 2016 (Leder fra LaRouchePAC) – Den amerikanske forsvarsminister Ashton Carters præstation ved den netop afsluttede Shangri-La Dialog om sikkerhed i det asiatiske Stillehavsområde gør det klart, at, med mindre præsident Obama fjernes fra embedet længe før januar 2017, står verden over for en umiddelbart forestående, global krig. Ikke alene promoverede Carter aktivt behovet for at skabe en NATO-lignende struktur i Asien, for at konfrontere Kina. Han har også gjort fremstød for lignende, endda mere umiddelbare trusler mod Rusland. Om nogle få uger, når Obama mødes med andre NATO-stats- og regeringschefer i Warszawa, vil NATO-bataljoner blive deployeret til De baltiske Stater og Polen. I Rumænien er der allerede installeret landbaserede Aegis BMD-systemer, og nogle mentalt sunde røster i Vesten har sat lighedstegn mellem alt dette og nazisternes opstillinger langs de sovjetiske grænser, før de lancerede Operation Barbarossa i 1940 under Anden Verdenskrig.

Parallellerne mellem nazismens og fascismens æra og nutiden går længere end til denne »snubletråds«-deployering, som NATO har planlagt. Stemningen af kulturel pessimisme og xenofobi, der har fejlet hen over hele Europa, i lyset af det økonomiske kollaps, Trojkaens program med ondsindet nedskæringspolitik, flygtningekrisen og truslen om gentagne, blinde terrorangreb, udgør i sig selv en alvorlig fare. Og stemningen i USA er ikke bedre.

Under en dialog med kolleger søndag understregede både Lyndon LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche kraftigt behovet for at genoplive princippet om individuelt menneskeligt geni, og for at lancere en ægte dialog mellem civilisationer, hvor de store bidrag fra alle kulturer og civilisationer fremføres som lysende eksempler på, hvad menneskeheden kan præstere, når samfundet organiseres omkring princippet om menneskets kreative evne til at gøre opdagelser af nye, fysiske principper, man tidligere ikke havde nogen forestilling om. Billedet af den store rumforsker, dr. Krafft Ehrlicke, er til særlig inspiration i takt med, at USA står over for udfordringen med at genoplive rumprogrammet, der er blevet skambeskåret og stort set ødelagt af præsident Obamas antividenskabs-ideologi og -politik. Krafft Ehrlicke, en af genierne bag det forgangne NASA-program, opstillede menneskehedens »udenjordiske forpligtelse«, eller imperativ, som fortsat er menneskehedens primære, uopfyldte mission i det 21. århundrede.

Dette tema om menneskeligt geni blev uddybet af **Lyndon LaRouche i en hel time under 'Manhattan-Projekt Dialogen' den 5. juni (videooptagelse)**, som værende den eneste løsning for menneskeheden.

»Indse blot, at der findes mennesker, der har geni-egenskaber, og ikke tværer dem ud!«, sagde LaRouche. »De erkender geniet i sig selv, og de indser, at dette talent, der er kommet til dem, er noget, der er af en meget seriøs natur, til gavn for menneskeheden. Det er, når menneskeheden ser sig selv som et opdagende væsen, hvis arbejde er uundværligt for menneskehedens fremtid – det er dér, skønheden kommer.«

Som respons på Ashtons Carters konfrontation med Kina, krævede admiral Sun Jianguo, vicechef for Kinas Centrale Militærkommissions Afdeling for Generalstaben, en fundamentalt ny sikkerhedsarkitektur for det asiatiske Stillehavsområde, baseret på samarbejde, gensidig forståelse og dialog. Alt imens det står klart, at flertallet af nationerne i det

asiatiske Stillehavsområde afviser Obamas og Carters krigsprovokationer, som det reflekteres i det faktum, at admiral Sun havde 17 bilaterale forhandlinger på sidelinjen af Shangri-La, så kan faren for et faktisk krigsudbrud, det være sig enten direkte imod Kina eller imod Rusland, ikke undervurderes. Det tyske forsvarsministerium er, iflg. *Die Welt*, i færd med at udarbejde en ny regeringsrapport, der vil definere Rusland som truslen – og ikke længere en partner.

Det er ikke overraskende, at de russiske medier rapporterer om en **appel, der nu cirkulerer i både Europa og USA, om, at mentalt fornuftige nationer nu fuldstændigt må trække sig ud af NATO.**

Sputnik bemærkede, at den fremtrædende franske, »venstre-gaullistiske« præsidentkandidat, Jacques Cheminade, allerede har underskrevet appellen.

Som Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede i går, »For at undgå Tredje Verdenskrig er det nødvendigt, at folk indser, at menneskeheden er én, og at alle kulturer har frembragt juveler«, der demonstrerer det potentiale for genialitet, der holder nøglen til menneskehedens fremtid i sin hånd. Lyndon LaRouche var endnu mere ligefrem: Med mindre, man organiserer samfundet omkring en forståelse af menneskelig kreativitet som den afgørende faktor, ved at fremlægge det for befolkningen, »er man ikke andet end en galning«.

Titelbillede: Grafisk fremstilling af Verdenslandbroen iflg. Lyndon LaRouches og Helga Zepp-LaRouches vision.

Konference i Manhattan, New York, med Lyndon LaRouche og Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Et levende mindesmærke – med afslutning af krig og terrorisme

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: "Idet vi taler om og tænker på de soldater, der døde i krige, vil jeg gerne understrege, at, i en tid med atomvåben burde det stå enhver på denne planet klart, at krig ikke længere kan være en mulighed til løsning af nogen som helst konflikt. For, hvis det skulle komme til det utænkelige, at der blev en udveksling af atomvåben – tja, der findes nu nogle teorier, der siger, at man kan have en 'begrænset' atomkrig – en regional atomkrig, der kan vindes. Men jeg tror, at enhver, der har undersøgt sagen lidt mere i dybden, som for eksempel at læse, hvad Ted Postol har skrevet, der uddybende har argumenteret for, hvorfor noget sådant som en begrænset atomkrig ikke findes, og ikke kan findes. Af den simple grund, at enhver, der antager dette, overser den fundamentale forskel mellem en konventionel krig, hvor målet er at slå fjenden, afvæbne ham og så stoppe krigen; men, med anvendelse af atomvåben vil alle eksisterende våben blive brugt, og de vil blive brugt omgående. Og skulle det komme til dette, ville det betyde civilisationens omgående udslettelse."

New York, 28. maj 2016 – Engelsk udskrift.

Tune this Memorial Day weekend **at 12:30 pm eastern Saturday** for a conference in Manhattan featuring live participation from Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche.

TRANSCRIPT

DENNIS SPEED: We are going to begin today this Memorial Day Weekend with this special presentation. We talk and have been speaking at several of these meetings for the past several weeks about the idea of a so-called living memorial. This was an idea that Mr. Lyndon LaRouche initially expressed in a response to matters that have been very much in the news recently concerning 9/11. But also recently, if only a few weeks ago, a Victory in Europe Day or Victory over Fascism Day. This was also the theme of the Immortal Regiment demonstrations that were done in Russia and in other places. However, there's a bigger idea between on the idea of the living memorial we'd like to point out. When you talk about China and the Second World War, most Americans have no idea that there may have been as many as 50 million civilian casualties in China during the Second World War. Most Americans have no idea that the official counts for Russia, for the Soviet Union, are between 24 and 27 million dead. And so, when we speak about the idea of the Second World War, and we think about, for example, the fact that there were countries like India, that were colonized by the British, didn't have the freedoms, that they were being told to fight *for* in that war.

The true issues behind what the keynote speaker of this morning is going to be talking about are left unrealized. It's been well over, now, 25 years that Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche led a campaign, which at different times had slightly different names. But it was a campaign that all veterans will understand. The campaign for the World Land-Bridge, first called the Eurasian Triangle, then called the Productive Triangle, and then the New Silk Road, and now called the World Land-Bridge, is the only real, living memorial you can give to the people who died, not merely during the Second World War, but in many, many other wars, and in the wars that are continuing today.

There are recent developments of a very important nature in this area, but there is also the extraordinary danger of war, a global war that can wipe out humanity. So we thought it was important this Memorial Day to remind people that the idea of fighting wars, is to end all war; and that that's the only way that you can truly celebrate the contributions and sacrifices that people make. And so, the idea that Helga LaRouche and Lyndon LaRouche put forward, the World Land-Bridge, *this idea*, that is the idea and the only idea that is the actual appropriate means by which we can, I think, even begin to think about the importance of the deaths and the sacrifices that veterans all over the world have made to bring us to this moment where we are capable of ending war forever on our planet.

It's always my honor and privilege to introduce, on these occasions, Helga LaRouche, the founder and chairman of the Schiller Institute, who will now address us. Helga?

HELGA LAROUCHE: Hello. (applause) Dear members of the LaRouche PAC, guests of the Schiller Institute, dear friends, it is a great pleasure for me to talk to you today. And as we are talking and thinking about the soldiers who died in wars, I want to stress that in the time of thermonuclear weapons, it should be clear to anybody on this planet that war cannot be an option anymore to solve any conflict. Because if it would come to the unthinkable that you would have the exchange of nuclear weapons, well, there are some theories, right now, that you could have a limited nuclear war – a winnable, regional, nuclear war.

But I think that anybody who has studied the matter a little bit more in depth, like, for example, reading the writings of Ted Postol, who has made the very elaborated argument why such a thing as a limited nuclear war does not and cannot exist. Simply because, anybody who assumes that, overlooks the fundamental difference between conventional war, where the aim is to defeat your enemy, to disarm him, and then to stop the

war; but with the use of nuclear weapons, it is the logic of such a war that once it starts, all existing weapons will be used and they will be used instantly. And if it would come to this point, it would be the immediate extinction of civilization.

And I think that was clearly understood at the height of the Cold War. You had the Mutual Assured Destruction doctrine, where it was very clear that either we survived together or we all die together. But that MAD strategy has been eroded since quite some time; because now you have all kinds of scenarios with the idea of winning war by having smarter, smaller, leaner, more usable, more precise, nuclear weapons and delivery systems, and that therefore you could use them. But that is now a mortal danger to civilization. We have been warning of that quite some time ago. We made a movie called, "Unsurvivable." We made many speeches about it, and we were almost, with few other people, the lonely callers in the desert. But now, in the last several weeks, there is a sudden eruption of awareness of many people who are now speaking out, warning that things have gone completely haywire.

This is all happening in front of several acute strategic crises: one on the Russian border in Eastern Europe; another one in Southwest Asia; still another one around Korea; and another one around the South China Sea. Each of these conflicts could become the trigger point for a global nuclear war. And people are really freaking out, because the upcoming NATO summit, which will take place at the beginning of July in Warsaw, is scheduled to manifest all kinds of changes, like moving four major battalions of 1,000 troops each into the Baltic countries; of linking at the date of that July summit, the recently installed BMD (ballistic missile defense) component in Romania with the Aegis class destroyers which are deployed already in the Baltics and the Black Sea and elsewhere. And that is reaching very quickly a point where Russia has said that they cannot tolerate a continuous

building of this ballistic missile system, because it's clearly aimed at Russia, and it's clearly aimed to take out the second strike capability of Russia, and it has never been what always was the pretext, it has never been against the supposed missile threat from Iran.

Now already two or three years ago, the Russian military had produced video animations showing that the systems installed now in Poland, in Romania, in Bulgaria, in Spain, and on these warships, are really assigned to hit Russia. But especially after the P5+1 deal with Iran containing the danger of missiles coming from Iran, has been agreed upon, there is no more such pretext. Now it has been noted by such people, like the New York University professor Stephen Cohen, that this is very clearly with the intent to launch a war. Another very important speaker from Russia, General Leonid Ivashov, said what we are seeing right now are clear steps in preparation for war.

Now it is very significant that even in Germany, somebody who I would characterize as a staunch Atlanticist, somebody belonging absolutely to the mainstream establishment, last week called a very important article in the conservative daily newspaper *Die Welt* with the headline, "No Protocol Will Save Us From Nuclear War." And there he talks about the modernization of nuclear weapons; the fact that they are supposedly less, even so, one has to say that the Obama administration has reduced less nuclear weapons from the stockpile than any other post-Cold War administration before, and the rate of reduction has been slowing down significantly. Now what this Michael Stuermer notes is that people should not assume that because these nuclear weapons become fewer, smaller, that this is good news. To the contrary, it is more reason to worry; because the very idea that these weapons are usable is lowering the threshold of them actually being used. And then he says, the problem is that during the Cold War, the military and political leadership had a very clear

understanding of what Mutual Assured Destruction would mean, namely the annihilation of all of mankind. But we have now new generations of both political and military leadership, who don't even pay attention to it anymore. And he said, all these almost fatal incidents, which are taking place now almost every day either over the Baltic Sea, or in the Black Sea, or in the South China Sea, they would have, in former times, put the alarm clocks to the highest noise possible; because people would have recognized how quickly such an accidental almost-incident could lead to the global war. And other statements in the recent months have made very clear that both the system of NATO and of Russia are all the time on launch-on-warning, and therefore, the actual decision-making time of any side, either the President of the United States or in that case the Russian President, have is about 3 to 6 minutes, at best half an hour. So we are sitting on a potential Armageddon, which if people would just think about it, they would really do everything possible to stop that.

Now there is right now a growing awareness of this. There was a hearing in the US Senate where Senator Feinstein commented on the fact that the United States is now committing \$1 trillion in the next decades to modernize the nuclear arsenals, including the tactical nuclear weapons, the B-61-12, which are stationed mostly in Europe; that makes the idea of using these weapons more within reach and that alone is utterly immoral because of the implication that it could lead to the extinction of civilization.

We have a similar situation like that in Europe, right now, in the South China Sea. There is a lot of propaganda that China is supposedly aggressively taking land. Nothing from that could be further from the truth. All that China is doing is, they put installations on some of these islands which historically they have claims to going back to the 9th Century, and which every other country in the region, the Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam, they are all doing the same

thing since a long time. And not one ship has been prevented, a cargo ship, from ever travelling. So the whole argument that this is a violation of the freedom of navigation, which has been put forward by the United States, is simply not true. And all the incidents were caused by violations of U.S. ships in the 12-mile zone of these islands or over-flights; which is also a breach of the code of such behavior.

So we are really at the edge; and I must say I got a very, very eerie feeling, when I got reports that Obama, before he went to Hiroshima, not only did not apologize for throwing these bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for which there was, in reality, no reason. It was not that which saved a million lives of American soldiers, which was the official narrative of the Truman Administration. It was very well known that Japan had already negotiated with the Vatican a resolution and capitulation; so the throwing of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was simply to establish the principle of *Schrecklichkeit*; to demonstrate to the Soviet Union at that point what the power of nuclear weapons would be.

So, Obama did not apologize, which is really telling already; but in an interview with the Japanese TV he said, when he was asked what he thought about this throwing of bombs on Hiroshima, he said, "Well I have been a President now for seven and a half years, and having been a wartime President myself, I can understand that presidents, under those conditions could be forced to make such decisions." I think people better wake up to where we are really at.

We have no reason to go to war. Russia is not aggressive; don't believe it for one second. Every step Russia has been taking, especially since the effort to pull Ukraine into the EU Association agreement, which was the beginning of the Ukraine crisis; which was unacceptable because Yanukovich, at the time, fled and left and reacted so strongly from the EU Summit, because he realized that that would have given NATO control over Ukraine. And it would have opened up the Russian

market for all the EU products, which was unacceptable for Russia. So, he cancelled the agreement.

Then the Maidan was sprung against the Ukrainian government. Then you had the coup on the 21st of February 2014, which was a coup by Nazis, which, everybody knew they were going back to the Stepan Bandera tradition. So the West went along with that. That led to the terrible conditions inside east Ukraine; and as a reaction to all of this Russia then annexed Crimea. People saying Russia was aggressive in taking the Crimea is wrong; because Russia reacted each single step as Russia reacted to the whole breaking of the promises which were given to Gorbachov, but also to other people at the time when the Soviet Union disintegrated, that NATO would not expand its troops to the border of Russia. Then you had the color revolution, the sanctions, all of this has been correctly characterized by Russia as being forms of a hybrid war which is already going on; which has the ultimate aim of regime change in Moscow. As Madame Albright and the former Green Foreign Minister of Germany, Joschka Fischer, said at one point, Russia has too big a territory and too many raw materials; as if it could be allowed to exploit these raw materials all by itself.

The same kind of geopolitical intention for regime change really exists against China, which I don't want to elaborate now, we can do it in the discussion if people want. But what I'm saying is that neither Russia nor China are aggressive. Don't believe these media lies which are part of a pre-war propaganda. As a matter of fact, the absolute opposite is true. China has started a policy which is a war avoidance policy; and actually, the only perspective to overcome geopolitics which has been put by anybody on the table. Back in September 2013 when Xi Jinping announced in Kazakhstan the New Silk Road, this was a policy in the tradition of the ancient silk road, which 2000 years ago, during the Han administration was an exchange of goods, of culture, of ideas.

And it led to a tremendous increase in the prosperity of all the nations participating in the Silk Road at that time; and what China is now offering with the New Silk Road, is doing exactly the same thing.

This project, which is now almost three years old, in September it will be three years since it was started, is now already involving 70 countries, mainly in Asia, along the ancient Silk Road, but it is also now reaching out to the ASEAN countries, to Iran, to Africa, to Egypt, to India. This is now a project which is pursuing a completely different principle. It is not the casino economy of the trans-Atlantic sector; but it is the idea to build infrastructure, to have a banking system associated with it which is not investing in high-risk speculation, but providing the necessary credits to solve the incredible lack of infrastructure which was the result of the policies of the IMF, the World Bank, who deliberately denied Third World countries access to credit for infrastructure.

The New Silk Road policy, and the banking system which is associated with it, the AIIB, the New Development Bank, and the new Shanghai Cooperation Bank which was just started, also the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the Silk Road Fund, the Bank of the SAG countries, the South Asian countries, all of these banks represent a completely different model of banking and economic cooperation. And they have invited the United States to join. Xi Jinping repeatedly said, this is an open concept for every country on the planet. We want to have a win-win perspective, where naturally, China has its advantages; but every other country has their own advantages if they participate.

