

Bidens opfordring til "Enhed" er ikke nok: Udvikling er det nye navn for enhed!

Schiller Instituttets ugentlige webcast med Helga Zepp-LaRouche den 21. januar 2021

Se Helgas Webcast på Schiller instituttets Youtube kanal her

I en vidtrækkende og meget provokerende dialog med Helga Zepp-LaRouche indledte hun med at bemærke, at hvis Joe Biden virkelig er fast besluttet på at skabe "enhed", som han sagde i sin indvielsestale, skulle han vedtage pave Paul VI's rundskrivelse, "Udvikling er det nye navn for fred", som sin politik. Dette ville kræve, at "identitetspolitik" droppes, samt den grønne New Deal – som han ikke viser tegn på at gøre – til fordel for LaRouche-bevægelsens plan for at skabe 1,5 milliarder produktive arbejdspladser, herunder udvikling af et moderne sundhedssystem i enhver nation for at håndtere COVID-pandemien.

Hun spurgte også, om den paranoia, som Hillary Clinton og flertalsleder i Repræsentanternes Hus, Nancy Pelosi, viste over for Rusland og Trump-vælgerne, gør dem til "QAnon"-tvillingerne [QAnon er en højreekstremistisk konspirationsbevægelse]. På en indsigtfuld måde forklarede hun, at QAnon er en operation for psykologisk krigsførelse. Hun beskrev, hvordan QAnon har fælles træk med den romantiske bevægelse, som blev skabt af oligarkiet efter Napoleonskrigene, for at ødelægge klassiske tænkemåder til

fordel for dissociative følelser.

Helga Zepp-LaRouche berettede, hvorfor hun mener, at EU's splittelse over den grønne New Deal, og de katastrofale virkninger det vil have på industrien, åbner døren til at besejre den.

Hun diskuterede også konsekvenserne af opdagelsen af nye varianter af COVID 19.

Uddrag:

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jeg overværede selvfølgelig indsættelsen og hans tale. Først og fremmest er jeg ikke imponeret over hans kunstneriske smag. Jeg fandt, at Lady Gaga var temmelig forfærdelig; Hvis man sammenligner Marian Andersons smukke fremførelse af nationalhymnen ved indsættelsen af John F. Kennedy [og Dwight Eisenhower i 1957] og så Lady Gagas, så får man en fornemmelse af, hvad der er galt med kulturen.

Lad os nu sige, at vi giver Biden kredit for, at han mener, hvad han sagde, at han ønsker forsoning. Nuvel, så har jeg et ganske godt råd til ham – han er katolik, og så burde han læse pave Paul VI's Encyclical (rundskrivelse -red,), som han skrev i 1967, under titlen 'Populorum Progressio' – eller 'om folks udvikling' – og hvori han sagde, at "det nye navn for fred er udvikling". Og på samme måde kan man sige, at det "nye navn for enighed er udvikling". Den eneste måde man kan håbe på at have enighed inden for USA ville være at sætte et økonomisk program på dagsordenen, der giver produktive jobs til alle amerikanere, hvilket ville annullere de økonomiske uretfærdigheder, der trods alt er grunden til, at Trump blev valgt i 2016, og til at alle Trump-vælgerne stadig holder fast ved ham. Så hvis han ønsker at have forsoning, må han gøre udvikling til det nye navn for enighed, og så vil det gå i samme retning internationalt.

Nu ved jeg ikke – men hvis han mener det alvorligt, er han

nødt til at slippe af med identitetspolitik. Fordi så længe man deler folk op efter deres etnicitet eller deres seksuelle eller anden overbevisning eller forskel, er dette polariserende. Dette er nøjagtigt det modsatte af, hvad Martin Luther King sagde, nemlig at alt skal være inkluderende. Lad os nu se, hvad Biden gør; virkeligheden vil vise sig meget hurtigt ved hans gerninger og ikke ved ordene.