Now, where does the war danger come from? Why is the United States, and the EU and Great Britain, why are they not simply not joining? Well, the problem is the British Empire. The problem is that the United States, in reality, is run by the idea that there must be a unipolar world run on the basis of

the special relationship between the British Empire and the United States. And unfortunately President Obama has completely bought into this idea, which is really a continuation of the Neo-Con policy, which was presented by such people as Wolfowitz, Perl, already at the end of the '90s. They called it the Project for a New American doctrine. And that is the idea, that, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, there is only one super-power left, and that super-power has the right to, basically, deploy militarily around the globe; that that super-power will not allow any nation or group of nations to bypass the United States in terms of economic, political, or military power.

Now the problem is, that unipolar world, in reality, does not exist anymore. Because China is rising, all of Asia is rising. China is already producing a lot more high technology goods for exports than the United States. They are producing more scientists, more engineers. They are just much more future oriented, as you can see by the most fantastic space program China has, while NASA has been dismantled. And the problem is that not only China is rising, but many countries in Asia are rising. India, for example, India has the largest economic growth rate in the world, about 8%. Other countries are totally committed to being modern, middle class countries by 2020 or 2025, such as Malaysia; or even Ethiopia wants to be very soon a normal, developed country. This is happening and you cannot stop that desire for development of all these nations around the globe.

Now, the problem is that the trans-Atlantic sector is about to blow up financially. You just had the conclusion of the G-7 meeting. The G-7 is supposedly the most important economic countries, or that's what they think. In reality, their influence is shrinking; so that even the German tabloid, *Bild Zeitung*, which is read by 8 million people every day, had a banner headline saying that the G-7 summit was the summit of the seven dwarves. That was a correct characterization, and

the only reasonable person at that G-7 summit, was, to a big surprise, Japanese Prime Minister Abe. Because he went into the summit after coming back from a visit to Sochi, where he met extensively with President Putin, and concluded many, many economic deals; gas and oil in the far east of Russia and many other such projects, which he did despite enormous pressure from the Obama Administration not to do. He came into the summit and said, "Look, we have to discuss the fact that the western financial system is about to have a crisis as big as 2008," the crisis of Lehman Brothers.

The problem was that did fall into deaf ears. Obama said, no, no such thing, we are in an upswing. So the final communique of that summit said the upswing is continuing, we are all doing fine. Now nothing could be further from the truth. Because right now, the too-big-to-fail banks, if one of these banks would bust, the entire system could evaporate. You have right now the ridiculous debate around helicopter money. That is the idea that the last measure of the Central banks is to print money electronically, like throwing money notes out of helicopters over cities, to prevent a crash from happening, which was the crazy idea of Ben Bernanke many years ago, but they are now doing it.

They have negative interest rates. They are issuing hundred-year bonds. If you want to give a donation to the bank, then buy a hundred-year bond, because what happens with this bond in one hundred years is a big illusion. It will evaporate, not exist; and if you sell such a bond before the hundred-year term is up, you will lose a lot of money by doing so. So it is a complete swindle to just try to get people who have savings to invest in the banking machine. The fact that people are buying these bonds, shows you that the confidence in the markets has really shrunk to an abysmal point.

This is the real war danger. Because you have people in the trans-Atlantic world who are absolutely determined to not allow Asia rising; who are about to commit exactly the mistake

the former Joint Chief of Staff General Dempsey warned of many times, to fall into the Thucydides trap. That was the conflict between Sparta and Athens in ancient Greece, where the fear of the one of the rise of the other led to the Peloponnesian War and finally to the destruction of the Greek empire. And Greece has never regained the importance it had at that time. Dempsey had warned that the United States should not make the same mistake; but that is exactly what is happening.

You have right now many, many changes in the world which are taking place with an absolute rapid speed. As I said, Japan is, right now, swinging towards the BRICS coalition, the Silk Road coalition. And, obviously, if Japan has very good relations now with Russia, that is a good stepping stone to improve relations with China as well. The Indian Prime Minister, Modi, was just in Iran; and concluded together with President Rouhani and the President of Afghanistan, Ghani, long-term investments into the Chabahar port industrial zone, which is part of extending the Silk Road from China to Iran and from there to India and to Afghanistan.

Now, the former President, Karzai, had already stated at a conference in New Delhi in March, that the only way Afghanistan can be pacified is by making Afghanistan a hub of trade and commerce for the New Silk Road connection between Asia and Europe. The President of India, Mukherjee, was just in China for a four-day visit, also concluding many, many deals. He made a beautiful speech referring to the long, ancient cultural collaboration and exchanges between China and India; and he said, "If our two nations," which are the biggest in the world in terms of population, they together are more than 2.5 billion people, "If our two countries work together, there is nothing we cannot accomplish on this Earth."

So, you have right now two completely different sets of policies. You have the trans-Atlantic world being still in fear of this unipolar control, which is preparing for war;

however, people in Europe [are] freaking out about it. There is a big discussion about ending the sanctions; there was a meeting in the French National Assembly, voting against it. Just yesterday, there was another meeting in the Senate in France in a commission, also voting against sanctions. Italian Prime Minister Renzi is against sanctions, and he's going in June to the St. Petersburg economic summit; which is clearly not what the United States would like to see. And in Germany, half (or even more) of the country is in favor of ending the sanctions; and right now, people realize they have to make a choice. Do they stay in the war machine in the trans-Atlantic world, or do they side with those countries which represent the future?

We have right now a branching point in history. Don't think that this very quickly changing situation will last forever. I think the decision of which direction mankind will go will be made in the coming weeks; in the month of June and not much beyond that. There is a war danger for this summer; people are talking about a danger of war with Russia for 2017. There is a book by a neo-con out with that title. People are very worried that this summer the crisis in the South China Sea may explode, or be exploded. I think there comes a point of no return.

So, we have to really think of what can be a way out. Let me bring in one other problem. In Europe right now, we are in really a complete turmoil because you have the influx of the largest refugee crisis since the end of World War II. Last year, there were about 2 million refugees coming to Europe; this year it's expected to be a little bit less, due to the fact that the EU is now committing a murderous policy by using the military means of Frontex driving the refugees back. Many of them drowning in the Mediterranean, and making extremely dirty deals with Turkey and with Saudi Arabia to help them to prevent the refugees from entering the EU. This will not work; it already has led to a complete discreditation of the

EU; no one from the EU should talk anymore about humanitarian values, or even human values, when they are committing such murderous policies against the refugees. But it should be obvious that you will not solve that problem by building new walls around every country; that is the end of the EU anyway. And also not walls around the outer borders of the EU. But you need to eliminate the real reason why people are risking their lives with a 50% chance they might die to get to Europe; because they are running away from wars and hunger and other catastrophes in Southwest Asia and in Africa. In the case of southwest Africa and Libya, it's clearly the result of American and British wars, NATO wars which were all based on lies; which has led to a complete explosion of southwest Asia. And in the case of Africa, it's the result of 50 years of induced increased death rates because of the conditionalities of the IMF.

Now, there is a way out. As I said, now China, India, Iran are all working to extend the Silk Road into Iran, Afghanistan; and the obvious idea is that we need a Marshall Plan-Silk Road approach towards the entire southwest Asia region – from Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the Caucuses to the Persian Gulf. We have to have a real development strategy to conquer the desert in this region through the development of new fresh water; peaceful nuclear energy for desalinization of large amounts of ocean water; aquifers; ionization of the atmosphere. We can do everything; these countries, which once were blossoming cultures, can be turned again to become blossoming countries which give a future to the young generation. And it is already on the way because the neighbors are committed to do that. All we have to do is convince the United States and the European countries to participate in such a Silk Road-Marshall Plan for the Middle East, and also for Africa. It would be so easy to eliminate poverty; we could do that in half a year. No person would have to die of hunger anymore, because the technologies all exist; and if you then would go and build infrastructure –

ports, railway systems, waterways, highways, food processing. Build new cities; build advanced technologies in all countries of Africa and southwest Asia. It could be turned around in a few years, and in one or two generations these regions could be as developed as the United States or Europe were in the '70s. I'm not saying now, but as they were in the '70s.

So, why don't we move in this direction? There is no good reason. We will lose identity as being human if we don't do that. I think we have never been at such a challenge as right now; and it is extremely important that we remember that this planet is inhabited by only one human race. Contrary to what the new racists and the new fascists – which are unfortunately on the rise; like in the '30s, you have the rise of racism and fascism. You have old wine in new bottles, but the content of these bottles remains the same. Anybody who says the refugees or foreigners are of a different genetic composition, or have different reproduction schemes and therefore must be kept out; these are racists in new clothing. And we must absolutely establish the idea that what makes us human is that every child born on this planet, is gifted with a potentially limitless potential to be a genius.

The fact that we don't have more geniuses on the planet right now is not due to the nature of the human being, but due to the fact that the conditions of life do not allow so far the best development of every child who is born. If they would have universal education and a decent living standard, and have a vision and a hope for the future, we could have an increase of geniuses in the world; which would really show that mankind is in the infancy stage, maybe even embryonic stage of its development. If you want to evade the fate the of the dinosaurs – that is, vanish – we have to make that evolutionary where we are not defined anymore by blood and soil, or territory, or color of our skin or hair. But that we are defined by that which is human to all of humanity, that we can all be beautiful souls. That we can not only develop

limitless new insights into the law of the Universe and make scientific discoveries of physical principles leading to tremendous breakthroughs in science and technology; but that we can also become better human beings. That we can become more beautiful in our character; that we can become more loving; that we can become more artistically brilliant; that we can compose music at least as good as the great Classical music and beyond.

So, I think we are really at a branching point, and you people there in New York have a very, very special responsibility. Because as Lyn has said, New York is a very, very special place in the United States; it's the founding of the United States. It's the place from which Alexander Hamilton operated. But even today, the New Yorkers are generally more cosmopolitan, they are less chauvinist, they are more intelligent, they are more political. And if we want to get the United States back to be a republic, a country which other countries want to be allied with and not shriveling in fear and terror, then it is you, the New Yorkers, and your example shining in the entire United States of America which will turn this country around. So, I think on this Memorial Day weekend, we have a tremendous moment; think about the people who died in previous wars, and we must have a solemn commitment that war should never become a means of conflict resolution again. If we mobilize people around that idea, and the idea that humanity is really at the point of finishing itself off, or making an evolutionary jump where we are all being defined by the global development partnership in which we can engage; and the responsibility for future generations that we must build the bridge to a better time and a better age. I think we can do it.

DENNIS SPEED: OK, we're going to go to questions now. There's a microphone here in the middle of the floor; there are chairs people can line up. When you get up, state your name, and please try to be concise in your asking of the questions.

First question.

Q1: Hello, Helga. On the question of war, something that people here may not know is that in 1962, while Kennedy was dealing with the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy's intervention – which is not very well known – but Kennedy intervened in the Indo-China War; which is the 1962 war between India and China, and was working with the Indian government to de-escalate tensions. It got to a point where even the aircraft carrier *USS Kitty Hawk* was stationed in the Bay of Bengal to come to the aid of India, in case we needed help. And this is something that he and James Galbraith – Kennedy's ambassador to India – were working with the Indian government; especially Prime Minister Nehru, who was the father of Indira Gandhi. Since then, the world has really changed, where in the United States you have a President who is escalating tensions in the world; and you have India and China, who are coming closer than ever. So, I just find it very interesting how the world has really shifted; because of interventions and because of leadership like Indira Gandhi and you and your husband, Mr. LaRouche.

So, I wanted to ask you, how in our interactions with Indira Gandhi, how did your concept of the World Land-Bridge change or develop? And how did she influence your ideas about the World Land-Bridge? And how do you think India can use its cultural heritage now in organizing the rest of the world into this New Paradigm?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, we talked with Indira Gandhi, I think it was between '79 and '83, until when she was assassinated. That was obviously before the idea of the Silk Road could appear; because you still had the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc. So, we were talking with Indira Gandhi about a 40-year development plan for India; and that was actually the idea that you need two generations – or at that point we assumed you needed two generations to do that. Because there were many parts of India which are totally undeveloped; not

even roads, you had dirt roads. The idea was to bring infrastructure in the first generation and universal education to every child. This is a big thing, because in India at that time, and I think to a certain extent it's still going on; there are many parents who send their children instead of sending them to the school, to help in the countryside in the fields. Which naturally, it's preventing children from having education, so that was our main concern; these two aspects – infrastructure and universal education to every child. And then in the second generation, you could have – with every child being educated – you could develop India fully. So, she liked that approach, and was totally determined to implement it; and when she was killed, we continued to work on that with her son, Rajiv Gandhi. And then he was assassinated as well.

So in a certain sense, India has been set back a lot by these assassinations; and therefore it is not extremely good that now with Prime Minister Modi, who is from the BJP and not from the Congress Party, but nevertheless he is very, very popular. And many people in India today compare him to Nehru, to Indira Gandhi; and they respect him as one of the great leaders who can really change the world. And he has managed to do one thing; he has successfully, in the short period he has been in office – a little bit more than two years – managed to change the role of India in the world from a regional power to become a true global power. And India is now assuming that role by saying they have already the biggest economic growth rate; they soon will have the largest number of people, they will bypass China. And therefore, I'm very happy; because when I was in India in March at the Raisina Dialogue, there was still a big concern about India-Chinese tensions – the border conflicts. And also naturally the issue of the development corridor China is building in Pakistan; will that be against India? So there were still a lot of these worries, and for the two problem points we have now made a breakthrough. Because with President Mukherjee going to China, and saying these countries are in an absolutely fantastic alliance, and

we can solve every problem in the world; this is on a very good track. And with Modi going to Iran, basically building bridges with Afghanistan; Afghanistan is a big security concern for India. So, this is all moving step by step in a very good direction; and I think the best thing we could do is, I think there are 3 million Indians in the United States – I think so, yeah. So, if these people would take pride of the great advances India is making right now, and basically say, "We are now living in the United States; and we want to have good relations between the United States and India. But that means stop this confrontation with Russia and with China, and then we can really move on in a global development partnership." So I think these 3 million Indians living in the United States could become a great asset for peace and for the future of all civilization; and we should appeal to them to act exactly in this way.

Q2: Hi, Helga; it's Alvin. I'm glad that you're here because there's a recent article on LPAC that's talking about and describing a recent conference that took place in the capital of Yemen as a breakthrough. And the Schiller Institute influence is being felt there, and continues to grow. As the article describes, this was widely attended; hundreds of finance ministers, private industry, civil and economic organizations were there. And of the many items that were resolved or passed, three of them involve the work of the organization as a whole, the principle of Hamilton where you're restoring – the New Silk Road of course, Reconstruction Bank and national credit. Now here is this small nation which is war-torn through the Saudis, through the British, through Obama, and they find themselves taking this giant step forward and making demands upon the UN to exile the Saudis and adopt these policies for future peace and development. Now obviously, the Schiller Institute's influence, this shows a good example of why we come under the types of attacks that you do, when you have such an influence. But what I wanted to ask you was, what do you really think are the implications

from a successful conference like this? And how should we, here in Manhattan, use this as a weapon to bring others in to understanding what a real global, strategic outlook requires?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I think the first message obviously is, no country can be so small or in such difficult conditions as not being able to rise above its so-called fate and take the initiative to change the situation. If we can stop this general war danger which I tried to describe a little bit earlier, if we can stop that and get some public debate in the United States about the fact that that war danger exists; the problem is, people don't even know it. There is no uprising; there are no people in the streets. There is nobody saying "We do not want the United States to start World War III." I think that's the first step. If we can stop that, then I am very optimistic in terms that we can get this World Land-Bridge approach for the reconstruction.

Because right now, with Putin intervening in Syria, the Syrian Army regaining more and more territory; China has now committed a special person for the reconstruction for Syria, who is presently in Damascus. There are many projects being worked on; and we will soon publish a lot more about it. We are working with Syrian architects and engineers who are totally determined to make the Project Phoenix a reality; which if people don't know yet what Operation Phoenix is, they should look at it. It's a very concrete project to rebuild the cities which were destroyed in Syria. All of this is going to happen; and also for Africa. There is a new mood in the developing countries. I'm almost reminded of the time of the Non-Aligned Movement, when there was a totally determined nation to get a Just New World Economic Order; and while they may not name it New World Economic Order right now, as I said, there are many countries in Africa and Asia who are absolutely determined to overcome underdevelopment. And isn't that what Roosevelt wanted, or what Martin Luther King was talking about; what Kennedy was talking about? And that is now a

distinct possibility; but I think everything depends upon us getting these changes inside the United States. Because the best person cannot live in peace if the evil-minded neighbor does not allow it; and that is a German proverb which applies to all these efforts. All these countries will not succeed if we cannot change the United States.

Q3: Helga, this is R— from Bergen County, New Jersey. You mentioned the losing of one's human identity; which can happen from the types of activities that one's government is involved in — referring to the nuclear build-up and so forth. My question is, if we go back to the case of Nazi Germany, the Germans under Nazi Germany, did Germans lose their human identity due to the activities of their government at that time? And also, what did it take for Germans to regain their human identity; and is that entire scenario analogous to what's going on in the United States today? In other words, have Americans lost, or are they losing their human identity due to the types of activities of their government? Can that be drawn as a similar situation to Nazi Germany; and what will be required for Americans to regain their human identity?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think the German example should be a warning example to any country around the world; that a country which is — I am at least proud to have produced some of the most beautiful composers, inventors, poets. I find the German Classical period is probably the richest of any country; and I'm not saying this because I'm arrogant, but because it's simply a fact. How could such a country plunge into the depths of the Nazi horror? I think it is very important to study exactly are the axioms which erode; and I think we have done some studies about it. That what started to erode the Classical period in Germany was the Romantic period; because the Romantic period started to destroy the clear principles of the classics. And that was then followed by an increasing pessimism with Schopenhauer; out of that came the youth movement before World War I, which was a terrible

youth movement. It was actually a proto-fascist youth movement. Then came World War I, World War II.