Meget mere kunne siges, men han er ny præsident, så lad os se hvad der sker. Hvis man ser på det hold han har valgt – tja, altså, mange kommer fra den gamle Obama-administration; mange har allerede udtrykt enighed med Pompeo, eksempelvis om holdningen til anti-Kina, anti-Rusland. Tony Blinken sagde, at han er enig med Pompeo mht. Kina, så det tegner ikke så godt... Så jeg tror, at mange ting skal ændres, og som jeg sagde, den eneste måde hvorpå Biden muligvis kunne forene USA ville være at bryde fuldstændigt med den politik, han har kæmpet for i valgkampen: 'the Green New Deal', fordi 'Green New Deal' betyder, at opgaven med at skaffe et produktivt job til enhver amerikaner er helt umulig. Så med mindre han ændrer politik, hvilket naturligvis ikke er sandsynligt, tror jeg ikke, at nogen af de ord han sagde, vil betyde meget.

Så lad os se. Mit råd til Biden ville være at støtte pavens rundskrivelse, 'Populorum Progressio', det "nye navn for enighed er udvikling".

SCHLANGER: To interessante aspekter ved præsident Trumps afgang: Den ene er, at vi endelig fik offentliggørelsen af noget af dokumentationen omkring Russiagate med frigivelsen af FBI-interviewet med Christopher Steele, hvor Steele indrømmer, at han fremlagde dossieret, fordi han var bekymret over det britiske forhold til USA, og forhåbentlig kommer der mere. Det er lidt sent. Men jeg var ret skuffet over Trumps beslutning om at give en benådning til den korrupte Steve Bannon og ikke gøre noget i forhold til Julian Assange. Har du nogen tanker om det, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Jo, 'skuffende' er et mildt ord – jeg synes, at undlade at benåde Assange kan virkelig ikke forsvares; der er ingen tvivl om, at Assange sidder i fængsel i Storbritannien for at have afdækket nogle virkelige forbrydelser. Han er en 'whistleblower', der skal have beskyttelse i ethvert samfund, der respekterer dets egne love. Så det er en trussel mod Assanges liv, og nu bliver det meget sværere at redde ham, så jeg mener, at dette absolut er uforsvarligt...

Engelsk afskrift:

Webcast With Helga Zepp-LaRouche: Call for 'Unity' Is Not Enough: Development Is the New Name of Unity!

January 21 (EIRNS)–Schiller Institute Weekly Webcast with Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Thursday, January 21, 2021

HARLEY SCHLANGER: Hello, I'm Harley Schlanger with our weekly update with Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder and President of the Schiller Institute. It's Jan. 21st, 2021.

Well, we're three weeks into the New Year, and already it's been a year of surprises and tumult, chaos. We had yesterday the inauguration of Joe Biden, and I find it a bit ironic that Biden's main theme was unity, when I guess he intends to enforce unity through censorship, through a new Patriot Act—what did you make of his speech, Helga?

HELGA ZEPP-LAROUCHE: I watched the inauguration and his speech, naturally. First of all, I'm not impressed by his artist's tastes. I thought that Lady Gaga was quite horrible; if you compare the beautiful singing of Marian Anderson of the National Anthem at the inauguration of I think it was John F. Kennedy [and Dwight Eisenhower in 1957] and Lady Gaga, then you get a sense of what is wrong with the culture. [<https://www.gettyimages.com/detail/video/marian-johnson-sings-the-national-anthem-as-john-f-news-footage/173704298>]

Now, let's say we would give Biden the credit that he means what he said, that he wants to have unity. And well, then I have very good advice for him—he's a Catholic, and then he should read the Encyclical of Pope Paul VI that he wrote in 1967, which was called *Populorum Progressio*, or *On the Development of Peoples*, and in which he said that the "the new name for peace is development." And in the same way, one can say that the "new name for unity is development." The only way one can hope to have unity inside the United States would be to put on the agenda an economic program which would give productive jobs to every American, which would undo the economic injustices which are, after all, the reason why Trump was elected in 2016, and why all the Trump voters are still sticking to Trump. So, if he wants to have unity, he should make development the new name for unity, and internationally it would go in the same direction.