Just today, there was a big celebration of 4000 German and French students celebrating German-French friendship; looking at what was it for four years to fight in the trenches in Verdun. And trying to build an understanding; what were these soldiers doing for four years? Mindless battles; shooting; killing back and forth; gaining nothing; back and forth. These four years of the First World War denuded the young generation in Germany so badly, that then with the Versailles Treaty and the hyperinflation and the Great Depression, gave rise to extremist movements. The Nazis, the Bolsheviks, which led to a right-left confrontation in the streets. But the Conservative Revolution, the idea that man is fixed; that man is not good; that you have to fight against the ideas of 1789, which is the American Revolution, the French Revolution. The idea that there is only one human race. That spread; 400 movements existed like that.

So, people now look at the present, and they don't see the continuity of these movements today. Even so, the Conservative Revolution is absolutely a continuous movement since the American Revolution; it's the oligarchy. It's the idea of taking back, reversing the American Revolution; reversing the idea of a Constitution. And that is why I think it is so extremely important that Americans have the clear idea to return the United States to become a republic again. To go back to the Founding Fathers; to Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, to a little bit later John Quincy Adams, and to the principles of Lincoln. And these early Presidents represented a United States which was quite different than what is happening today. And I think you have to revive the best traditions, in order not to let it come to such a deep plunge, like Germany did. It has, in my view, not happened yet, even though it's had much in the vicinity of it. But, you have to really use the *best* traditions of the United States,

to prevent the disaster. Because, racism is clearly there. You have, clearly, elements which I would characterize as, "Nazi-like," and people don't dare to say it, but that is what people should really recognize. Germany, right now, I would say, is, sort of, you know, a little bit, still impotent, decapitated, doesn't dare to have a clear idea of its own traditions. But, it has successfully changed; it has admitted the guilt. It is clearly, "no war!"; people have a clear idea – never war again. And therefore, I see *apotential* that Germany may not go along. You know, if *Japan* can break out of this, and Germany could break out of it in Europe; we could solve this danger. Because, without Germany the war would not happen. So, I think, you know, we should draw lessons from history. Because, if we deny history, we are bound to make the same mistakes.

Q4: I came to this country in '73. And, kind of a secret mission. During the civil war in Russia, my father was in the "White Army," not in "Red." So, they never trusted me; and I lost my sea career in the Pacific. Instead of becoming captain, I became a professor of political science, because I could not sail. They were afraid that I would escape. It's family arguments. Now, finally, in the 1960s, I came to Moscow, and sent my old mother to United States, to seek her brother in Chicago. He was a soldier in the White Army, and left Russia in 1921, from the Crimea, with General Wrangel.

Anyway, what I talk about: I knew how to behave, in that world, where I was; one word could cost you too much. So, it was much more comfortable not to talk, but to listen. And, I was in Moscow in 1970, when the political police arranged mental asylum for me. At that time, already, no shootings; it was a democracy. So, then I— that was the system that I built. In Moscow, you have two restaurants: National, where Russian KGB catching Western spies; and Prague, this is the citadel of the Russian elite. So, I went there, and found a guy, who proved to be a colonel in the KGB, at the top of the pyramid.

And, he took me to his home, in Moscow, locked me for three days. And then, came back and said that, "You're under protection, don't worry." And, I stayed some years, and what was my problem, then: To return to merchant marine? Only in coastal trade, because, if you go abroad, you never return. So, I understood that the people, never knew what they were doing. The situation was, that I had a cyanide pill, here – all that nonsense. And, in 1972, I finished my first – while sitting in Moscow; I wrote 900 pages my travel in the Pacific. It's coastal trade, between Japan and Arctic. And, tell me the concentration camps, everything, big material for people who can read. And, they wanted to publish the books, abroad. In that case, I have to go to mental asylum. They could not help me.

So, we agree that I better go out. And, they arranged me; KGB all obeyed. Immediately I got my visa, and, in '72, in fall, I left. And, when I came here, after some time, some thought that I was a Russian agent, a twice American double agent, and they never know what they are doing. I never touched anybody. I was a driver for 25 years; driving school; fresh air, and I enjoyed it.

Now, about this organization: I heard about it, but I have doubts. In my secret mission, I delayed for 20 years, then I sent to Bush my analysis of American war in Middle East. I got from him a big photo, with, "Thanks." And, Mr. Reynolds, from Republican Congress, reported to me that they appointed to me as a "honorary American [inaudible 1.06.21]" That has been my plan. But that was all I could do. As I promised my guys in Moscow, I never joined any political struggle inside. It was not the purpose. Anyway, I sent him my material, first time, and got results. Then, Mr. Obama appeared, and invited me to join to his shadow cabinet. At that time, I didn't know that he as bad as you pictured him. I had no idea about him; I was a Republican. So, I joined him, now. And, I stand aside.

What I know, now, the situation is. I don't know even the name

of this organization. But I saw them. And, I see, clearly, a few points: That they talk business. The world is moving to war; this I know. Back in Russia, my father was in the White Army, not Red. My uncle was in the Tsarist army, fighting Germans. And every week, they met each other for drinks; they called it "brotherhoods." And then, Stalin – not only you – in Russia, nobody knows him, what he did that way. I saw it all: I lived in Siberia, then Arctic, the whole country, one-sixth of the Earth.

After Stalin prepared Russia for war, after Lenin's death, he created the world's biggest military machine. And in 1941 in Moscow, when Hitler's army group one, under big Marshal Bock were ready to take Moscow; when Stalin recalled his divisions from the Pacific. I saw them arrive, near Moscow, it was in October. Then, in November, they prepared; in December, they attacked, and destroyed German army, completely. It was a catastrophe, there. They drove them about 600 km – 300 miles away from Moscow. That was the end of the WAR, in fact. After that, Hitler knew that it's all over for him. But, he tried to save his army, himself, and Germany. He failed, everywhere. Finally, a bullet into his throat.

I don't want to talk about Hitler, because he was a nervous man, not fit for anything. But Germans paid a high price for that.

I talk about this situation. Now, Russia is a huge, military machine, ready to – why? – I did not tell you. The last thousand years, Russia was ten times attacked, once from the east, nine times from the west. Incessant attacks. And, Hitler's attack was the latest draw. So, one of them, before I left; I had friends, no jobs. He told me, if anybody comes to us, once more, with guns; so far, they came, we chased them back. This time, nobody will be chased back; we kill them all and bury them, and that will be the end. If you take Russia, European part, to Moscow, it's like Europe, then also from Moscow–

SPEED: Excuse me, Viktor, we need you to wrap it up.

Q4: I finish it, tomorrow, thank you.

SPEED: No, no, no. Just, if you have a final point.

Q4: No. Just one word. This organization talks business. But, what I found out, it gets no financial support, absolutely. I am the banker. I have a friend; I gave her \$100, several times. Just now, I'm empty, then, soon I going to make, again. It's amazing, for me. The only organization that talks business, which involves prevention of war; because nuclear war will make this planet dead. Even spiders will die. They already afraid of my house, never returned to my house. I have a house – I am a rich man, now. And, I keep my mouth shut; first time I talk. [laughter] But, listen: War is war. I talking nonsense, but, I can talk different ways. So far, you see, I am a retired political scientist.

SPEED: I think that Helga may have something to say.

Q4: So, give me two minutes more!

SPEED: No, no, no– [laughing] you get 30 seconds.

Q4: OK: I wish you good luck! [laughter, applause]

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, I think that you are not the only person with Russian background, who is reminded of the Great Patriotic War, and the fact that Russia was attacked several times. As a matter of fact, if you look at what Napoleon did, he tried to conquer Russia. And it was the brilliant collaboration between the Russian generals, and the German-Prussian reformers, such people like Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and also the cousin of Schiller, who actually defined the line of long penetration, into Russia, luring the Napoleonic army into the far territory, Russia. So, then when, finally, Napoleon reached Moscow, they burned it down so that he couldn't have Moscow as a winter headquarters. And then, on

the way back, they chopped the entire Napoleonic army – an army which was several hundred thousand – ended up (I think) with a couple of hundred people, at the end of that war. And, that was exactly the same mistake Hitler made, who thought he could conquer Russia.

And, right now, you have, fortunately, in the person of President Putin, somebody who has proven to be much, much superior as a strategist, than the West; especially the people who are trying to push this confrontation.

But, right now, the fact that you have the largest concentration of troops, on the Russian border is bringing forward the memory of exactly the Nazi invasion in '40, '41. And it is really something people should not underestimate; the suffering of losing so many people in the war, that memory is coming back in the Russian population today. And that is why the Immortal Regiment demonstrations were so absolutely moving, a couple of weeks ago.

And I think we have to somehow revive that spirit of fighting Nazism, fighting fascism. That fascism is not coming in the form of Hitler, it's coming in the form of a unipolar world and imperialism and basically destroying other nations for the sake of the world empire. But we have to call forth, nevertheless, the deep emotions associated with the sacrifice of previous generations; and not gamble it away lightly. Because what Lincoln addressed in the Gettysburg Address, or what other people said in similar occasions, we have to keep the suffering of our previous generations as a source of inspiration to build a better future and make sure this never happens again.

I think that your experience is unfortunately typical of people who got in between the various developments. But I think we really have to have a clear vision that the future of humanity should not be like that; that we have to have a situation where people relate to each other as scientists, as

composers, as poets. If you read the letter exchanges of great people of the past – of Einstein and Max Planck, or Schiller and Humboldt – then you get a sense of what is a truly human relation.

And I think we have to have a clear vision today of what should be the future in 100 years, in 1,000 years. People should grow up; I don't think people should remain the way the 20th Century has been, or the beginning of the 21st Century for that matter. I want people to become like Plato, like Nicolaus of Cusa, like Leibniz. Why should every person not be like that? I'm not talking about copies; I'm not talking about talking like Leibniz, talking like Schiller. But in the realm of genius, there is no limit; there are infinite possibilities to develop creativity and contribute to the human development. I think we have a tremendous responsibility, because it is our action today that will decide that we unleash this unbelievable potential of the human species.

I can imagine that in 10,000 years from now, people will be completely focused on problem solving in the Solar System, in the Galaxy; they will probably have traveled to other Galaxies. We have probably mastered higher energy flux density, so that moving around in the Universe will be a completely different question than we even think about it today. And that people will discover principles and creativity that we have not even an inkling of today; in the same way people in the Stone Age could not anticipate that fusion power would solve soon the energy problems of the entire planet. Would people have discovered the use of fire? Would they have thought that we would be able to control matter/anti-matter reactions in the future? No. And they couldn't even think it; and I think there are things we cannot even think about, but which become the absolute natural condition of man. And that people will be loving. I don't think that the nasty character most people have today is what

is human. I think that people will become loving, creative, humorous; they will have a totally different character. And therefore, I disagree with President Obama fundamentally when he made this speech in Hiroshima, where he said the nature of man has always been to go for war. I don't think that that's true. I think the idea of making war is an infantile disorder; and in the same way as little two-year old boys kick you against the knee, when they are grown up they stop doing that if they are civilized. And in the same way, I think this idea of solving conflict with war will vanish. And man is principally good; he just has to be more developed so the goodness can come out. I fully agree with Nicolaus of Cusa, who said that sin is a sign of underdevelopment; and that if all people just had the ability to spend the time on the development of their creative potential, sin would vanish. And that's what I think is absolutely true. [applause]

SPEED: Let me simply say, hold on before we go any further. We want people to be concise. It is true that it's Memorial Day; it is true that we have veterans of the war, and we wish to hear from people. But you have to think about what you just heard Helga say; and think about it as you pose matters for deliberation for the people here. Other things can be discussed in the halls or in the breaks and so forth; but it's important we, here, focus. So, I just wanted to say that to everybody before we continue.

Q5: Thank you. I will be concise. My name is H— M—; I'm from Staten Island. I apologize for my voice. I agree with much of what you said in your presentation. There were a number of issues that you didn't mention that I think are critically important. The first is that the American economy is going through a major transition with the advance of technology and different sources of energy. We need fewer and fewer fully-educated unskilled workers; and essentially we don't most of the lower 80% of the labor force. Thomas Frank, who wrote that famous book, *What's the Matter with Kansas?*,

recently published a follow-up to that.

SPEED: Hold on; this is exactly what I meant. If you have a matter that you want as a question, fine.

Q5: The first issue that you didn't mention is what's going to happen with the transition in the global economy that is occurring. We don't need low-skilled workers. How are we going to deal with that? If you had all geniuses, you would still need somebody to pick up the garbage. The second thing is that when you have international conflicts that can't be resolved, the Second World War, for example, was necessary. There were a lot of conflicts that were going on in Germany and Eastern Europe and Western Europe prior to the Second World War; and the only way they could be resolved was through an explosion, which occurred. These conflicts between China, Russia, and the United States have to be resolved.

SPEED: OK, hold on. You have two issues there.

Q5: I have a third; can I just mention the third? So war can create a new stabilization. And the third is that we have global warming; and that's going to have an immense impact on the population of the world.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, just to mention global warming first. Global warming does not happen; it's global cooling since about 16 years. And global change, change in weather patterns, have nothing to do with CO₂ emissions; they have everything to do with the cycles of our Solar System in the Galaxy. So, we better get accustomed to these changes, because we cannot influence them. We have to learn to live with it better; because there were these Ice Ages and warming periods over the last hundreds of thousands of years. That's just the way it is. In the same way, if we lose a couple of species, we should not be so concerned; because the evolution of the Universe produces new species all the time. That's part of what evolution is all about.

But to the more fundamental point, I cannot agree with what you say that the Second World War was necessary, or that it was a cleaning explosion or something like that. And in the same way, it's utterly untrue for the present conflict between Russia, China, and the United States. The Second World War was really the continuation of the geopolitical games which led to World War I; which Haushofer, Mackinder, Milner, such people had basically worked out. Which was really the idea that whoever controls the Eurasian heartland is the master of the planet; and that this would be at the disadvantage of the trend of the Atlantic Rim countries. It was that crazy thinking which led to World War I; and that was not resolved through that war. It was cemented through the Versailles Treaty; which really was the basis for all the conflicts now, including the conflicts in the South China Sea. Because the Paris Treaty, which was part of the Versailles Treaty, left the territorial conflicts of the South China Sea unresolved by leaving a tremendous feeling of injustice in the Chinese population; because a lot of the previous German colonies were given to Japan. And the same thing happened with the Sykes-Picot agreement already in 1916; it happened with the Trianon Treaty which was part of Versailles. And all of that was the result of the same empire policy persisting with Versailles after the First World War; and Versailles was an absolute contributing factor to World War II, in which the same imperial forces who groomed Hitler as one tendency – the National Socialists were just one tendency of that Conservative Revolution which I mentioned earlier. They groomed Hitler as a orator through the Thule Society; and they read *Mein Kampf*, and they said if we pit Germany and Russia against each other, it will lead to World War II. And that's why the oligarchs in Great Britain and such people as the Eugenics Society in the United States backed Hitler; because they liked his race policies. That was the reason why World War II finally happened; because it was a geopolitical manipulation. And it was a total setback for mankind; and many countries have not recovered from it to the present day,

Germany being one of them.

So I do not agree that you need these explosions. And if it would come to such an explosion today, I'm pretty much afraid that nobody would be left. I think we have to think completely differently; we have to think about a New Paradigm of mankind. A paradigm which is defined by the common aims of mankind; that which makes us human together. The problems we have to solve together, like space travel, to make it safe for the human race to exist. We are not safe right now; we could be destroyed by asteroids, by volcanic explosions which could lead to a winter period like what probably happened after the dinosaurs. Ninety-six species gone 65 million years ago. We have to think about how to make life safe for the human species; not only on Earth, but also on Earth. And for that, we have to work together. The New Paradigm must conceive of mankind in the same way as the difference was between the Dark Age of the 14th Century and the modern times which started with the Renaissance period of the 15th Century with the Golden Renaissance in Italy.

If you compare the leading axioms of the Middle Ages with the leading axioms of the modern times, you have two completely different sets of ideas. The Dark Age, the Middle Ages, were characterized by scholasticism, by the Peripatetics, by the control of Aristotle in all the universities, by witchcraft, by the Flagellants, by people who would burn women as witches, by the Inquisition. All of this was characteristic of the Middle Ages. And then came, based on Dante, Petrarca, Nicolaus of Cusa brought the heritage of Plato to Italy at that time; which had been lost for about 1700 years, and that all led to a tremendous scientific and cultural explosion known as the Italian Renaissance. And the image of man, the absolute emphasis on the individual creativity, on the idea of the common good as being the purpose of the state, the idea of the sovereign nation-state, all of these new ideas developed in this period of the early 15th Century into the middle of

the 15th Century, about two generations. We had an explosion of science, of knowledge, and that led to the foundation for Nicolaus of Cusa, for Kepler, for Leibniz, for the allusion of modern science, of precise natural science, of great Classical art.

And these two systems have coexisted for 500-600 years, and now this has come to an end. We are now at an end of an epoch. The end of the epoch of the coexistence of empire and nation-state. And if we don't make the jump now, to say, both empire is a finished model, but also the nation-state as such has to be complemented by a higher form of "the common aims of mankind," and the idea of the truly human behavior of people working for the common aims; making a new Renaissance of all cultures of this planet, where each culture knows the other culture, the high point; every American will know what Chinese culture was, what Russian culture was, what German culture was, and make something new, beautiful out of that: a new Renaissance which will take the best of the ideas of what each nation produced, celebrate it, make it common knowledge.

Make the cultures of the world as known to every human being, as maybe the *Ninth Symphony* of Beethoven is pretty known to all human beings. But do people know everything about Chinese philosophy, poetry, Indian painting, Indian Classical dance, Indian Classical music? No, they don't! And that is the kind of human heritage which we have to have as the common good of all people, to create something new out of it.

So we need a new paradigm, and I think people should each, individually, think, what do you want to contribute with your life, so that in a hundred years, mankind is more human by several orders of magnitude than today? And that your life has contributed, to end this *terrible* popular culture which we have today, which is completely Satanic. I mean, all the youth culture is utterly Satanic. All the pop music is Satanic, fashion is mostly ugly; all of the modern painting is an insult to the human mind, to even consider that as

creative. I mean, true, there are some exceptions, but we have to go back to the highest standard of all the cultures before, to make something new out of it.