Now, I don't know—if he means it seriously, he has to get rid of identity politics. Because, as long as you divide people by their ethnic or sexual or other conviction or distinction, this is polarizing. This is exactly the opposite of what Martin Luther King said, that everything has to be inclusive. Now, let's see what Biden does, if the reality will show itself very quickly by its deeds and not by the words.

A lot more could be said, but he's a new President, so let's see what will happen. If you look at the team he has selected, well, many of those are from the old Obama Administration; many have come out already agreeing with Pompeo, for example, on the anti-China, anti-Russia stance. Tony Blinken said he agrees with Pompeo on China, so that does not forebode very good. And one cannot forget that the shadow which is hanging over the Biden Administration is exactly what was done in the five years of the Trump candidacy in 2016, the four years of Trump's Presidency when we had Russiagate, we had the Mueller report, we had impeachment 1, impeachment 2; we had the collusion of the heads of intelligence with British

intelligence against Trump for this entire period. So that is the heritage, and now, basically, if everybody who voted for Trump is potentially a domestic terrorist—well, if somebody is a white male and voted for Trump, if he is labeled a domestic terrorist, that makes about, at minimum, something like 40 million Americans domestic terrorists—I don't think that that will work for unity.

So, I think a lot of things have to be changed and as I said, the only way how Biden could possibly unify the United States, would be to completely break with the policy he has campaigned on in the election campaign: the Green New Deal, because the Green New Deal means that the task to have a productive job for every American is absolutely impossible. So if he doesn't change policy, which is not likely, obviously, I don't think any of the words that he said will mean much.

So, let's see. My advice to Biden would be to go with encyclical *Populorum Progressio*, the “new name for unity is development.”

[http://www.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html]

SCHLANGER: Two interesting aspects of the departure of President Trump: One is that finally we got the declassification of some of the documentation around the Russiagate, with the release of the FBI interview of Christopher Steele, in which Steele admitted that he produced the dossier because he was worried about the British relationship with the United States, and hopefully there'll be more coming. It's a little late. But, I was quite disappointed in Trump's decision to issue a pardon to sleazy Steve Bannon and not to do something with Julian Assange. Do you have some thoughts on that, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Yeah, “disappointing” is a mild word, I think, not to pardon Assange is really not defensible, because there's no question that Assange is sitting in jail in Great

Britain for having uncovered some real crimes. He's a whistleblower which should be protected in any society which respects the laws it has given itself. So it's a threat to Assange's life, and now it will be much more difficult to save him, so I think this is absolutely indefensible.

Concerning Bannon, this unfortunately is not a surprise, because it was clear for the better part of 2020, that Trump, who had distanced himself from Bannon, which was a good thing, had moved back into the influence domain of Bannon starting in April, when he started to say this line that the COVID virus was deliberately spread by China, which is scientifically ridiculous. Nobody in the world who has any knowledge about pandemics would argue like that, and it was also wrong. It is a matter of fact that China has done an enormous job to contain the virus, and to then immediately help a lot of other countries, first with masks, then with medical supplies, now with the vaccine.

So, it is wrong, and to say something like that is also dangerous, because it is creating an enemy-image, which in line with what the military-industrial complex is saying and doing against China, is creating an enemy-image for a potential future military conflict, which is really inexcusable.

I think this is really bad. And Trump also stuck to his line that the U.S. economy is doing great because the stock markets are going up, or are up—I mean, all of these are the weak points, and I don't think that that was a very good departure at all.

SCHLANGER: You mentioned the strategic continuity between people like Blinken, the new Secretary of State, or would be Secretary of State, with Pompeo. We saw something that was quite hideous with Hillary Clinton and Pelosi conspiring to criminalize all 75 million Trump voters, but also continuing the targetting of Russia. If this continues, this is extremely

dangerous.

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: I mean, sometimes one wonders if either Hillary Clinton and Nancy Pelosi are the Democratic version of QAnon, or, maybe the two ladies have a severe attack of paranoia. Because the idea, what Clinton actually said, that she thinks it's possible that Trump was on the telephone with Putin during the attack on the Capitol on Jan. 6—it's a world full of conspiracies, of insinuations; it's just completely, I think, deranged.