So do not think that war is necessary, or was necessary. War is a relic of an infantile feature of the human person.
[applause]

SPEED: We're going to take two questions, and then we're going to take a break. We're going to take a break so that all those people who completely disagree with much of what was just said, can vent in the halls, before you come back, hopefully with cogent questions about the next session. So, go ahead.

Q6: Hello, Helga, we have a question here from a contact from Brazil that we met recently, B-A-. And his question is, "What do you think about the coup that is going on against the democracy of Brazil? It is a violence and danger for Latin America. For example, what would be the impact on the world economy if the Brazilian economy collapsed, since it is the seventh largest in the world? Without the BRICS would there be a world?"

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, we will publish in the coming issue of *EIR* a documentation of who is running this coup. Because Dilma Rousseff herself said repeatedly that this has nothing to do with corruption she was involved in, but that it was a coup by the right wing Brazil. Now while it is obviously clear that the right wing in Brazil has been involved in this, what she has not said is what we will document, that, how certain forces in the United States in particular, and in Great Britain, have been behind steering this coup, in the same way as the attack on Cristina Fernández de Kirchner is organized from the United States, from certain hedge funds, from certain political interests; and we will put this out in writing.

And hopefully somebody in Brazil will pick it up. Because I think the only way how the integrity of Brazil can be protected, is that the truth comes out, and that the population in Brazil which is obviously being targetted by a black propaganda campaign following the Italian model of "Clean Hands." And this was even admitted by Bloomberg, that the model of Clean Hands is what was being used.

This goes back to the history of Italy, where everybody in Italy knew that the way how Italian politics would function in the postwar period was the *amici di amici* principle: that if you would give somebody an order, you would give him a kickback and the kickback would be distributed to all the friends of that person and it was called the "*amici di amici*" principle. And that system, which everybody participated in for decades, all of a sudden was exploded, when the British decided to take over Italy for cheap money with the coup; the plot of the *Britannia* royal yacht, devaluing the Italian lira by 30% and then buying Italian firms up for cheap. And then in the context, they destroyed all the political parties in Italy, and created new, synthetic ones, which no longer could defend the sovereignty of Italy in the same way.

And that is exactly the model which has been applied in Brazil. And Dilma Rousseff herself went after this corruption system and she was not involved. And now this new phase has erupted, where the finance minister had a telephone discussion with a Senator, where they said, if we want to stop this corruption campaign, we have to get rid of Dilma and put in Temer [the then-Vice President]. So now that has been leaked to the media and this is like "the revolution eats its children" because there is no honesty among thieves. The next wave of the destabilization is already hitting now, those who committed the first wave of the destabilization.

And this will go on. And the danger is chaos. And I fully agree with you, if the Brazilian economy would be weakened even more, than it is right now, it would be a disaster for

all of Latin America, and therefore, the first priority is that the truth of who is behind this coup should be published, and it should become a household word in all of Brazil and all of Latin America.

Q7: Hi Helga, this is Lynn Yen, from the Foundation for the Revival of Classical Culture. You've made two great intellectual breakthroughs: One which is the idea of Friedrich Schiller, that to bring mankind into adulthood, you have to educate the emotions through great art and great culture. And the other is the breakthrough of Nicolaus of Cusa, who said that as man comes closer to absolute truth, if he's intelligent, he realizes that he knows nothing at all.

Now, at our foundation and our work with a lot of young people, the idea of Classical culture, it's easy, when you introduce Classical culture to young people, they can get it almost immediately. But what do you do about all the other people? How would you do about the adults? A lot of people out there oftentimes the adults, who think they know things that they actually don't know, and how do you address that?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, my own experience is that when you make people more conscious about the difference of the music they like and Classical music, they realize, at least there is a superior species when they deal with Classical culture. So I have done educationals and pedagogicals where I would download from the internet, the worst example of black gothic rock or some other Satanic popular culture, because there's some really *awesome* examples! I mean pop music has many varieties and Madonna has made some Satanic movies, you know? Like sitting on an electric chair having an orgy with herself. I mean, there are some really *horrible* examples! And then I would show these, not too long, maybe a minute – loud, ugly, the people would really see it like in a mirror. And then I would confront that, for example, with Marian Anderson singing the National Anthem at Kennedy's invitation in 1962, and people would see; or confronting Beyoncé singing the National

Anthem with Obama and Marian Anderson singing the National Anthem; and I would really invite you go home to your laptop and look at that, because Beyoncé is Hollywood-like, a façade-like face, not really human; she could be a robot. And then you have in the video they made about that, they had Michelle and Barack Obama looking like heroes in Russian Socialist art, looking into the future listening to this Beyoncé. It's so – in German there is this word – *kitsch*. You know, *kitsch* means, when the fat and the oil is dripping out of something which is so horrible. Anyway. And then you see Marian Anderson, who completely, simple, non-stylized, just very truthfully and beautiful, sings the National Anthem and it moves everybody to tears.

And that way you have to educate people to start, you know, when you have a completely degenerated taste, it takes a while to reeducate that people even have the tastebuds to taste what is beautiful! And you have to give them many, many examples, also the principles of when is a painting beautiful, and when it is not truthful. Or when is a poem beautiful, and when is it not beautiful. And you have to use examples, because it's something people can learn, and I'm absolutely certain adults – you know, age as somebody said recently, is not a question of the bones, it's a question of the mind. And I *fully* subscribe to that. Because if you are future oriented and optimistic, and have big plans, you're not aging. It just doesn't happen. Your body may be a little bit more stiff, and quirky and whatnot, but your mind can be as youthful as whatever age you choose to be.

And in the same way, I think that older people, they can recognize the difference between ugliness and beauty. In that sense, Schiller, for example was completely against the idea that you would have categories of the *Sturm und Drang*, which was the period before the Classical period. He said, the difference is, is art beautiful or not. And anything which is not beautiful should not be called art. And I think that that

is so true: Because if the art is elevating the human mind, and appealing to the soul, bringing forth this power of love, of what makes us human, this inside power which enables us to do everything we want, for the good, for the future, for mankind; if art evokes that, it is beautiful. And if art brings us down, makes us more full of lust or greed or just mindless passion, like in a rock concert where you're just moving like an ape, you can repeat rhythms you know, like a monkey rattling his cage; but that is not human!

So the question really, is how to teach the eye, the mind, the ear, to see the beauty, and reject the ugly.

SPEED: So, we're just going to be taking a brief break. Before we do, Alvin, I'd like you to take the microphone for a moment, and we want to recognize our veterans. We're just going to go person by person, we'd like each of you to say who you are, what war you served in; and anyone that we're missing, please just hold up your hand, and Alvin will go around.

BILL MONROE: Good afternoon everyone. It's a real pleasure to be here today amongst you all and with my fellow veterans. I'm looking forward to an opportunity to speak to Lyn, but it's always a pleasure to speak to you, Ma'am.

I'm sorry: My name is Bill Monroe, I'm from New Jersey. I've spoken with you on several occasions, Helga, and it's always a pleasure to see you. You're doing a wonderful job, dear lady! Keep it up! God bless you!

AL KORBY: This is Al Korby. Pearl Harbor was bombed on my 17th birthday. On my 18th birthday I joined the Army Air Force, and I worked as an aircraft mechanic on B-24s and B-29s in Texas, Kansas, Colorado and Utah. ...

PATRICK S: Good afternoon, I'm Patrick from Greenwich, Connecticut. I'm happy to be here. I was in the United States Army, stationed in Germany, in 1960-63.

PAUL BARRON: [ph] Good afternoon, Helga. My name is Paul Barron and I was in the Vietnam era, and I've from Storrs, Connecticut.

BILL MONROE: I forgot to tell you: I served in World War II, in the European theater of operations, and from there I went to the Philippines at the cessation of the war.

JAMES CHRISTIAN: Good evening, my name is James Christian, I served in the U.S. Navy as a radio operator between 1957-1960.

MICHAEL LEPPIG: My name is Michael Leppig and I served in the U.S. Navy, I was a Vietnamese linguist in Vietnam in 1966-67, and Helga, I was very inspired by your presentation. Thank you so much.

HAL VAUGHN: I was in the U.S. Army, '72-'74; I was in Turkey in 1973 when your friend Henry Kissinger caused a little trouble over there.

TORY HALL: I was in the U.S. Army, I was stationed in Germany from 2012-2016.

RONALD: My name is Ronald. I served from 1969-1971 in Vietnam.

INTERMISSION

Lyndon LaRouche Dialogue with the Manhattan Project

LAROUCHE: Well, what we would look at is Putin. Look at Putin. Putin is an honest soldier in every sense of the word.

DENNIS SPEED: So, my name is Dennis Speed and on behalf of the LaRouche Political Action Committee, I want to welcome you here for our Saturday, May 28, Memorial Day Dialogue with LaRouche.

Of course, this is an event which needs and demands no introduction [laughs]. We've come – whether or not we wish to

have come to the conclusion or not – to expect from Lyn, his normal, highly truthful, characterization of all things related to thinking.

As I said earlier, I hope that people have by now vented sufficiently and are ready to ask questions, and receive the answers that they're going to be given. Whoever our questioners are, please line up.

Lyn, would you have any statement for us at this point?

LAROUCHE: Well, I think I've been aware of what my wife has been saying, during the passing hours, and, I would like to add a rebuttal! In a certain kind of way.

SPEED: [laughs] Like I said! I think there may be some things that some of the veterans had to say, but let's just ask first of all, if there are one or two questions, either from the last session. If not, we'll give you gentlemen, – a couple of them had a few things they wanted to say.

LAROUCHE: Okay.

SPEED: So maybe Patrick, you want to start us off? You had something....

Q: Good afternoon, Mr. LaRouche. I'm Patrick from Greenwich, Connecticut. I'm honored to be here today, for the Live Memorial to the veterans, and the 9/11 victims.

A little bit about myself: I joined the Army, May 2nd, 1960. And, I had basic training in Fort Dix, New Jersey, and I went to Fort Sill, Oklahoma for artillery, and I trained on a 105 Howitzer. Then, I was stationed in Germany – I went overseas, and my new outfit was the 3rd Missile Battalion, 21st Artillery. This was the "Honest John" missile, which had a nuclear capability. And, in 1961, the Berlin Wall went up; 1962, the Cuban Crisis started, and 13 days, we were out in the field, about 3 kilometers from the Czech border, with our

missiles fully prepared and ready to go. But, thank God that Kennedy and Khrushchov were sane people.

Anyway, my question is: The Cuban Crisis of that era, and what's going on now, with the nuclear capabilities. What is your opinion as to the two different – the Cuban Crisis, compared to now?

LAROUCHE: The Cuban Crisis was something which was being pressured, under the conditions of the FBI. The FBI was a key factor in bringing the matter to its form. And, that was a big problem. It was a rather evil operation, because the thing that was being done at that time, from my direct, personal knowledge what was going on, and I was in a leading role, position of authority, in the first part of my existence, as a major figure.

Then, of course, I was cancelled by the FBI; the FBI just threw me out of the organization, where I had been a leading figure, in what the FBI did. And, I got bounced around a few times, and I finally organized my own organization; which was quite successful up to the point of the FBI again came into my career and put me in prison.

So, I'm used to these kinds of treatments, that kind, knowing that every one of these guys who were doing that against me were bums! Rots and bums! With no right to anything.

But, I just go ahead and do what I have to do, and I do it.

Q: My name is Mike [leppig], I'm from New Jersey, and I'm a Vietnam veteran. And well, Helga kind of provoked a whole series of memories in my mind. I was 17 years old in 1965 when I joined the U.S. Navy, and I became a Vietnamese linguist. I went to Vietnam, and I left for Vietnam in November of '66. At that time, this was after the Gulf of Tonkin; after the Kennedy assassination, the view of my family and my parents was that the military would "make a man of me." The attitude generally, at least in the community that I came

out of, was supportive of the government, "if the government's behind it, this is it."

While I was in Vietnam, what I experienced was an almost total cynicism about the war itself, on the part of the military leadership, with a significant element of that leadership, I would consider in retrospect very patriotic; that they were committed in Vietnam, they wanted to see it develop, they had, what I now understand, is a kind of a traditional military outlook. Others were careerists, they were their own career.

Anyway, coming back from Vietnam, by the end of the '60s, what you describe as the condition of the government today, that it has no legitimacy, that's the way I felt. And, I think a lot of my age-people felt the same way. Now, we're confronted with a society that's their children, and we have an FBI-run Presidential election; like the riots in San Diego yesterday FBI show.

And it seems to me like this is our moment, like never before. I am so optimistic; I can't believe it! Because, nobody believes in the election; people who say that they're for Trump – they hate Hillary; people who say they're for Hillary – they hate Trump. But, you probe it, and they don't give a crap about either one of them; and when you mention your name, there's respect. Either they go away, because they don't want to hear it, they don't want to know the truth, or, if they're at least interested in the truth, they stop, they take the literature, they may not give money, but they know that you represent the truth. So, it seems to me that this puts a big burden on all of us here in the room, because you've done your work, now what we've got to do is just say that we're with you, and be able to stand up, with you in mind. That's what I want to say.

LAROUCHE: We have to do more than that. We have to activate the thing, again, by understanding exactly what's wrong, with the way the government runs today, and to present an account

of what the errors are, of government, in management today. It has to be cleared up. Because what happens? The people who are doing the frame-ups against people, are still doing the frame-ups! By and large. Not the same people who kept doing it, but new, alternative figures, who are doing the frame-ups. That's where the problem lies.

So, the difficulty is to find an honest group of people who will actually listen to their own mind and find out what is going on *in* their own mind. And the problem is, in the United States generally, most people are incapable of listening to the product of their own mind.

SPEED: Okay! Next question, if it's actually a question.
[laughs]

Q: Hi Lyn! This is Tory Hall. I'm also a U.S. Army veteran. I served from 2012 to 2016. I was in Germany. They sent me to a few different places as well. And most recently they had sent me to Ukraine. I was there, physically. In my own mind, I rejected the entire operation that happened there. But that wasn't common. That wasn't typical of the other people there. And because I rejected these things—in a way I was already looking towards the New Paradigm—the idea of the Silk Road—then this type of conflict doesn't even make sense. What does a military look like in a New Silk Road paradigm?

LAROUCHE: Well, what we would look at is Putin. Look at Putin. Putin is an honest soldier in every sense of the word. His commitments are honest to the total extent of the work. He's the greatest builder of competence right now. His brother was killed, in the family. He became a career.

I met him, not directly, I met him indirectly, because I was doing some work in that area against the Chechen operation there. He was doing it at the same time. So I was actually operating in parallel to him, not in direct relationship to him, but in parallel to him. Then I came out of that service

and he went on with his own career, as we've seen up to today, so far

He's a very capable person. He probably is one of the best, most competent, military figures of the current time. He has a *tremendously* good record. And he has great achievements. He's learned how to do things that most other people in government and in military service have not learned what to do.

And he's a backer for China. He probably will turn out to be a backer for Japan, because the evidence now is that the Japan organization is going to agree, *against –against Obama*. They're turning against Obama.

But the overall situation is: Just think of the military situation, as such. Now, in the military situation is, there's no reason why the United States military under the military system should do anything for Obama. Obama is evil. He's a thief, a swindler, he's a cheat, and other unpleasant things. And therefore, the important thing here is, that Obama is what he is; but Putin is also what he is. And Putin is a man of great achievement, *unusually* great achievement. If you're going to win a war, you'd better work with him on that, and you're likely to win.

Q: Hello, Mr. LaRouche, I'm Igor Kochan. I'm the president of Russian Youth of America organization. I'm also a member of Coordinating Council of Russian Compatriots in the U.S.A. We do a lot of different cultural events to bring Russians and Americans together, to let Americans know more about Russian history and Russian culture.

One of the events that we had this year, was called the Immortal Regiment. I'm really grateful that members of your organization joined us, and grateful for the choir that sang at that event. The Immortal Regiment, so that everybody understands what it is, is that, it's the walk where people

are walking with pictures of their grandparents. We do it close to the May 8th, which is Victory in Europe Day. The idea is to preserve the history of your family to make people remember the veterans of their family, and to walk with their pictures in their hands, and to lay the flowers, this year, to the East Coast Memorial.

There was about 600 people this year. We would like to get more Americans involved in that, so that it becomes not only a Russian tradition, but an American tradition also. Because we believe that to bring Russians and Americans together, it's really important that Americans remember their own history—the history of their families, the history of their country—because right now, unfortunately, when we were asking people what they remember about the World War II, they couldn't even remember who won that war! Some people were giving some ridiculous answers, like "Well, you know what? Germans won the war." No, no, no! It's like Germans were Nazis!

By trying to remember the heroes of the war, people who fought in that war, in their families, people also learn who were participating in this war; that Russians and Americans were not enemies, actually; that they fought together, against Nazis. It's real important. If they were friends at that time, maybe they're still friends, or they should be.

So, what do you think about the idea of the Immortal Regiment? And do you think it's possible to make it an American tradition to remember the veterans?

LAROUCHE: Well, "American" is a special name for the kind of process we're talking about. There're many nations which have memorial organizations; that is, they have a history of tradition. And that is, of course, different in different nations. But the idea of having such organizations is not wrong. You've just got to make sure you've got the right home of that organization. That's all you require. Otherwise, what

happens, you have people like that who become the firemen, everything else that is needed for emergency purposes. Those people who serve as a military or other kind of service, of the same kind of thing, these groups are usually, and generally, very useful inside of society.

Q: Mr. LaRouche, this is Al Korby. Pearl Harbor was bombed on my 17th birthday. Then I joined the Army on my 18th birthday. I was on my way to Okinawa when the atom bombers bombed Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I thought that was a good thing at the time. The war was over. I found out later that it was a senseless massacre; that Japan was in the process of negotiating surrender. As a civilian again, and in a small business, I avoided politics because I thought it was a corrupt system. Then the Kennedy assassination and the cover-up. I said, "Why? A cover-up?" I was looking for an answer, looking for the reason. It wasn't there.