SCHLANGER: [laughs] I like that. The twin "Q Sisters."

Now, the other thing that's happening is we're seeing a kickoff in a couple of days of the Green New Deal with the World Economic Forum, the Davos group, pushing their Green policy based on the Great Reset. There's resistance developing to that. This really is no solution, but what do you think is going to come of this meeting, in the next few days?

ZEPP-LAROUICHE: It will be interesting, because, it's a virtual meeting; it will be addressed by many heads of state. Not all of them are on this Green Deal line. You have President Alberto Fernández from Argentina, President Xi from China, Prime Minister Modi from India, Merkel, Macron; so I think we will hear quite different accentuations from these different leaders. But it is very clear that the Davos crowd—this is the top 2,000-3,000 CEOs of the top financial institutions and multinational corporations, they are pushing for the Green New Deal, the Great Reset, the idea of implementing a "stakeholder capitalism," as they say. There will be a tremendous push to brainwash the whole world into accepting the idea that everything has to be Green, all investment must go into only Green technology. But the reality is there are now the first voices realizing, or speaking out, that this will be a catastrophe. For example, of a place where you would not necessarily expect it from—namely, an economist from Deutsche Bank, Eric Heymann—he put out a quite interesting article

saying that the policy of the EU, which naturally also for the Green Deal, is very dishonest, because they're not telling people that this will only go through with a massive reduction in the living standards. And that, in turn, can only be implemented through massive eco-dictatorship, in other words, a complete bending of all legality and constitutionality by implementing dictatorial measures.

Now, that is slowly dawning on some people. For example, when the EU just recently tried to implement the infamous "taxonomy," as they're naming it, which means that all the firms have to give their CO₂ footprint, ten countries refused to do that, and the EU was forced to postpone this whole affair, because they couldn't get the unity—it was mostly East European and South European countries, that obviously have already been on the losing end in terms of the EU austerity policy, so their enthusiasm for the EU policy is very limited to say the least in the first place.

So, I think that this whole Green Deal is absolutely crazy. For example, the head of Toyota in Japan, Akio Toyoda, he calculated and said that if you want to put Japan entirely on e-cars, electric cars, it would cost investments in infrastructure of over \$1 trillion. Now, we took the figures given by the Toyota study and tried to calculate a similar cost for the EU: Germany alone is already scheduled to lose 400,000 jobs in the auto sector if there is a transition to e-cars, because they have much less components for the motors, so the supply industry becomes shrunk. But it's much, much worse: First of all, you would need an investment in infrastructure for e-cars in Europe of over €1 trillion, probably €1.2 trillion, and then naturally you have no electricity because we already had several almost blackouts for the entire European energy grid, last week! Now, if you try to put all these cars on electric fuel, the electricity is by far not sufficient. So this whole thing is economically very stupid. It would destroy the industrial countries of

Europe, the United States and Asia if they would go with it. So I can imagine that there will be a lot more resistance once people start to realize what the effect is: it will drive energy prices even higher, it will cause mass unemployment; it will drive prices in general much higher.

So I think that if there is an effort to implement that in earnest, what we have seen in terms of the Brexit vote, the Trump vote, riots in the streets, Yellow Vests, all of that will increase, because you cannot destroy the livelihood of millions and millions of people without their starting to go to the street in protest, when they realize that their livelihood is in danger.

So I can only say, people should abandon this idea. There is climate change—obviously—but what it is exactly is not so clear. There are big debates in the scientific community; there are many studies which attribute the climate change to very different phenomena, such as galactic cycles. We have introduced on the Schiller Institute website a page, which is called “Science—Stop Green Fascism” [<https://schillerinstitute.com/stop-green-fascism/>]. And there we will institute an international debate, where we already have many scientific papers, by many scientists. And I invite you to go to this page—we will have many more coming in the next days and weeks, so that is a place where you can inform yourself about what is really behind this Green Deal, and get a more scientific approach.