Then a call came from Margaret Greenspan in 1994. It was within a few days of you're getting out prison. I took a subscription, and then I started understanding what was going on; that we were being manipulated by the British Empire. Then in 2001, I became a full-time activist with the organization. Now, on the 7th of this month, I participated in the Immortal Regiment march, with the colonel from Russia. I said that we had to make a joining of the continents at the Bering Strait a reality.

So, what are the particular actions we must take now, to make this a reality?

LAROUCHE: What you've got to do, is you've got to change the mentality of the usual citizen in the United States, because most of the usual citizens in the United States who are living today, are incompetent; they are confused at the very best. And therefore the problem is, we don't have a standard, under our government today, which trains people or induces people to pick up a career which is justified for the help of the

protection of a nation. The idea that you have to protect a nation. You have understand why you're protecting the nation, what the protection is, what the requirements are. We don't have that any more. We have too many FBI people, and not enough real citizens. [applause]

Q: Hi Lyn! It's Alvin. A quick quote from something you recently stated: "There's a large, powerful, force which is accumulating its expression, and this will be the deciding factor if mankind is to survive." Now, we're taking the Obama/British Empire of repeatedly only knowing one type of script to follow. They're dangerous, but they're very stupid. You continue to emphasize to us the importance of the strategic leadership, particularly around China and Russia, with Xi Jinping doing something in his way toward development, and Putin demonstrating his ability to outflank the Empire and avoid war, so that we might live to actually have a future; that mankind might be able to actually realize its true potential and grow up.

On the [Fireside Chat] call Thursday, we're here in Manhattan, and we're trying to organize people around these conceptions, have them get over their own ignorance and fear. You mentioned—and this relates to the work that we're doing outside of the political realm—the question becomes, "Can a human being become greater than themselves?"

That's our job here: To improve ourselves as human beings, and then inspire others. So, I just would like for you to elaborate on that theme, and how we can continue to make progress.

LAROUCHE: Well, that's difficult to do, because you have to explain a lot of things that go into this kind of question. Very few people really have much skill at that. That's where the problem lies. You have people who have some insight into what it *might* mean, but they don't understand what it is to *deliver the product*. And the people's ability to deliver

the required product, is where the problem comes up.

Q: Hello, Lyn. John Sigerson. I'm not a veteran, though both my parents were. This is along the same lines as some of the people who have addressed this, but I wanted to look into the future, along the lines of what Helga said about a world without war, a world where this infantile malady had finally been expunged from our culture, and we should look at all of the people who have served and have died, as people serving in the name of *that*, rather than simply defeating some enemy, however, nefarious that enemy might have been or might be.

But my question is, looking into the future, with a vision of a society without war, how do you do maintain a warlike attitude in the population so that the population does not go *soft*, and that you still have a warlike attitude, but not from the standpoint of actually physically fighting wars against some enemy?

LAROUCHE: ... involve wars or fighting wars as such. What's important is the ability of the human individual to apparently fulfill a military obligation, *apparently*. But that is not necessarily true. Often the professional soldier, is a fake. This is a common problem in the military service, that the people who are in there do not have the qualifications to carry out the mission! So generally you get a limited number of people in the military who do have some understanding of what this means and appreciation of what its implications are, but in general, most people in society do not have a comprehension of what that means, and I'm talking about people who are civilians as well as otherwise. That they are not capable of summoning in themselves, the kind of role which is necessary to do the job.

Now, this comes up in strange ways, which are not really formal ways. When somebody who comes in to rescue someone who is endangered, *that's* the typical case. And therefore, you find out, is that person *capable* of delivering a successful

effect, for the benefit of the population. That's what's important. It has the implications of being something tantamount to a military organization, but it really isn't. It's the guy who, with clothes or not, who goes out to do something, to save people from some threat against them, or to some injury against them in another sense.

And that's what the issue is. It's to get people to understand that their obligation *in*society, is to *lead* society or to assist in leading society to enable a population, to accomplish its true mission. Not just *some* mission, but the true mission of a member of the society as a whole.

You get people to understand this, to see, to understand what they *are*, and find out there's something *good* that there is what they are. And when they find those talents are expressed, then you have a sense of victory.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Daniel [burke]. On that question of a successful leadership of the population, we're embarked upon something, which we discussed at the opening of this event here, which is to create a justice and a meaning for the lives of those people who were killed, wantonly, in this horrible attack on 9/11/2001. And I'm very concerned to know, to discover, what are the proper principles of achieving this? And I do think that it is in context, or that we have to keep in context, the fact that Obama and the Saudis and the British are losing. They have lost a certain amount of control of Japan; they have major people in France and Germany saying "end the sanctions against Russia." There is an opportunity here, and so, it's all the more important that we achieve this justice: How do we do that?

LAROUCHE: On the case of Japan, for example: The Japan case, Japan is now realizing that its enemy is coming from those quarters, and they have to deal with that quarter, and they're doing it, to some degree. I don't know to what perfected, or non-perfected degree; that's working out now. But there is an

orientation among people in Japan, to develop Japan as an instrument, to *defend* the people against Obama! So, this is a part of thing.

So therefore, you can't come down with some kind of mechanical explanation. You have to say, these are developments where people, in this case, Japanese, who've moved into this area of attitude, and they've moved into it. Why? Because they thought it was in their best interest, and they thought what they were getting from Obama and company was not in their best interest. I don't know how much they were against Obama, or not. But I do know what they were doing in practice, was something which was to the advantage of the people of the nation, and to the Japanese themselves. So, that's fine.

And these are the kinds of things you have to look at; look at it in those kinds of terms. Not simple, mechanical kinds of interpretation.

Q: This is R— from Bergen Country, New Jersey. In the recent issue of *EIR*, there is an editorial called "LaRouche's Triple Curve," and I found something that you — on the occasion of bringing out this Triple Curve concept, you gave a talk — this was around 1995 — and there's a quote in there, which I'd like to read a simple extract from that, if I could. I'm quoting you:

"We always blame somebody else. Now, the job of a leader is not to blame leaders. We can point out some are bad, some are defective, some are utterly immoral, some are barely human. But the problem lies in the people, not in the leaders. The problem, often, of oppression, lies in the oppressed. Because they will not accept any proposition that is not consistent with the assumption that they must remain 'the oppressed.'"

So is it accurate to say that people get the leaders that they deserve? And if so, is that why the cultural issue is so important?

LAROUCHE: Well, the cultural issue is one which I laid out about the time where I was about to be bounced out of the organization. And I designed this program, which I proved, and then they bounced me out and I disappeared for some time as a result of that, because I was in jail, put in jail by the FBI. And so that was what the temporary end of the thing was.

Now, we have a different situation, a very similar situation, however, not just a different one, and they're still after me; the FBI is still after me. They're a little bit more skittish than they were in times back, but the point was that what I was talking about was simply, my scientific discovery, of the fallacy of the usual kind of assumptions, about *how things work*. My specialty was *how things can be made to work*. And I introduced a new idea, which was unknown to most of the people in that time. And are *still* unknown to most people of the present time! Because they never discovered what I presented. But some people got it.

Q: Hello Mr. LaRouche, my name is J— and I'm from the Bronx.

LAROUCHE: That's all right! [laughs]

Q: I heard something over the weekend that I think you might like: The education and the act of educating is to overcome ignorance. But I believe, and I'm sure you would agree with me on this, that the education system today is *meant* to make kids my age, and maybe a little younger, to *keep* them ignorant. [laughter] See people already agree with me on that point.

LAROUCHE: The main purpose of the education system in the universities and high schools and so forth today, is to make the students dumber.

Q: [follow-up] Now, what we've been doing — by "we," I mean we started a "Basement club" as well, that we started here in New York, me and a group of four other students, including Lynn Yen, and we've been led by Megan as well; and what we've been

doing, is we've been studying Kepler and we've been looking at Classical pieces. And over the summer as well, we've been holding summer classes, where we teach Plato's work, the *Meno* dialogue, especially, as well, which has *really* resonated with me, to combat the ignorance that the education system has placed in the minds of these students. And I know this to be true, because I am part of this system, that tries to keep us ignorant [LaRouche laughs] ... standardized testing, SATs that restrict the way we think, that don't allow us to look at things differently, but say "this is what's right, and this is what's wrong: out of four options on this bubble sheet that you have, only one of them is right and you are not allowed to think differently."

LAROUCHE: [laughs] I know what you're talking about!

Q: [follow-up] Basically, what I'm trying to get at is, is there *more* that I could be doing, and that others can be doing, to fix this system, other than just reading Plato; and other than just looking at Classical music? Is this enough? Is that what you're telling me?

LAROUCHE: No, you really have to have, an in-depth discovery, an actual discovery, done by many scientists in different generations, and so forth in the process. And you have to rely upon *that* experience, and seeing that experience in terms of your experience; and trying to see whether you agree or not. But to get to insight into what this is all about. When you go with formalities, all you get is blab. And blab and flab. So you don't need blab or flab.

So what we have to do, is get some people out there, who will actually engage in discussion of what makes the truth be the truth. And you've got to come up with some evidence. You've got to produce some evidence which tells you that the truth that you believe is the truth, is the truth. That's where the tough business comes into play.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Asuka. My question is about my country, Japan. There's quite an earthquake going on, the political earthquake, and it could be bigger than "Hokushima." But I want to ask your insight into this, because certainly there is a role that you and your wife played in this. Last December, Helga went to Japan and had a conference where she keynoted. And she also spoke among the prominent industrialists of Japan, and also there was Yakunin, former head of Russian Railways, present.

So, for me to see the recent development in terms of Abe's visit to Sochi and meeting with Putin, coming out with this fantastic proposal to develop the Siberian region, I think there was a certain precursor in this that we saw in Helga's visit to Japan. And I know you personally went to Tokyo with Helga before. So if you can elaborate a little bit about your insight and your experience regarding Japan, and what's going on?

LAROUCHE: Well, the point is, what you're seeing is the effect, and the effect is already available to you immediately, without too much explanation. What's happened is that Japan, the population of Japan has produced within itself, a body of people who are concerned with a fresh view of what the future is, because what's happened, they're being stuck now with some of the things that are going on in that region, and therefore they want to get *out* of that region and be more sane, and practicable. And they're attracted to this. They are attracted to this against, – and every time they get a smell of Obama, they want to vomit! And therefore what they do is they aim their mouth in the direction of the distance, and let the vomit come out, and then feel fresher. [laughter]

SPEED: OK – next question!

Q: Hi, Lyn, it's K– from Bronx.

LAROUCHE: Acknowledged!

Q: I see a mental shift taking place among the nations and among people, to a higher level, where they want to have growth and they want to have cooperation among nations and among each other. I wanted to interject about the Middle East: I have gathered some information together, that tensions are somewhat reduced in that area. They're not eliminated but there is some reduction; from what I understand Hamas and Hezbollah have other enemies that they're more interested in than Israel, and they also recognize that Israel could wipe them out or certainly decimate them quite badly.

I also believe that there is a change of leadership coming in Palestine and if I'm correct on that, do you know anything about it? And is the next leader, to be more amenable to trying to get along in the neighborhood?

LAROUCHE: Well, as you probably know from your background, on this matter, that, in the Jewish community in particular, you had some very rough treatment: Assassinations being perpetrated by Jews, against Jews. And I was of course, early on the course of my postwar experience, I was associated with an initial Israeli organization, which was a military organization at that time, and I was associated with that. So therefore, I was very much concerned with the defense of that.

Then at the end of a cycle, what happened was, everything went bad, and from that point on you had people who were Jews or murderers, or not murderers. And that was going on under the influence of the *British*. The British system took control over the Israelis on that basis, and thus they produced a degenerate quality of person, and some of the degenerates were in California. California had a Jewish community which was really a butcherous community.

But the core of the Israeli population, not so much from Russia, not so much from Germany. Germany was a disease; for Israel, Germany is a disease, it's a disease that's infectious and you try to duck it if you can. But in this case, what I

was associated with, was a group of people who were the hard core of the people who had been the military leaders who were already operating in the Middle East in that time, and these people were then suppressed by the crowd coming from Britain. So the British crowd that came in, started a war among Jews, and therefore, there killings of Jewish leaders by some people, and killers of Jewish leaders by some other people – in other words both ways. And this thing was going on for some time.

One would hope, that on that question, given the present circumstances, we would have a more peaceful arrangement under which the Israelis or the Israeli faction, were being a more, shall we say, suitable leadership. The leadership of Israel under those guys, the British guys, – get rid of them! is the best advice. And, if we could get some peace in this area, we can save Jewish lives and everything else. And just look at it that way.

It's the British system. It's the British angle of this thing, that sets up all these evil things that come out of Israel.

Q: [follow-up] A rabbi in the neighborhood where I live said there are two Israels: there's the religious and there's the secular. And in her opinion, if Israel goes down that would be the reason they went down. That's her point.

I had also heard, and I don't know where I got this information, that the Chinese, the Egyptians, and the Indians were hoping to work with Israel and the Palestinians to try to do the resolve. If that were to take place, it would knock the United States and the British out of that neighborhood. Do you know anything about that?

LAROCHE: No, that would not. The point is, you've got a population of Jews in that region, and other groups as well, and you have people who are good people, just honest, good

people; they may be a bit confused on this or that, and so forth, or ignorant. But that's it.

But the point is, my concern is, here I was, I had just come out of military service and I went out to associate myself with the Israelis who had been the leaders of the defense of Jews in that period. They got bounced out about four years later, and I was bounced out. But so that was the condition.

What today is, if we can pacify the situation, now that doesn't mean the individual as such; pacify the situation, because you'll find that when people are pacified in a certain way, they are no longer *freaking out* about accusations against one person and another person. If you can get a community to agree, on making arrangements with each other, in order to function better, then you've won. So I think that's where you've to go today. I know what the situation was when I saw it, after the initial Israeli development there. But the whole thing changed after a time; we went through a whole period when the British element was controlling the Jewish population. That thing is shifting. And I think the time now, because of the Turkish problem, and some other kinds of problems, that the people in that network would be very happy to escape from getting entangled into that kind of nonsense, which is going on today.

People do like peace, you know! They do like to live! [laughter] So the point is, how can we get – this has always been for me, what's the problem? What you have to do to make people peaceful? And to help each other?

Q: Hi Lyn, it's Denise. First off, I was really, really moved by Helga's presentation on the new paradigm. And I was thinking about this new paradigm from the standpoint, that I was making a mistake, and I'm sure many other people, who are mentally focusing on these idiots who are running for President. And if you only think about that, or if that's in your mind, you can't have a new paradigm, you're a dead duck.

What I thought of was the only way to have political freedom, as Schiller had said, is through beauty. And I'd wanted to make a special call to honor Jeanne d'Arc whose saintly feast is May 30, and her being the leadership of France against the Burgundians and the English; and I also want to say that it's our chorus and our music work that's going to come above all of this stuff having to do with the two idiots who are running for office.

You know, this week we're going to open our *fourth* chorus in the New York City area, which is *wonderful* that we're doing that. And now I'm thinking, more and more, having heard Helga and having heard you, to get out of this other mindset.

And I finally want to mention that I'm the eldest of seven children, whose father was a United States Marine and served in both World War II and Korea. Thank you.

LAROUCHE: Thank you.

Q: Hi Lyn, this is Renée [sigerson]. I wanted to just address briefly a matter that I've been thinking about for the last few weeks, in which you opened up my mind by nothing that people lack the qualifications or the developed capacities, to address the subjective questions that come up in the organizing, and how we actually deal with that, which we're actually doing in this discussion. But I want to focus on one aspect of it, which I think is crucial and quickly, to frame it in this way.

A year after you were in jail, I'll never forget a message that you sent to us, it was about one year later, and you said: "I'm the happiest man in the world, because I have the most wonderful wife, and all of my enemies are complete moral degenerates." [laughter] And I'll never forget that.

And it came about the same time, that Michael Billington was going through the most incredible harassment in the Virginia prison system. And the combination of these circumstance,

captured by those two elements and what Mike describes in his book, which really, at the time, was completely – it was another very heavy blow – I know went through a transformation, where during that period of time, I just got really *bored* and sick of my fear of the enemy. And I just suddenly said, "we just got to crush these guys." And there was a certain resolution in my own mind that suddenly, they weren't frightening any more, but they just had to go.

And I thought about this a lot, because in a way, it exemplifies a principle which you then addressed when you came out of prison, which is very relevant to the discussion we're having, which is the principle of metaphor. Because I think that it is really impossible to do what you want us to do, unless people rivet themselves on being able to identify that truth lies in metaphor, and metaphor is truth; that this is not some kind of interesting "twist," or decoration, but that this is the essence of how truth actually functions. And it really clears your mind.

Like people bring up fixating on the election. Well, if you think metaphorically, you don't fixate on the election, because you just say, this is a bunch of idiots, and you can see it right away. You don't see contradictions between saving the United States and dealing with the Congress and at the same time, fighting internationally to win the fight for the Land-Bridge: All these things that are *different*, somehow form this very beautiful, elaborate crystal, that in your mind, is a One, if you think metaphorically. But if you haven't worked at thinking metaphorically, you're always in this truncated, vulnerable state of mind. And I think the question of metaphor is also, that your emphasis on this over years and years, in different ways, was one of the things that strengthened some of us, at a critical moment to finally find out that fear is a very boring emotion.

But could you say something about that?

LAROCHE: Yeah. The question of metaphor is ambiguous at this point, unless you qualify it. Because the question is, what can you do in society, and how can you do it? And so, the problem is, if people are not able to equip themselves to adapt a policy which inures them against fears, and that's what the issue is. And if you want to educate a population, you have to educate the population as such, in order so that they don't get in the grip of *fears*. Like fears of the FBI. For example, you should rejoice, every time you can dangle a jig about yourself against the FBI out there. Wherever the FBI are doing something and you hope, saying, "Well, let them go out there and jingle on the sidewalk, let him go out and make an ass of himself. Let him see what a damned fool he is." Right? And say, "*that's* the way to look at this guy!"

Q: Good afternoon Mr. LaRouche. It's Jessica from Brooklyn. On May 24th, which was just the past Wednesday, there was an article in the *New York Post* and I didn't read the *Post* because, you know, we've talked about newspapers before. But I saw it on the internet also, that Schumer had up-ended the 9/11 Saudi suit which is called the JASTA bill [Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act], and what's interesting about this, is when you're living in history, things change from moment to moment very quickly. And before I knew it, the families of the victims of 9/11 were saying that this was an article that was not reported accurately; that Schumer had not done these things; that it was some Republican faction or something that was trying to introduce something to water down the bill.

And I thought about our work on the 28 pages, and even though we are in support of the JASTA bill, it kind of led me to talk about the 28 pages even more among my colleagues. And so, in their asking me about this article, I started talking about the 28 pages, and how this is actually something that we're doing as a mission to get to the truth; to talk about the truth about the Saudis and the British, in *all* terrorism, in

terrorism around the globe, and how people need to really understand what the truth is about this entire 28-page operation.

So I'd like you to kind of comment, because now my colleagues, every time they see me, and they ask me questions about stuff, they go "all power to the people." So any time I see a colleague, they go "Oh, Power to the people, that's Miss White," you know. So I'd like you to comment on the fact that our mission is to expose the truth about the 28 pages, *and* the fact that two Presidential administrations have not only reclassified their own information, but have covered this whole, entire thing up, to the point of where it is now, and we're trying to get to the real crux of the matter, concerning, not just the 28 pages, but these Presidencies.

LAROUCHE: Well, there has been a very bad twist put on this question, in terms of Manhattan. Especially for Manhattan as such. And this was a lie! Now, why was the lie: The lie was in order to try to avoid making Schumer the scapegoat for the FBI; that's essentially what it was, plus and minus.

Q: [follow-up] That's amazing.

LAROUCHE: Yeah. He was guilty. I mean, Schumer was actually guilty by sliding along – I think sliding along is the most appropriate thing, or sliming along is equal. But the point is, he did wedge in an argument against the steps, and that confused people. And then, therefore, people in other parts of the government tried to crawl onto that thing, and thus make a case against what had happened, and to cover up what Schumer had said. Schumer had slid into something, and they covered up for him. Because he wanted to be in with the right boys!

Q: [follow-up] Right: "go along to get along" right? Thank you.

SPEED: Any other questions?

LAROUCHE: Any survivors? [laughter]

Q: [Bill Monroe] First of all, I want to wish you a very memorial holiday, today, Lyn. And guess what? Look. [Gives a crisp salute] Some of these folks may not know that you and I both are old warriors. My name is Bill Monroe, same as that country western singer.

I've been following your brilliant career for way over 20 years. I wish to state, it has been brilliant, illuminating, and consistent, never, ever wavering! You have inspired my life, sir! And I want to thank you for that.

I want to tell you a little something about myself. I'll be as brief as I possibly can. I joined the Army in 1943, and I went over to England aboard the *Queen Mary*, and never mind the British government – the British *people* treated Bill Monroe *real, real damned good* and I thank them for that! They made my stay there, I was there about a year before the invasion.

I landed over there on D-Day, the third wave of invasion of Omaha Beach. A lot of people did not make it. I'm very fortunate to say, luckily, I did make it. I further want to say, that as things began to quiet down, I had a most illuminating experience. I became a friend of the mayor Sainte-Mère Église, and one day, he sent word over, "Sgt. Monroe, I want you to come over and meet somebody!" So, I said, OK, as soon as I possibly can. So when I got leave, I went over, I walked in, and look at me [slowly cranes his head upward] – I said, "Êtes-vous Général de Gaulle?" "Je suis le même!" ["Are you General de Gaulle?" "The very same!"] [laughter]

I want to back up just momentarily: When I was in high school, it was compulsory at that time, different than it is today, unfortunately, that you had to take *some* foreign language. Unbeknownst to me as to my destiny, for some reason unknown to

me, I chose French. So when I got to France, I was able to converse with most of the people there. Again, they treated Bill Monroe *darn* good! I met what I call my French mother and father, because they kind of adopted me while I was in their area, and they treated me, as I said, "darn good." That dear lady walked three miles into town to get something special for Bill Monroe, and three miles back. Guess what she made? *Escargots*. [laughter] At that time I had not the slightest inkling as to what *escargots* was! I said to myself, "Oh, they fix tuna fish a little different here!" When I got back to camp, and I leafed through my French-English booklet and I seen "escargots," and I said, "Oh my God, I at snails!" But these are edible snails.

So, when I finally got back to the States, at an Italian restaurant, "Hey, Bill, what would you like to have today?" I said, "Escargot!" He said, "Oh, yeah? Okay!" And I said, "And give me a cappuccino, too!" [laughter]

Lyn, I want to say one thing: I've had a very, very illuminating career myself. You've been a real inspiration to me, sir. I believe you have helped pilot my life. I'm hoping that a lot of folks will do the same. I want to God bless you, sir, you and your wife, Helga. You're doing a brilliant thing, in spite of the so-called "FBI" which I used to have respect for! Keep it up, all right? [laughter, applause]

SPEED: Well, do you have anything to say in response to that?

LAROUCHE: It's hard to do that. That consumes my appetites.

SPEED: OK, very good. It looks like we may have a follow-up question.

Q: It's me again J— from the Bronx. You know, the English language is pretty dumb, it's pretty dumb, right? And university students have found a way to surprise me and this is something I expressed to Dennis as well, but they've found a way to make the English language even dumber! You can't

even call someone a color any more because it's offensive. You're not allowed to say an idea if it's offensive to someone, or if someone's offended, and frankly someone of the things you say offend me! In fact, why don't I just censor you now? Why don't I just storm out of this building and protest against you?

I'd like to believe that I'm probably the last open-minded person in my generation nowadays, because everyone is so afraid to accept a new idea, or everyone is so afraid to live outside what comforts them, or – I don't know. People are afraid to get hurt by something they've never heard before; or people are so accustomed or coddled by gender-study professors [laughter] – it's true! People forget what's in-between their legs nowadays, and then you know, you refer to them as Mr. or Mrs. and suddenly it's like "I want to be referred to as 'zee' or 'they', or some other pronoun," and it's like, "Oh, okay." And then this subject of man-splaining, where a man who explains an idea is perpetuating sexist culture, and that's a way of censorship, honestly. That's all that it's leading up to, censorship! I believe my generation has almost shot itself in the foot.

And we're going backwards! It's called the "regressive Left." You know, there was a time when the Left stood for something right. You know, MLK, the '60s, it was a great time. And somehow we've gone backwards. We can't seem to do anything any more. And I don't know, I just want to know your thoughts on that.

LAROUCHE: I think we need to improve the population. [Speed guffaws] I think we're in a desperate strait for cleaning up the population.

SPEED: All right, I think we've sort of drawn out everything we're going to draw out for the moment. There's probably some more opposition in the audience, but I don't think we're going to hear from it today! So, Lyn if you have any – oh, of

course, it is a bit expanded from the last time you saw us, and I think we're going to be seeing this as a trend. But if there's anything you'd like to say to our – or your army in Manhattan, please go ahead.

LAROUCHE: Well, I think we are ready to extend the grip of Manhattan, into the area of some parts of the neighboring waters, a little bit distant. We're going to be opening up more channels in different parts of the world than we have been doing before. And that's going to be the augmented aspect of what's going to happen to me in the coming days.

SPEED: Great! That's good news. We'll await results.

LAROUCHE: Yes. You'll get it, too.

SPEED: All right great! [applause]

USA og Europa har mere brug for samarbejde om Den Nye Silkevej end Asien har – Interview med Helga Zepp- LaRouche

Onsdag, 1. juni 2016 – Schiller Instituttets grundlægger Helga Zepp-LaRouche, der i Kina har fået tilnavnet "Silkevejsladyen", og som, sammen med Lyndon LaRouche, er den

fremmeste promoter af denne politik i Europa, blev interviewet af TASS den 31. maj 2016 om at træffe valget mellem enten en ny, global krig, eller økonomisk udvikling og samarbejde.

TASS: Hvordan vurderer De det aktuelle, internationale samarbejde?

Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Der er to radikalt modsatrettede bevægelser på planeten netop nu. På den ene side mødes kombinationen af præsident Putins meget succesrige militære flanker, såsom hans intervention i Syrien, der skabte potentialet for fred, og så hans forskellige diplomatiske interventioner i Asien, parallelt med Kinas initiativer for Den Nye Silkevej.

Disse indsatser repræsenterer allerede et win-win-perspektiv for flere end 70 lande.

På den anden side finder der en ekstremt farlig konfrontation sted fra USA's, Storbritanniens, EU's og NATO's side imod Rusland og Kina, der har bragt verden ind i multiple kriser, der er farligere end på højden af den Kolde Krig.

TASS: På hvilke områder er dette mere aktivt, og hvor er det ikke?

Zepp-LaRouche: Med hensyn til Syrien, så er samarbejdet mellem [den russiske] udenrigsminister Lavrov og [den amerikanske] udenrigsminister Kerry, såvel som også Genève-samarbejdet mellem Rusland og USA, meget positivt. Men så længe USA imidlertid ikke opgiver sin politik for 'regimeskift', er situationen fortsat farlig. Præsident Putin har vist sig at være en fremragende strateg.

Dette giver tiltro til, at det ikke vil lykkes krigshøgene i NATO at lokke Rusland ind i en fælde og give NATO et påskud til at lancere et førsteangreb.

TASS: Omkring hvilke spørgsmål må vi optrappe samarbejdet

mellem Vesten og Rusland, og hvorfor?

Zepp-LaRouche: Kendsgerningen er den, at hele den transatlantiske sektor er bankerot og tæt på at eksplodere på en større måde end i 2008. Den japanske premierminister Abe understregede, efter et meget vigtigt besøg i Rusland, klart dette ved det nyligt afsluttede G7-møde, men blev afvist af præsident Obama, der hævdede, at "den økonomiske genrejsning går fremad", hvilket er absurd i lyset af centralbankernes negative rentesatser og debatten omkring "helikopter-penge" (ubegrænset pengetrykning, -red.).

Vesten har derfor mere end Asien brug for den form for økonomisk samarbejde, som samarbejdet om Ét bælte, én vej/den Eurasiske Økonomiske Union byder på, og som integrerer Eurasien fra Vladivostok til Lissabon, men som også inviterer USA til at deltage i dette perspektiv. Vi kan kun undgå en katastrofe, hvis det lykkes os at overvinde geopolitik og nå frem til et nyt paradigme, baseret på et partnerskab for global udvikling og menneskehedens fælles mål.

TASS: Hvorfor forhindrer Vesten i den grad samarbejde med Rusland, på trods af den åbenlyse terrortrussel, cyberkriminalitet og andre internationale udfordringer?

Zepp-LaRouche: Næsten alle betydningsfulde konflikter stammer fra det anglo-amerikanske imperiums indsats for at bevare en unipolær verden, på et tidspunkt, hvor denne verden de facto allerede er ophørt med at eksistere. Flere og flere kræfter i verden indser, at de må træffe eksistentielle beslutninger, og at deres nationers interesser er meget bedre tjent med at standse sanktionerne og konfrontationen imod Rusland og Kina.

Den kendsgerning, at Rusland og Kina har skabt et meget stærkt, strategisk partnerskab, med Indien som en tredje partner, har flyttet den strategiske balance i verden. Flere og flere lande ser det som langt mere gavnligt at samarbejde om fælles udvikling end at befinde sig under åget af en

militær konfrontation. Vi befinder os på et punkt i historien, hvor der må vælges, og det, der tæller, er lederskab af den art, som vi har set komme fra præsident Putin.

INTERNATIONAL APPEL

Warszawa-topmødet forbereder krig –

Tiden er inde til at forlade NATO nu!

Det forestående NATO-topmøde i Warszawa den 8. – 9. juli forventes at blive endnu en provokation mod Rusland. Ved at underskrive denne appel siger vi "stop" denne optrapning mod atomkrig, før det, der er uigenkaldeligt, indtræffer!

Download (PDF, Unknown)

30. maj 2016: Følgende appel cirkuleres internationalt, inklusive på den internationale LaRouche-bevægelses websider:

Det forestående NATO-topmøde i Warszawa den 8. – 9. juli forventes at blive endnu en provokation mod Rusland. Ved at underskrive denne appel siger vi "stop" denne optrapning mod

atomkrig, før det, der er uigenkaldeligt, indtræffer!

Dette er en alvorstung time. En ny missilkrise er under opbygning, som et spejlbillede af den, der i 1962 førte til, at Sovjetunionen deployerede atomspræghoveder på Cuba, på USA's dørtærskel. I dag er situationen omvendt. Dengang bekæmpede NATO Warszawa-pagten; i dag organiserer NATO et topmøde i Warszawa!

Vi, der underskriver dette, observerer, at NATO gennemfører en provokerende "inddæmningspolitik", som følger: (se pdf)

1.

**RADIO SCHILLER den 17. maj
2016:**

**De nordiske lande skal ikke
indrulles i
Obamas konfrontationspolitik
imod Rusland**

Med formand Tom Gillesberg

Planlægger den amerikanske præsident Obama en krig mod Rusland og Kina i august?

Af Alexander Hartmann, redaktør af "Neue Solidarität".

7. maj 2016 – Vil den amerikanske præsident Obama indlade sig på en militær kraftprøve med Rusland og Kina endnu før sin tilbagetræden? Den slutning må man drage, når man betragter de nyeste bestræbelser inden for amerikansk politik: Umiddelbart efter at det var lykkedes for USA's udenrigsminister John Kerry og Ruslands udenrigsminister Sergej Lavrov at forhandle sig frem til en udvidelse af våbenstilstanden i Syrien på grundlag af aftalen i Geneve, hvor der skulle oprettes et særligt, større kontor i Geneve med russiske og amerikanske militærpersoner og diplomater for at overvåge våbenstilstanden, blev Kerry – øjensynligt af Obama – foranlediget til offentligt at stille et ultimatum til den syriske præsident Bashar Assad: Dersom Assad ikke træder tilbage inden den 1. august, så vil USA "inddrage andre sider". I betragtning af, at USA allerede er ved at indsætte amerikanske soldater i Syrien uden den syriske præsidents godkendelse, må der øjensynligt være tale om en større militær indsats, der har det udtrykkelige formål at fremtvinge et regimeskift i Syrien. Og dermed står det klart, at Rusland og Kina, der begge modsætter sig et udefra påtvungent regimeskift i Syrien og selv er militært til stede der, skal stilles over for et valg om enten at lade Assad falde – eller at tage en direkte militær konfrontation med USA med i beregningerne. Og samtidigt fortsætter den militære opmarch og indkredsningen over for Rusland og Kina med at skride fremad "som en damptramle", sådan som BüSo's forkvinde Helga Zepp-LaRouche understregede det den 4. maj på sit internetforum.

Afgørende er tiden frem til NATO-topmødet først i juli, hvor skabelsen af NATO's faste troppetilstedeværelse i Baltikum skal godkendes af NATO's medlemsstater.

Disse enheder skal ikke udstationeres permanent, men indsættes i skiftende hold – ligesom i krigsområder. UN News citerede en ubenævnt militær talsmand: "Vi går fra gensidig hjælp over til afskrækning og fra gensidig hjælp over til opstilling til kamp." Det samme gælder også for de amerikanske troppeoverførsler til Filippinerne. USA's regering har allerede anmodet kongressen om en firdobling af midlerne til den amerikanske troppeindsats i Østeuropa, og den har – både gennem forsvarsminister Ashton Carter såvel som gennem general Philip Breedlove, den hidtidige overkommandoindehaver over USA's tropper i Europa, og dennes efterfølger general Curtis Scaparrotti, som Carter overdrog kommandoen til den 3. maj i Stuttgart – også gjort det ganske klart, at den betragter Rusland og Kina som sine vigtigste fjender.

Øjensynligt er præsident Obama ude på at gennemtvinge en "endegyldig løsning" af syriensproblemet efter sit eget sind, før han forlader embedet. Det er muligt, at dette set fra Obamas synsvinkel blot er ét stort blufnummer, hvormed han vil bevise over for sig selv og resten af verden, hvem der er "herre i huset" – men hvis Obama skulle gå hen og forregne sig her, så kommer der til at blive en kernevåbenkrig mellem supermagterne. Det er på høje tid, at de fornuftige kræfter i de vestlige regeringer og parlamenter endelig tager sig sammen til at forhindre Obama i at udføre sådanne forrykte dumheder, for det farlige ved ultimatummer er, at de ofte frembringer en situation, hvor ingen af parterne længere kan trække sig tilbage.

Det er klart, at selvom Rusland og Kina samtidigt strækker hånden frem mod Vesten for en fornuftig samarbejdspolitik, kan de overhovedet ikke gøre andet end at reagere på den vestlige opmarch med selv at opruste og med forhøjet kampberedskab. Således meddelte Rusland for eksempel, at det som reaktion på

NATO's oprustning i Østeuropa ville opstille tre nye divisioner, hver på 10.000 mand i løbet af året i sine vestlige og sydlige militærområder. Og det er ikke blot USA, der arbejder febrilsk på at modernisere sine atomvåben; Rusland og Kina gør nøjagtigt det samme.

Den nye Operation Barbarossa

Helga Zepp-LaRouche sammenligner NATO's opmarch i Østeuropa med "Operation Barbarossa", Det tredje Riges troppeopmarch for at overfalde Sovjetunionen, og begrundede denne påstand på sit internetforum. Efter Obamas besøg bekendtgjorde forbundskansler Merkel, at 250 tyske soldater straks skulle deltage i NATO's bataljoner i Baltikum. I Rusland genopvækkes erindringerne om Den store Fædrelandskrig kraftigt her for tiden, "og når tyske soldater så her bare 71 efter afslutningen på anden verdenskrig udstationeres lige op til den russiske grænse i forholdsvis højt kampberedskab, så kan jeg meget vel forestille mig – ja, jeg føler mig fuldstændigt sikker på det – at det vil fremkalde virkeligt stærke følelser i Rusland. Hele NATO's politik er jo i grunden ikke andet end en indkredsning af Rusland og af Kina."