SCHLANGER: And while we’re talking about this question about the loss of energy production that’s planned with the Green New Deal, we have an attack from Pompeo in the United States against the Nord Stream 2 [pipeline] which is crucial for Germany. But we’re also seeing something interesting: The choice for the new chairman for the Christian Democrats in Germany is someone who’s considered to be anti-Green. How significant is this?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: First of all, it is not so clear that the German industry and politicians will capitulate to the U.S. sanctions [against firms working with Gazprom to build the Nord Stream 2 pipeline from Russia]. I mean obviously, the danger of being hit with such sanctions is a deterrent, so one of the industries involved, Bilfinger, already withdrew. Even Gazprom said it's questionable if it can be brought into completion, but there is also massive resistance, because people know that what's behind that is an effort, on the one side, to treat Germany and the other 12 European countries that participate in Nord Stream 2 as a colony, and people don't like that so much any more. And secondly, everybody knows the U.S. wants to sell their liquefied natural gas and that is also pretty obvious; it's more expensive, it's more environmentally unfriendly (to say the least), so I think there is still resistance.

Concerning Mr. Armin Laschet [new Christian Democratic Union chairman], he has already been attacked that he is "soft" on Putin, that he did not agree with the Skripal interpretation; that he didn't make enough fuss about the Navalny case—I think all of that speaks for Laschet, because all of these cases were efforts to manipulate an anti-Russian hysteria. That's all I can say on that point for now.

SCHLANGER: Going to the more crazy side of U.S. politics, we have this movement called QAnon, which was predicting a military coup, that Biden would be arrested, Hillary Clinton arrested, Trump would be brought back in—this has many people wrapped up in it, and it's turning out, from the research we're starting to do, that this was a military psy-ops from the beginning, using the military side of artificial intelligence and so on. This is also emerging in Europe, as well. What do you make of this, Helga?

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Well, it is a psychological warfare operation against the population, to try to confuse them: As you say, we are looking into the connections to the military right now,

but there is also another interesting observations which intrigued me. It's written by a designer of games, Reed Berkowitz, and he basically says that looking at the way the QAnon operation works, he said it's exactly like the games he is designing, that it leads to something which he called "apophenia," which is a notion coming from psychology which means that people have a sort of free association, where they connect things and put them together in a pattern which looks logical but these things are not connected, or at least not in the way they're being put together. For example, you have this really crazy interpretation of people who say that the entire COVID-19 is just a conspiracy to implement military or dictatorial means. This is a mental disorder, because the pandemic is quite real, which we should talk about a little bit later. But I think this idea of game theory, or designing games is actually quite accurate. [https://medium.com/curiouserinstitute/a-game-designers-analysis-of-qanon-580972548be5]

And when I read the article by Berkowitz, I was immediately reminded of my research into the Romantic movement. Now, this is extremely important. Because how do people judge things, like reality? How do they know that their judgment is truthful or at least trying to be truthful? Well, you have to think like a scientist, or you have to think like a Classical artist, because these are the only two groups of people who think in terms of universal principles. A universal principle is something which you can verify everywhere, no matter if you are in Africa, or in the United States, or in Europe, because it's a universal principle because it's universal; therefore, you have a test of reality.

The last time there was a culture which was based on such universal principles, was the German Classical period, which produced such giants as Bach and Beethoven, Haydn, Schubert, Schumann, Mozart; but in poetry, Schiller; Shakespeare would another, from another period, proponent of such universal

thinking; and this was extremely important, because it established a high standard of morality, a high standard of intelligence, of creativity, and it would have liberated the population to be truly free if that would have been the dominant culture. And it was on a good way in Germany, because one of the closest collaborators and friends of Schiller for example, Wilhelm von Humboldt, had designed the Humboldt education system, and when he was Education Minister he started to implement it. And it would have meant that the entire population would have been rational creative, the potential of everybody would have been brought out, so it was on a very good way.

But then, a counter-movement developed, which started maybe innocently as a Romantic, just slightly confused form of thinking in the person of Novalis. But then, soon there were some others, like August Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel, Tieck, and these people were quickly taken over by Metternich, by the Restoration, and they became the political Romantics. Now, what is the difference between Classical thinking and Romantic thinking? In Classical thinking it's what I said before: you have an absolute ability to find the truth by the method of exhaustion, by establishing principles which can be found, and established and proven again and again, because they are principles which are pertaining to the real universe.