Når man betragter den samlede strategi – lige fra sanktioner mod Rusland over forsøgene på at iscenesætte farverevolutioner og til den oprustningsspiral, som Rusland og Kina er tvunget ind i – så bør det være klart, at dette sker med den hensigt at frembringe regimeskift. Det spørgsmål forbliver ubesvaret: "Hvorfor skal atomvåbnene moderniseres? Alle amerikanske atomvåbenlagre skal moderniseres, de taktiske atomvåben B61-12 i Tyskland – det er angrebsvåben. Og hvad skal russerne mene om det?"

En offentlig debat savnes

Frem for alt kritiserede hun, at der hidtil ikke har fundet nogen offentlig debat sted omkring disse ting:

"Der er ikke engang nogen i Tyskland, der vover at udtale sig

om sanktioner – bortset fra med en tilbageholdende kritik. Men en debat om hele den militære dimension mangler egentlig fuldstændigt. Og det er virkeligt en skandale. Jeg mener, at vi virkeligt behøver en dramatisk ændring af vor politik, for vi skal selv bestemme over vore egne interesser i Tyskland og hele Europa. Bliver vi draget med ind i sådan en krig? ... Skal vi virkeligt lade os drive ind i sådan en konfrontation, så at sige i ly af USA, der virkeligt sætter Tysklands eksistentielle interesser på spil? For hvis uheldet er ude, så ophører Tyskland med at eksistere.”

Det egentlige motiv

Det virkelige motiv bag konfrontationspolitikken over for Rusland og Kina, understregede hun, ligger i forhandlingerne om frihandelsaftalerne TPP (med de asiatiske nationer) og TTIP (med Europa), som USA's regering vil gennemtrumfe endnu før Obamas afgang. Dette demonstreredes af et indlæg fra præsident Obama i Washington Post med den megetsigende overskrift: "Amerika – og ikke Kina – fastsætter reglerne." "Heri siger han, at Sydøstasien og Sydøstasien udvikler sig med rasende fart, og vi – USA – kan ikke tillade, at Kina fastlægger reglerne, for det gør vi! Og dermed har han egentlig lukket katten ud af sækken. For også ved den førmtalte militære oprustning og ved konfrontationsscenarierne drejer det sig egentlig kun om én ting. Såvel ved TPP, TTIP som ved NATO's oprustning over for Rusland og naturligvis også i Det sydkinesiske Hav, i Korea, i hele den militære dimension, drejer det sig kun om ét enkelt tema – og det er at forsvare USA's enevældige position med alle midler.”

I Det sydkinesiske Hav drejer det sig med sikkerhed ikke om et par klippeøer, og den frie sejlads er heller ikke krænket blot en eneste gang, det er alt sammen blot grov propaganda. Tværtimod ønsker Obama at konsolidere "USA's krav om overherredømme over Stillehavet og sandsynligvis også snart over Det indiske Hav, det vil sige over alle verdenshavene... Det drejer sig om at opretholde den unipolære verden." Men det

er så at sige fortid nu, for den er holdt op med at eksistere. "Asien stiger opad, Kina udvikler sig, andre asiatiske stater, Indien, det, som før kaldtes for tigerøkonomierne, udvikler sig med rasende fart." Kinas regering har reageret meget køligt på Obamas artikel ved at slå fast, at handelsreglerne ikke skal fastsættes af ét land, men af alle de inddragne nationer. Og under et møde i Australien, hvor det drejede sig om den kinesiske handelsaftale, deltog 15 lande, "der øjensynligt fandt de af Kina foreslåede betingelser for langt mere attraktive end TPP, der egentlig kun har til formål at holde Kina udenfor."

Thukydide-fælden

Men det afgørende punkt er dog, "at alle imperier i historien er gået under som følge af at have forstrakt sig... USA har forstrakt sig her for tiden, de økonomiske tal er katastrofale – både hvad angår tallene for arbejdspladserne og tallene for den produktionsstigning, der i de sidste fem år har været nul eller endnu lavere. Det vil sige, at USA's fysiske økonomi skrumper mere og mere ind, og banksektoren er naturligvis blot en kæmpeboble, der har det endnu værre end i 2008 og truer med at eksplodere – ligesom i Europa."

Hun fortsatte: "Med andre ord, så er dette en politik, der ikke er holdbar, og det gør den også så farlig." For der er kræfter i den transatlantiske sektor, der reagerer således på denne udvikling i Asien, at de er ved at gå i den såkaldte Thukydide-fælde, som den tidligere amerikanske generalstabschef flere gange har advaret om, nemlig konflikten mellem Athen og Sparta i det klassiske Grækenland, som Thukydide beskrev, "hvor den ene parts opstigning førte til den anden sides krigsførelse og dermed startede den peloponnesiske krig, der i sidste ende førte til det klassiske Grækenlands undergang." Det er noget, der i dag i brintbombernes tidsalder, og hvor der er tale om overgang fra afskrækning til kampberedskab og mobilitetstilstand for tropperne, er ekstremt bekymrende. "Jeg har sagt det så tit: Vi behøver en offentlig debat. Hvor er

Tysklands interesser henne? Tysklands interesser er netop ikke fremmedfjendtlighed eller "lukkede grænser", for den eneste måde Tyskland kan sikre sin eksistens på længere sigt er ved at indlede et nyt paradigme og deltage i det med andre stater, frem for alt med hele Eurasien, der så i fællesskab kan løse de problemer, der berører os alle: Det nære og mellemste Østens fuldstændige ødelæggelse og den frygtelige situation i Afrika. Og den eneste mulighed, vi har for at slippe ud af alle de konflikter, er den, at vi sammen med Rusland og Kina udbygger Den nye Silkevej til en Verdenslandbro."

NATO's nye »Operation Barbarossa«: Hvad har det tyske forsvar mistet i Litauen? af Helga Zepp-LaRouche

30. april 2016 – Betragter man NATO's forskellige aktiviteter over for Rusland såvel som de amerikanske styrkers over for Kina, så får man et billede af en politik, der er lagt an på indkredsning og provokation, og som i sidste ende egentlig kun kan munde ud i den store katastrofe. At lige netop den tyske regering nu vil udstationere tyske soldater som en del af NATO's tusinde mand store bataljon i Litauen – 71 år efter Hitlers tilintetgørende nederlag under hans vanvittige felttog mod Sovjetunionen – det er en skandale.

Efter at præsident Obama allerede inden sit sidste besøg i Hannover havde tilkendegivet, at han ville kræve et større militært engagement og større økonomiske bidrag fra Tysklands

side, havde forbundskansler Merkel intet bedre at tage sig til end »bag lukkede døre« at forsikre Storbritanniens, Frankrigs og Italiens regeringschefer på det såkaldte minitopmøde med præsident Obama i Hannover, at det tyske militær nok skulle bidrage til NATO's fortsatte østekspansion. Endegyldigt skal denne mission med skiftende, kort udstationeret mandskab vedtages på det kommende NATO-topmøde i Warszawa i begyndelsen af juli, hvor en hel række yderligere offensive forholdsregler ligeledes skal sættes i gang mod Rusland.

På sikkerhedskonferencen i Moskva, der lige har fundet sted, advarede den russiske NATO-gesandt Alexander Grusjko om konsekvenserne af NATO's konfrontationspolitik på dennes østflanke som for eksempel den såkaldte permanente tropperotation (hvoraf de tyske tropper kun skal udgøre en del), den fortsatte udstationering af tunge våbensystemer i forskellige østeuropæiske stater, uafbrudte manøvrer, vedvarende overvågning af luftrummet, og forstærkning af flådeenhederne i Østersøen og Sortehavet. Under den sidste episode i Østersøen, hvor russiske kampfly fløj hen mod amerikanske krigsskibe, der befandt sig godt 120 km fra den russiske enklave Kaliningrads kyst, påberåbte man sig fra amerikansk side den såkaldte »anti access/area denial« (A2AD) og hævdede, at Rusland forhindrer den frie adgang til militær hjælp til De baltiske Lande – hvor det i virkeligheden drejede sig om at stille spørgsmål ved Ruslands ret til at forsvare sig selv i umiddelbar nærhed af sine egne grænser.

Noget andet, der forberedes, er militære brigader, der skal sammensættes af tropper fra Bulgarien, Rumænien, Ukraine såvel som Litauen og Polen. Også udbygningen af det amerikanske raketforsvarssystem i Østeuropa fortsætter uforstyrret, selv om enhver begrundelse om, at dette forsvarssystem skal tjene som værn mod iranske raketter, er faldet bort med »P5+1«-aftalen med Iran. Det er nu helt klart, at det skal tjene til at udslette Ruslands mulighed for gengældelsesangreb.

Det kan kun forklares som et eksempel på kollektiv lammelse og hukommelsestab, at så godt som ingen i Tyskland stiller det

spørgsmål, hvorfor Obamaadministrationen i de kommende år vil give en billion dollars (!) til at modernisere det samlede amerikanske kernevåbenarsenal – indbefattet de i Tyskland udstationerede taktiske kernevåben B61-12 – for (sammen med stealth-fly) at gøre det mere »indsatsegnet«, sådan som det for nylig fastsloges under en høring i det amerikanske senat af fru senator Feinstein. Alt dette finder stadig sted i et miljø, som militæranalytikere som Ted Postol eller Hans Kristensen betegner som farligere end højdepunktet af den kolde krig, altså Kubakrisen, hvilket fik personligheder som Mikhail Gorbatsjov og den afdøde Helmut Schmidt til for ikke særligt lang tid siden til at advare mod en tredje verdenskrig.

Denne gang går fru Merkels og de karrieresyge militærpersoners imødekommende, vasalagtige troskab for vidt. Tysklands øgede deltagelse i NATO's indkredsningstrategi over for Rusland, hvor NATO rykker helt frem til Ruslands grænser, og ikke omvendt – den russiske udenrigsminister Lavrov talte om et »beskidt forsøg på at stille sandheden på hovedet« – , sætter selve Tysklands eksistens på spil, idet der intet vil blive tilbage af landet eller dets indbyggere, dersom en atomkrig virkelig finder sted. Og ingen kan overbevise os om, at fru Merkel, fru von der Leyen (den tyske forsvarsminister) og forsvarsledelsen overhovedet intet skulle vide om dette.

Oven i NATO-operationerne mod Rusland kommer de amerikanske stridskræfters ligeledes eskalerende provokationer over for Kina – hvor USA slår på »den frie sejlret i havet« i Det sydkinesiske Hav, selv om Kina ikke en eneste gang har forhindret denne – de hermed begrundede krænkende overflyvninger af det kinesiske territorium, de omstridte øer og rev, forsøget på at udnytte krisen omkring Nordkorea til at udstationere det mod Kina og Rusland vendte THAAD-raketsystem i Sydkorea, og udsendelsen af yderligere 250 amerikanske specialtropper i Syrien uden tilladelse fra den syriske regering, uden mandat fra FNs sikkerhedsråd og uden den

nødvendige bemyndigelse fra den amerikanske kongres, sådan som den amerikanske forfatning kræver det.

Alt dette er elementer af en yderst risikabel politik. Er den lagt an på at lokke Rusland og Kina i en fælde for at fremprovokere reaktioner, der så kan bruges som påskud for stort anlagte straffeaktioner? Drejer det sig om opmarch for et førsteangreb, der svarer til de forskellige doktriner såsom Prompt Global Strike eller Air-Sea Battle? Tror man virkeligt i fuldt alvor, at udgifterne til en ny oprustningsspiral i kombination med farverevolutioner vil fremkalde regimeskift i Moskva og Beijing, fordi landenes befolkninger vil rejse sig mod Putin og Xi Jinping? Alle disse varianter er vanvittige. I alle tilfælde risikerer man at udslette menneskeheden i en verdensomspændende, termionukleær krig.

Problemet er hveken Rusland eller Kina, men den neoliberale finanspolitik, der ligger til grund for en indbildt nødvendighed af at udvide den transatlantiske imperialistiske politik. Fastholdelsen af denne politik er i sidste ende grunden til, at der ikke er nogen, der taler om »årsager« til den flygtningekrise, der er resultatet af de på løgne begrundede krige i Sydvestasien, og af den politik, der har nægtet Afrika udvikling på grund af Den internationale Valutafonds berygtede kreditbetingelser. Det var denne politik, der åbnede en uudholdelig afgrund mellem rig og fattig i mange dele af verden, og som synes rede til at ofre alt til gavn for få og på manges bekostning på højrisikospekulationens alter. Og netop denne politik er håbløst bankerot, sådan som de lige så afsindige debatter om »helikopter-penge« demonstrerer.

Bare tanken om, at vi her 71 år efter det fuldstændige nederlag for nationalsocialisterne, der bragte uendelige lidelser over den russiske befolkning såvel som mange andre lande – ikke mindst vort eget – atter kan deltage i en »Operation Barbarossa« mod Rusland, må tilbagevises med fuldt eftertryk, også i praksis. Når alle de for tiden planlagte

optrapninger, indbefattet Ukraines og Georgiens tilbudte medlemskab som »associerede partnere« til NATO, hvilket Rusland for længst har betegnet som en rød linje – når det mulige NATO-medlemskab for Finland og Sverige og udsendelsen af enheder fra det tyske forsvar til Litauen besluttet på det kommende NATO-topmøde, så befinder vi os sandsynligvis på den direkte vej til Helvede.

Vi må benytte de to resterende måneder til at fremføre et alternativ, og et sådant er »Win-win«-sammenarbejdet med Rusland og Kina, uden hvilket intet af de problemer, der truer vor eksistens – krigsfaren, det truende finanskraak, flygtningekrisen eller terrorismen – vil kunne løses. Og vi kan ikke gøre det sande Amerika nogen større tjeneste end ved at stå fast på dette samarbejde.

Der er en udvej: Vi må sammen med Rusland, Kina og Indien udbygge Den nye Silkevej for at fremkalde en økonomisk opbygning af Sydvestasien og Afrika og for at genopbygge vor egen produktive økonomi; og vi må gøre det klart for Amerika, at vi ikke er rede til at begå selvmord for at opretholde et imperium, der for længst har forstrakt sig ved sin egen opførsel. Derimod indtager George Washingtons, Alexander Hamiltons, Abraham Lincolns, Franklin D. Roosevelts og John F. Kennedys Amerika en æresplads inden for den samlede menneskehed.

Et nyt paradigme for menneskeheden:

Afskrift af Helga Zepp-LaRouches tale til seminaret på Frederiksberg den 18. april 2016

Kommer senere på dansk.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche Addresses Seminar in Copenhagen,
April 18, 2016 [unproofed draft]

We Need a New Paradigm for Humanity

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, thank you very much for this
kind introduction.

Dear Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to
start my presentation with showing you a point of view which
may

be unusual to discuss the strategic situation, but I think it
is

quite adequate.

This is a time-lapse video where you can actually have a view
from space. This is the kind of view normally only astronauts,
cosmonauts, taikonauts have. They all come back from their
space

travel with the idea that there is only one humanity, and that
our planet, which is very beautiful and blue; however, it is
very

small in a very large solar system and an even larger galaxy,
not

to mention the billion galaxies out there in our universe.

With that view comes, naturally, the question of the future.

Where should mankind be in 100 years from now, in a 1000

years,
in 10,000 years? Well, you have to exercise your power of imagination. In 10,000 years, we probably are well beyond having colonized the Moon, we have completed very successful Mars missions, we will have a much, much better understanding about our solar system, our galaxy, and we will have gotten a much deeper understanding about the principle of our universe. Just think, that it took 100 years before modern science could confirm that Einstein's conception about gravitational waves was correct. Ten thousand years of the past human history has brought tremendous progress. But just think that this growth can go on, exponentially. And since there is no limit to the creativity and perfectibility of the human species, in 10,000 years we can have a wonderful world. So, let's look from that view, into the future, to the present, to have the right perspective. Yesterday, the {New York Times}, in the Sunday edition, had an article saying "The Race Escalates for the Latest Class of Nuclear Arms," portraying in detail that the United States, and Russia, and China are developing new generations of smaller and less destructive nuclear weapons, which would make them more useable. They quote in the article James Clapper, the Director of the National Intelligence of the United States, that the world has now entered a new Cold War spiral, where, basically, totally different laws and rules govern, than it used to be the case with Mutual Assured Destruction. The previous NATO doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction proceeded from the assumption that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is so horrible, because it will lead to the

annihilation of the human race, that nobody in their right mind would ever use it. And therefore, it was a deterrence that these

weapons would never be used.

This is now no longer valid. What they are now discussing, openly, on the front page of the {New York Times}, is that what

we, for a very long time, only we and a few of military experts,

have said, namely, that these modernized tactical nuclear weapons, like the B12-61, in combination with stealth bombers, with hypersonic missiles, can actually lead to the winning of a

nuclear war.

Ted Postol and Hans Kristensen, very respected military analysts, have detailed at great lengths, why the idea of a limited nuclear war is completely ludicrous, and it is the nature

of the difference between thermonuclear weapons and conventional

weapons, that once you enter a nuclear exchange, that it is the

logic of such a war that all weapons will be used, and that will

be the end of mankind. We are closer to that possibility than most people dare to even consider, because if they would, they would not remain so passive as they are now.

This is why I want to make emphatically the point—and this is the purpose of conducting meetings like this seminar and many

other conferences we are engaged in—that we have reached a point

in human history where geopolitics must be superseded with a completely new paradigm. And that is why I started with the view

from space. We need a new paradigm, basically saying goodbye

to
the very idea of geopolitics, which has caused two world wars
in
the 20th century. That new paradigm must be completely
different
than that which is governing the world today.
We have, right now, rising tensions in the South China Sea.
Policymakers and the neighboring countries are extremely
worried
about what will happen in the period between now and the trial
in
The Hague. You have the largest maneuver around North and
South
Korea right now, where people in the region are extremely
worried
that the slightest provocation could lead to an exchange of
nuclear weapons.
You have the NATO expansion up to the Russian border.
Countries like Poland and Lithuania are asking to have these
modernized nuclear weapons located on their territory, even
that
makes them prime targets.
The United States is continuing to build the anti-ballistic
missile system which, supposedly, was against Iranian
missiles,
but after the P5+1 agreement has been reached, it is obvious
this
was always a pretext and the aim was always to take out the
second strike capability of Russia.
Then you have the entire region of Southwest Asia, still
being a terrible destruction and consequence of failed wars.
North Africa is exploding. You have new incidents between NATO
and Russia, all of a sudden in the Baltic Sea, which was, up
to
now, a calm region where there are no conflicts, or, there
have
been no conflicts.

In the Middle East briefing, discussing President Obama's trip to Riyadh on the 21st of this month, they say that this trip will open up a new page of NATO in the relationship to the Middle East, that what Obama will try to establish is a new relationship between NATO and the Gulf Cooperation Council countries. So, we have a situation where the {New York Times}, also yesterday, and I'm quoting these papers to say that these are not some opinions of us, but this is now the public discussion, that what is really at stake in the South China Sea is not so much the fight around some uninhabited reefs and cliffs, or some tiny islands, but it is the American effort to halt China's rise. And not only China's rise, but that of Asia. China, Asia arising; the trans-Atlantic region is in decline. Just now, we are heading towards a new financial crisis, and all signs are, that we are going into the same kind of crash like 2008. Already since the beginning of this year, \$50 billion corporate defaults were taking place, which is on the same level like what happened in 2009. What the United States is trying to assert under this conditions, where the trans-Atlantic world is in decline or marching towards collapse, to insist that nevertheless a unipolar world must be maintained. The problem is, that unipolar world, effectively, no longer exists. But still, what carries American policy to the present day, is the Project for the New American Century, the so-called Wolfowitz Doctrine, which is a neocon

idea

which says that no country and no group of countries should ever

be allowed to challenge the power position of the United States.

In the age of thermonuclear weapons, the insistence to maintain a

non-tenable world order could very quickly lead to the annihilation of civilization.

It is a fact: China has made an economic miracle in the last 30 years which is absolutely breathtaking. And it is continuing,

despite all the media rumors about China's economic collapse.

India has by now the largest growth rate in the world; it's above

7%. Many other Asian countries have explicitly formulated the goal for themselves to be developed countries in a few years.

The

Chinese economy right now is rebounding. They just announced that

in the next five years China is going to import \$10 trillion worth of imports. They will invest \$600 billion worth of investments abroad. Every day 10,000 new firms are being created

in China.

So, if you look at the development, especially since

President Xi Jinping announced in September, 2013 in Kazakhstan,

that the New Silk Road, the One Belt One Road, is put on the agenda. In the Two and a half years since that time, more than sixty nations have joined with China in this development. They have created the New Silk Road, the Maritime Silk Road; these nations have created a whole set of alternative

economic-financial institutions, such as the AIIB, which, despite

massive pressure from the United States not to do so, immediately

was joined by sixty founding members. The New Development Bank also started just now its functioning. The New Silk Road Fund, the Maritime Silk Road Fund, the Shanghai Cooperation Bank, and

many more. All of these were created because the IMF and the World Bank had not invested in the urgently required infrastructure.

These banks are now engaged in very, very impressive, large projects. For example: China invested \$46 billion in the China-Pakistan corridor. When President Xi Jinping recently went

to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Iran, consequently Iran, fool-heartedly, declared that they are now part of the One Belt

One Road, New Silk Road development. Greece is now talking about

that after China is investing in the Port of Piraeus, that Greece

will be the bridge between China and Europe. The 16+1, that is the East and Central European countries, just declared that they

absolutely want to participate in China helping to build a fast

train system in these countries. Those projects which the EU has

not bid, China is now building. Part of it is, for example, the

Elbe-Oder-Danube Canal, which will connect the waterways of these

countries. When President Xi recently was in the Czech Republic,

President Zeman announced that the "Golden City" of Prague will

be the gateway between the Silk Road and Europe. Also, Austria and Switzerland are now fully on board and see the benefits of their country's joining with the New Silk Road.

When President Xi Jinping at the APEC meeting in October

2014 offered to President Obama to cooperate in all of these projects in a "win-win" perspective, he not only proposed economic cooperation, but he put on the agenda a completely new model of international relations exactly designed to overcome geopolitics. The new model is supposed to be based on the respect for sovereignty, non-interference into the internal affairs of the other country, respect for the different social system the other country chooses to adopt. It would really be, in a certain sense, a fulfillment of the principles which are laid out in the UN Charter anyway.

How was the Western response? Very, very ambiguous. The United States in spite of this, never really responded to President Xi's offer. They keep insisting on an unipolar world.

For example, in the TPP, like in the TTIP for Europe, it is said

very, very clearly, the U.S. sets the rules of trade for Asia and

not China. Recently, the American Defense Secretary Ash Carter,

and also NATO commander General Breedlove, declared the enemies

#1 of the United States are, first, Russia, second, China, third,

Iran, fourth North Korea, and only fifth terrorism.

Now that is in spite of the fact that many other statesmen, such as United States Secretary of State John Kerry and Foreign

Minister Steinmeier, and many others, have recently also stated,

that all crucial problems of the world cannot be solved without

the cooperation of Russia, and China. For example, the P5+1

agreement with Iran, would never have come into being without a constructive role of {both} Russia and China . Without Putin's very intelligent intervention in the military situation in Syria, this situation could not have come to the potential of a political solution.

Also, apart from the military pressure, there is massive pressure on the new institutions such as the AIIB and the New Development Bank, to {not} be outside of the casino economy but to follow the "international standards."

Now, in these times of the Panama Papers, of the various LIBOR scandals, of the money laundering of many of these banks, it is a sort of laughable thing, what should be these "international standards" of the Western financial system.

Now, let's be realistic. At the IMF/ World Bank meeting which just concluded in Washington over the weekend, behind the scenes there was complete panic, but nobody dared to speak about it openly, behind the scenes people were talking, what former IMF boss Strauss-Kahn has said repeatedly, publicly, that we are heading towards the "perfect political storm." That if one of the too-big-to-fail banks collapses, it will lead to a crisis much, much worse than 2008.

At the recent Davos Economic Forum, the former chief economist of the BIS William White said that the world system is so utterly overindebted, that there are two roads only possible:

Either you have an orderly writeoff of the debt, like in the religious Jubilee, so that you just say "these debts are not payable," and you write them off, or it will come to a disorderly

collapse.

Now, the situation is all the more urgent, because unlike 2008 when everyone was talking about the "tools" of the central

bank, like interest rate reduction, rescue packages, bailouts, all of these tools don't function any more. As a matter of fact,

when the competition for more zero interest rate, or even negative interest rate, when into high gear in the last month, when, for example, the Bank of Japan or the central bank of Norway, or the ECB declared a zero interest rate policy, or even

a negative interest rate policy, it boomeranged! It had the opposite effect: Rather than leading to more investment, in the

real economy, it led to a deflationary escalation of the collapse.

When Mario Draghi, the chief of the ECB, recently announced, "yeah, yeah, we have a discussion about helicopter money."

And

Ben Bernanke echoed it and said, "yes, now we need helicopter money," meaning electronic printing of {endless} amounts of worthless money, virtual money, they de facto announced that the

trans-Atlantic financial system is absolutely in the last phase.

Because after helicopter money comes only evaporation.

But this is only the most obvious of the crises. Another one, which is in a different domain, but equally systemic is the

refugee crisis in Europe. Now, I supported Chancellor Merkel when she initially said, we can manage that, we can give refuge

to these people, and for the first time, I was saying "this woman is doing the right thing." I know there was a lot of international criticism, but she acted on the basis of the Geneva

Convention on refugees, but it was the right thing to do. But the reactions from the other European countries, revealed an underlying, basic flaw of the EU, a flaw which was not caused by the refugees, but it was revealed by the first serious challenge, that in the EU, as it has been conceptualized in the Maastricht Treaty going up to the Lisbon Treaty, there is no unity, there is no solidarity; and with the collapse of the Schengen agreement which allows free travel within the internal borders of the EU, the closing of the so-called Balkan routes, to prevent refugees from coming, the basis for the European common currency is also gone, because without the Schengen agreement, the possibility to have the euro last is extremely dubious.

Now, with the recent response by the EU to basically have a deal with Turkey, I mean, this is beyond the bankruptcy of the whole EU policy if you can top it. At a point when the Russian UN Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, presented the UN Security Council with evidence that the Turkish government, is continuing up to the present day to supply ISIS with weapons and other logistical means, to then say, we pay Turkey EU6 billion, for what? To have them receive refugees; and Amnesty International has already said, there is no guarantee that these people will be protected, but rather that Turkey is sending them back to the war zones, like Syria, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

So, if you look at the pictures of Idomeni, where the

Macedonian police are using tear gas against refugees who are absolutely desperate; if you look at the fact that Greece is now, rather than having refugee camps which would somehow process these unfortunate human beings, they have, on pressure of the EU, been turned into detention centers. Pope Francis was just in Lesbos, together with the Greek Patriarch Bartholomew, and this Patriarch said, the present EU policy on the refugee crisis, is the completely bankruptcy of Europe. The Doctors Without Borders left their job in Greece, because they said they cannot be accomplices to the murderous policy of detention, where the police decide who is a patient and not doctors. Instead of protecting the people running away from wars and persecution, they are now being treated as criminals. Immediately, days after this disgusting EU-Turkey deal, it turned out that it's a complete failure, the so-called "European values," human rights, humanism, well—they're all in the trashcan, because now the refugees, obviously still fleeing for their lives, go to Libya trying to get into small boats to Italy. And just yesterday the news came that another 400 people drowned in the Mediterranean. And this will keep going on. And it will haunt the people who are refusing to change their ways. Now, there is a new element in the situation which may cause sudden surprises, and that is a program which was presented by CBS, a week ago Sunday, in the so-called "60 Minutes" program portraying the coverup, of the U.S. governments from Bush to Obama, of the famous 28 pages omitted in the publication of the

official Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 by the U.S. Congress; and as many people have said, and was said in this program, this pertains to the role of Saudi Arabia in 9/11. Yesterday, {all} the U.S. talk shows, and all the U.S. media, pointed their finger to the coverup of the Bush administration and even to the present day of the present government, that there is a coverup of criminal activity.

Now, the Saudi Arabian government reacted very unnerved, and this was again reported in the {New York Times}, that they would

sell off \$750 billion in U.S. Treasuries, if the U.S. would allow

a bill that would allow Saudi Arabia to be held responsible in court, for their role in 9/11. Now, that's not exactly a sign of

sovereignty, but of despair. There are several U.S. Senators, among them Mrs. Gillibrand from New York, who demand that this whole question of the Saudi Arabian role in 9/11 must be on the

agenda when President Obama goes to Riyadh this week. Which in

any case, may not happen, but it will not be the end of the story

because the genie is now out of the bottle.

OK: How do we respond to these many, many crises? Well, there is a solution to all of these problems. The trans-Atlantic

should just do exactly what Franklin D. Roosevelt did in 1933, in

reaction to the world financial crisis at the time. Implement

the full banking separation – Glass-Steagall – and the whole offshore nightmare which is being revealed in the Panama Papers,

and remember, that this firm Mossack Fonseca is only the fourth

largest of such firms, and 11 million documents still need to be read through, and processed. But we have to go back to the kind of international credit system, as it existed in the Bretton Woods system, before Nixon ended the fixed exchange rate in 1971, opening the gate for floating exchange rates and especially the creation of offshore money markets for the unlimited creation of money and other illegal operations as it now is coming out. Then we need a writeoff of the absolutely unpayable state debt, which has accumulated and ballooned after the bailouts of 2008 and afterwards. And we have to basically get rid of the toxic paper of the whole derivatives markets, because they are the burden which is eating up the chance for the investment in the real economy. Then, we need a Marshall Plan Silk Road; and the only reason I'm talking about a Marshall Plan, despite the fact that China is {emphatic} that they do not want a Cold War connotation to the New Silk Road, it gives people in the United States and Europe a memory, that it is very possible to rebuild war-torn economies, as it happened in Europe after the Second World War. Now, with the ceasefire which was negotiated between Foreign Ministers Kerry and Lavrov, you have now a still-fragile, but you have the potential for a peace development in Syria, and soon other countries in the region. But it is extremely urgent, that the peace dividend of this ceasefire is becoming visible for the

people of the region, immediately. That is, there has to be a reconstruction and economic buildup, not only of the territory and the destroyed cities, but the entire region, has to be looked

at as one: From Afghanistan to the Mediterranean, from the North

Caucasus to the Persian Gulf. Because you cannot build infrastructure by building a bridge in one country. You have to

have a complete plan for the transformation of this region, which

mainly consists of desert.

Now, the idea is to have a comprehensive plan, greening the deserts, building infrastructure, creating new, fresh water from

desalination of ocean water, of tapping into the water of the atmosphere through ionization, and various other means. And then

build infrastructure corridors, new cities, and give hope to, especially, the young people of the region, so they have a reason

not to join the jihad, but to become doctors, to become engineers, to care for their family and their future.

Now this is not just a program any more, because when President Xi Jinping visited Iran about two months ago, he put the Silk Road development on the agenda for this region. So, all

you need to do, is extend the Silk Road, and the first train has

already arrived in Tehran; you have to continue to build that road, from Iran, to Iraq, to Syria all the way to Egypt. Other

routes should go from Afghanistan, to Pakistan, to India. From Central Asia to Turkey to Europe, and this obviously can only work because the problem is so big, that all the neighbors of the

region, Russia, China, India, Iran, Egypt, but also the

countries

which are now torn apart by the refugee crisis such as Germany,

Italy, Greece, France, and all other European countries must all

commit themselves to work on such a Silk Road Marshall Plan for

the reconstruction and economic buildup of the Middle East/Southwest Asia, {and} all of Africa, because the economic situation is equally dire in that continent.

The United States must be convinced that it is in their best interest to cooperate in such a development, and stop thinking in

terms of geopolitics. Now, the United States should only be encouraged to cooperate in the development of these regions, but

the United States needs {urgently} a New Silk Road itself.

Because if you look at the condition, not only of the financial

sector in the United States, but especially the physical economy;

if you look at the social effects of the economic collapse, like

the rising suicide rates, in all age brackets of the {white} population, and especially rural women in the age between 20 and

40, the suicide rate is quadrupling and even beyond. This is a

sign of a collapsing society.

Now, China has built as of last year, 20,000 km of fast train systems. Excellent, top-level technology fast-train systems; it wants to have 50,000 km by I think the year 2025.

How many miles of fast train as the U.S. built? I don't any.

But if the United States would join the New Silk Road and

participate in the economic reconstruction, as Franklin D.

Roosevelt did it with the Tennessee Valley Authority plan, with

the Reconstruction Finance Corp. in the '30s, the United States

could very, very quickly be a prosperous country, and could again

be regarded by the whole world as "a beacon of liberty and a temple of freedom," which was the idea of America when it was founded.

So, the whole fate of the whole world will depend if we all succeed to get the United States to go back to its proud tradition of a republic, and stop thinking like an empire, because that cannot be maintained in any case; because all empires in the whole history of mankind always disintegrated when

they became overstretched and collapsed. There is not one exception to this idea.

Now, therefore, let's go back to the idea from the beginning: Let's approach all problems in the present from the

idea, where is the future of mankind? Where should mankind be?

Do we exist, or will we destroy ourselves. And that requires a

change in paradigm, which must be as fundamental and thorough, like the paradigm shift from the European Middle Ages to the modern times. And what caused that shift was such great figures

as Nikolaus of Cusa, but also Brunelleschi, Jeanne d'Arc, and many others; but what they introduced was a rejection of the old

paradigm—scholasticism, Aristotelianism, all the wrong ideas which led to the destruction of the 14th century, and they replaced with a completely {new} image of man, man as an {imago

viva Dei}, which was a synonym for the unlimited creative potential and perfectability of the human being. It led to a new

image of man which created a blossoming of science, of modern

science, of the modern sovereign nation-state; it made possible

the emergence of Classical arts.

And that is what we have to do today: We have to stop thinking in terms of geopolitics, and we have to focus on the common aims of mankind. Now, what are these "common aims of mankind"? It is, first of all scientific cooperation to eradicate hunger, poverty, to develop more and more cures for diseases, to increase the longevity of all people. We have to study much more fundamentally, what is the principle of life? Why does life exist? How does it function? What, really, is the

deeper lawfulness of our universe? And that must define the identity of human beings, which is unique to the human species.

And I have an idea of the future, which will be full of joy. Because we will discover new principles in science and in classical art, and we will create a new Renaissance. As the Italian Renaissance superseded the Dark Age of the 14th century,

what we have to do today, is we have to revive the best traditions of all great nations and cultures of the world; and make them known to the other one. Have a dialogue of the most advanced periods of Chinese, of European, Indian, African, other

cultures, and revive—and that is being done in China, already—the great Confucian tradition, which is in absolute correspondence with the best neo-Platonic humanist ideas of Europe. We must revive the great Vedic tradition in India, the

Gupta period; the Indian Renaissance of the late 19th to the 20th

century. We must revive the Abbasid Dynasty of the Arab world;

the Italian Renaissance; the Andalusian Spanish Renaissance, the

Ecole Polytechnique in France, the great German Classical

period.

The great Italian method of singing in Verdi tuning and the bel

canto method. And if all of these riches of all the different countries become the common good of all children of this planet,

and everyone can learn universal history, other cultures as if it

would be their own, I can already see how humanity can make a jump, and how we can create the most beautiful Renaissance of human history so far.

I think everybody who is thinking about these questions, has a deep understanding, that we are at the most important crossroad

in human history. And it is not yet clear which way we will go,

but it is clear to me, that we will {only} come out of this crisis if we mobilize the subjective emotional quality, which in

the Chinese is called {ren}; and the European equivalent, you would call {agapē}, love. And we will only solve this problem if

we are able to mobilize a tender, maybe even {passionate} love,

for the human species. [applause]