What the Romantics started to do, they started to consciously take the poetical stringent form of the Classical culture apart, by saying there should be no beginning, there should be no end, day and night, and waking and dream should all be interwoven; you should have free association follow diffused emotions, and this became a real Schwärmerei and it turned the absolute optimism of the German Classical period into the pessimism which now, in the end—and I'm leaving out many steps in between—it ended with the horrible 12 years of the National Socialism in Germany, which was sort of the end form, or in the modern deconstruction of all modern art.

So, when you see something like that, and you see a method being applied which consciously confuses people, as it is clearly the case in the QAnon movement (or whatever), it is psychological warfare of people, because it goes against science, it makes people deliberately believe things which they are no longer able to think through, and I think it's a real dangerous thing, and we will do some more work on it, to discover what it really is.

SCHLANGER: Good, that was very important, what you just went through. We're down to just a couple minutes, so I'm going to jump ahead to the one question that you referred to earlier, which is the importance of addressing the new variants of coronavirus. This is now out of control in Germany, in the United Kingdom; the situation seems to be getting worse, the vaccines are not ready. Where is this headed?

ZEPP-LAROCHE: Well, just today there was an EU meeting, and Merkel, who is not my favorite politician, but she said something which is extremely truthful, unfortunately, and she seems to have a little bit better grasp on COVID than most politicians have shown; and she is warning of something which many medical experts have express extreme concern about in the recent days: Namely that these new variants, which emerged in Great Britain, in South Africa, and Brazil—each of them being different—are rapid variations, and there is a danger that soon these variants will be vaccine resistant. Now, if that would happen, then we would look into a completely different kind of catastrophe, because up to now, for example, in the United States, most of the bets, at least in the previous administration were put on quickly developing a vaccine, and if that goes out of the window, then you are really in trouble.

I think the only possible answer to that, is, we have to have a world health system: This is what we have been saying since the beginning of this pandemic, that unless you have a modern health system in every single country—in Haiti, in Mali, in

Ecuador, in India—just simply every single country, you are not going to protect your country. The idea that American, or Germany, or any one of these so-called advanced countries can be protected when the pandemic is raging in the developing countries, is simply an illusion. And since the medical experts already have been warning that new viruses are already waiting to spread new variants of MERS and SARS, that this question of really changing the attitude towards the developing sector is becoming a question of the moral fitness to survive for the entire human species. That means, we have to build modern health systems in every country, and that is only possible if you have infrastructure! If you don't have clean water, electricity, means of transport and communications, you can't do it.

So we are at the crossroads where we in earnest have to go to the policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt, what he intended with the Bretton Woods system, which was never realized because he died too early; but he wanted to increase the living standard of the entire population of the world, and that, he said, is the precondition for peace. I think we are at that point, where we either correct that failure of the entire post-war period, or we will go into an endless series of catastrophes.

That is the program which we have been putting forward, 1.5 billion productive jobs have to be created anew, and the whole drive has to start with this idea of a world health system. And I would appeal to all of you who are listening to this, that if you agree with that, then you should join our efforts. We have a Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites, which is trying to get an approach to all the aspects of this problem, meaning to double food production worldwide to deal with the famine of "biblical dimensions," and at the same time train young people to be helpers for medical personnel, partnerships of the developing countries—all of this is still in the works.

But I think we really have to start with a change in the attitude: You cannot this pandemic in one country, and you

cannot, for sure, solve it with the Green Deal. If you go for the Green Deal, there is no way how the necessary science and technology can be available, or the industrial capacities to implement such a world health system. So, we are at a crossroads, and you should join the Schiller Institute and work with us to give this whole thing a different direction.

SCHLANGER: For updates on this story of the coronavirus, as well as everything we were discussing today, you can get them at The LaRouche Organization website [www.laroucheorganization.com] as well as the Schiller Institute [https://schillerinstitute.com]

So Helga, thank you for joining us today, and we'll see you again next week.

ZEPP-LAROUCHE: Till next week.